

Vetus Chronicon, which reckon 30,000 years from the beginning of time to Typhon, the murderer of his brother Osiris (i. e. to the flood; for Typhon signifies also the sea, as Osiris the mainland); and, farther, 3984 years from thence to Menes, and besides 217 additional years? We are informed by Censorinus, Horapollon and others, that the Egyptian word *abot*, *habot*, (complexus) signified not only a year, but also a month, and also a season of two months. Consequently Manetho and the author of the *Vetus Chronicon* were authorised to calculate times according to such shorter years, without contradicting the other historical traditions of their nation. Now we know, moreover, that Manetho's history of Egypt was called the book of the Sothis, that is to say, the book of the great canicular period of 36,525 years. This number was obtained by the multiplication of the smaller Sothis of 1461 years with the Apis-period of twenty-five years, and proximately coincided, as we have seen, with the great world-period of 80,000 years. Now since Manetho was very well acquainted with the very year of the creation, 5871 B. C., which was recorded in the planetary constellations concerning the commencements of the three first ages of the world, he must have taken shorter years as the basis of those periods, of 30,000 and 3984 years, in order to include in his great Sothis of 36,525 years the entire history of Egypt down to his time. In short, for the purpose of establishing a history of 36,525 years, called Sothis, Manetho turned solar years into months by multiplication, as we find it also among the ancient Chaldeans, Hindoos, Chinese, and others. He therefore regarded those 30,000 years of his from the creation to the flood as so many lunar months, (*abot*) and consequently reckoned only 2424 solar years for the period in question. Moreover the 3984 years, (*Horæ*) from the deluge to Menes, of which each expressed a season of two months, give but 604 solar years; and Manetho's third period of 217 years, rather comprises the days from Menes' departure from Babylonia to his arrival in Egypt.

Hence there is nothing at all irreconcilable between Manetho's Sothis and the other traditions of his people. All know that, according to the above-mentioned planetary configurations, the creation had taken place on the 10th of May, 5871 B. C., and the arrival of Menes on the 16th of July, 2871 B. C. Between the two epochs 3089 years intervene, and precisely this number we have in Manetho's periods of 30,000 months and 3984 *Horæ*, with 217 days. In fine, as Manetho reckons from the creation down to Typhon (the deluge) 2424 solar years, the Egyptians placed the flood 2424 years subsequent to 5871 B. C., and therefore in the year 3447 B. C., to which year, as has already been said, the planetary configuration in the alphabet refers.

The whole history of Egypt is now determined, even to minute dates of years and days, by means of the many planetary configurations mentioned above, as having occurred at the birth of the Pharaohs, at the commencement of the said four ages of the world, and at the beginning of the reign of Menes, the first Egyptian king; by means of the transits of Mercury connected with the reign of certain monarchs, and lastly by means of the Phoenix-periods, and Apis-periods, concerning which we have already spoken. On the basis of these mathematical truths, we, in the first place, find the commencement of the reign of Thutmose, the first king of the XVIII. Dynasty, during whose government the Hebrews emigrated, to have been in the year 1904 B. C. On the 7th April of the same year, there was a renewal of the Phoenix-period of six hundred and fifty-one years, which is said to have taken place in the reign of this very Thutmose, or Amos I. and in

the sixth year of the emperor Claudius. The arrival of the Shepherd-kings (Hyksos,) i. e. the Hebrews, as Josephus testifies, is ascertained with equal certainty. Even Manetho states, that these Hyksos became the builders of Jerusalem, subsequently to their expulsion from Egypt; and, according to Africanus' copy of Manetho, they ruled contemporaneously with the Diospolite-kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty, that is to say, in their land of Goshen. The Hebrews, therefore, arrived in Egypt, according to Manetho, in the 700th year of the canicular period, (2782 B. C.) consequently in 2082 B. C. The precise time of Sesostris the Great, of the XIIth dynasty, is determined by the circumstance that during his reign, and on the 6th of April, 2,655 B. C. those Phoenix periods of six hundred and fifty-one years commenced, which were subsequently renewed in 1904 B. C. under Amos I., and in 50 B. C. under Claudius. The first year of Menes, name'y the 2781 B. C., is determined by sixteen astronomical inscriptions, and by the very fact, that the *Vetus Chronicon*, an old historical work of the Egyptians, places Menes in the first year of the canicular period, that is also in 2781 B. C. Thus it is evident, that between Menes and the XVIIIth dynasty, several dynasties must have ruled simultaneously in upper and lower Egypt, which was early divided into twelve provinces, or Nomi. The question now is, which of these Manethonian dynasties were contemporaneous? Eratosthenes has left us a translation of a list of the Pharaohs from Menes to the end of the XVIIIth dynasty, (1046 B. C.,) together with a statement of the years of the respective reigns of these kings; and from these it is manifest, not only that Menes did not come from Babylonia into Egypt until the afore-mentioned year 2781 B. C., but also that among the earlier dynasties enumerated by Manetho, the Ist, XIIth, XVIth, XVIIth, and XVIIIth only were successive, and that the intervening ones were contemporaneous with them.

