

other Hindu documents we learn that, among the very ancient kings of Magadha, which was originally the Hittite Megiddo (in Egyptian Maketa), there were several in the Andhra dynasty called by the names Satakarni and Skanuaswati. The *Iroquois Book of Rites* places them among the founders of the ancient League as the Seneca Shadekaronyes and the Onondaga Skandawati. Did space and time permit, hundreds of such illustrations of the vitality of oral tradition might be presented.

Arabian tradition long prior to Mahomet knew Abraham, Isaac and Ishmael as historical personalities. The name of the father of the faithful survived in Syria where Nicolas of Damascus found it. Brugsch, a prominent Egyptologist, is a thorough believer in the Egyptian sojourn of Israel during the time of the Hyksos and their successors, and there is hardly room for doubt that Rameses III., Haq-on, the Akenkeres of Greek writers, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The story of Joseph's temptation is set forth in the Egyptian tale of the Two Brothers, in that of the Persian prince Siavesek, as told by Firdusi and Mirkhond, and in the Greek legends of Peleus, Hippolytus, and Bellerophon. Moses is testified to by a great cloud of witnesses. Professor Goldwin Smith allows Longinus, who was late, but Trogu Pompeius, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Pliny, Tacitus, and hosts of other Greek and Latin authors, refer to him. Neither Manetho nor Apion attempted to deny the sojourn of Israel in Egypt and the Exodus, although they travestied the history. Strabo believed the much older narrative of the destruction of Sodom, and echoes of it are found in Ovid's Philemon and Baucis, and in Geoffrey of Monmouth's tale of Benlli of Powis. The world is full of similar echoes of the Bible story, and wherever a contemporary monument has been found, it has proved in accord with the sacred record.

It has been said that the ethnology of the Bible is at fault. One would like to know where. Josephus was at fault in interpreting it, but he is not the Bible. But for the Bible, exact ethnology would be next to an impossibility. The Hebrew scribe introduced confusion at times by translating Padi-Shal. Zur-yune, Hadad-ezer and Hammu-rabi into his Abimelech, Beth-Zur, Benhadad and Beth-Rapha, but this confusion is only temporary. Here is an objection critical rather than ethnological, but worthy of consideration. "That the alleged record is of a date posterior by many centuries to the events, and therefore no record at all, plainly appears from the mention of kings of Israel in Genesis (xxxvi. 31). No reason has been shown for supposing that the passage is an interpolation, while the suggestion that it is prophetic is extravagant." If Dr. Goldwin Smith will compare the Hebrew of the verse quoted with that of I. Chronicles i., 43, he will find them to be word for word identical. All reputable commentators are agreed