

And we might expect, not forgetting prayer as the foremost means, that the ranks of the depleted ministry would be filled to something more near the level of our country's needs, and the pressing requirements of the foreign field.

III.—EGYPTOLOGY No. IV.—THE MONUMENTAL BOOK OF REVELATION.

By REV. CAMDEN COBERN, PH.D., PARIS, FRANCE.

"EGYPT: from whose all dateless tombs arose
Forgotten Pharaohs from their long repose."

SLOWLY wrap after wrap was removed from the old mummied language of the Pharaohs. Very slowly did this process seem to the on-lookers, and when the resurrected Egyptian Lazarus stood out at last free from his graveclothes he was yet found to be "slow of speech and of a slow tongue." The Book of Revelation in his dried fingers seemed as yet sealed with seven seals. One by one, however, these seals were broken as the decades passed. In 1836 Sharpe could venture to declare that Egyptologists knew by what king and in what order the great buildings of Egypt were erected; though even then the Rosetta stone remained the chief source of their knowledge of the language, and even he thought that old Cheops reigned after the days of Solomon!

It was not long, however, after the middle of the century had passed before translations of the Annals of Ramses and Mattemes began to appear in the "*Archæologia*," and historians began to think of re-writing Egyptian history in the light of contemporary Egyptian documents.

It is not surprising that the claims of Egyptologists, who boasted themselves able to read and translate the memoranda of scribes and the journals of tourists who were contemporaries of Joseph or Amram, were met with ridicule, even in high places. As late as 1862, after the Rosetta stone had been before the public for 60 years, and Champollion's discovery had been published for 40 years, Sir George Cornewall Lewis in his "*Astronomy of the Ancients*" severely took the Egyptologists to task, claiming that with all their pretensions, their labor had been thrown away, as their injurious structure of a so-called language was totally worthless. He ridiculed Champollion's "discovery," and pointed out the enormous demands which his theory made upon the adherent's credulity. First, it was incredible that the language was alphabetic, when almost every ancient writer declared it to be ideographic or symbolic. Further, it was equally incredible, even if it were alphabetic, and if students of the language were able to pronounce the words, that without any dictionaries they could ever tell what the words meant—especially as, according to their own showing, the same hieroglyphic group in different relations might stand for a cow, a boat, a husband, a duck, or a dozen other things