As the collections for the General Purpose Fund of the Church Society are about to be taken up, we would recommend a careful perusal of the following extract from the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH OF THE U. S.

In the communications received by the Committee, in response to an invitation of the Chairman, in the *Spirit of Missions*, and which have come from both clergy and laity, the subject of *Lay co-operation in the work of Domestic Missions* has been presented and discussed. That our laity generally are too little engaged in the active work of the Church, has long been mourned over as one of the greatest evils to which we are liable. Without at all infringing upon the peculiar prerogatives of the sacred office, the laity have it in their power to do much good as labourers in the Missionary work. As is remarked in one of the communications referred to, "What the pioneer in our new regions is to civilization, the laity should be to the Ministry. They may clear away the timber and rubbish, break up the land, and remove the causes of that prevailing deadly miasma so fatal to health and progress. They can combat with, and soften prejudice, where the Ministry cannot even enjoy the privilege of a hearing; and even where the ministry may be heard, the layman oftentimes occupies a position to exert a scarcely less powerful influence for good." In the new and destitute portions of the country, the laity should be active and zealous in the organization of Sunday Schools, and Catechetical and Bible classes, under proper advice and

direction, they should perform the service of the Church, gathering together their friends and neighbours, for the worship of God, and thus laying the foundation of future parishes, and doing a work that shall be felt through distant years and generations. Exemplary laymen may be found in all parts of our great Missionary field, who are fully qualified for such duties, and it is to be earnestly hoped that, in time to come, they will more generally act as co-workers in Missionary operations. The Committee have no matured and definite plan to propose, by which the co-operation of the laity in this work may be more effectually secured: but in considering the important question intrusted to them, they have regarded the subject now referred to as worthy of the especial notice and action of the Board. Many of our scattered people, who otherwise would be well nigh, if not entirely, lost to the Church, would, by the plan now suggested, be kept within our fold, and the laity, acting thus as the pioneers of the Ministry, would not only promote the extension and increase of the Church, but would also be making use of one of the surest means to secure their own personal progress in all virtue and godliness of living.

The Committee deem it within their province to allude to the absence of all systematic provision for aid in the erection of churches at Missionary Stations, as one of the chief hindrances to the Domestic Missionary work. This subject is one of great importance, and it is a matter of surprise and regret that it has not as yet received, among us, the attention that it deserves. Some of the principal denominations of our country have adopted systematic arrangements by which feeble congregations are assisted in providing for themselves places of public worship; and the result thus far has proved the great utility of such a provision. A church is surely one of the very first things needed by a worshipping congregation; and oftentimes the work of our Missionaries almost fails of success for want of a fitting place where the people may assemble and meet together. And yet our Missionary parishes are ordinarily unable to erect churches, without some foreign assistance. To secure this assistance, the general practice has been to send the Missionary on a tour of solicitation; and, in the absence of any regular provision for such objects, this has seemed to be the only plan that was available. But it is evident that the whole Church now regards this practice with little favour, and that it is destined to meet with more and more discouragement year by year. The true policy is for Missionary parishes to be content, in their feebleness, with simple and cheap churches, and to improve or supersede them, as the congregations grow in strength and ability. But as, in many instances, some aid is indispensable, it is desirable that some plan should be devised by which the end in view may be accomplished, without a resort to the objectionable practice to which reference has been made. A voluntary society was organized a few years since, for the purpose of raising funds to procure sites for churches and parsonage in our new states and territories, and much good has doubtless resulted from its operations. But funds for churches are more needed than funds for sites. In most of our new towns and villages, sites may be secured as donations, or for a merely nominal consideration. The Committee would venture to suggest that this subject calls for prompt and general action on the part of the Church. The Board itself cannot divert its funds for the purpose in question: but it may feel disposed to express its sense of the importance of the same. And, in due time, some means may be devised by which one great hindrance to the Domestic Missionary work