

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

## ORDINARY MEETING,\*

HELD AT THE HOUSE OF THE SOCIETY OF ARTS.

THE PRESIDENT, SIR GEORGE G. STOKES, Bart., M.P., P.R.S.,  
in the Chair.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following Elections were announced:—

VICE-PATRON:—His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Brazil.

[His Majesty sent a message, of which Dr. R. H. Gunning, F.R.S.E., was the bearer, expressing his wish to be admitted a Member.]

MEMBERS:—His Excellency Count Bernstorff, Berlin; S. Joshua Cooper, Esq., Yorks.; Rev. R. M. Ferguson, M.A., Cheltenham; Rev. A. A. E. Taylor, D.D., LL.D., United States.

ASSOCIATES:—W. J. Gunning, Esq., United States; Revs. J. Dark, E. Hargrave, and F. C. Williams, New South Wales; Rev. E. H. Smart, B.A., Oxon, Northallerton.

The following Paper was then read by the Author:—

*THE HISTORICAL RESULTS OF THE EXCAVATIONS  
AT BUBASTIS.* By EDOUARD NAVILLE.

THE King of Babylon had led into captivity part of the population of the kingdom of Judah; the inhabitants of Jerusalem had turned a deaf ear to the warnings of the prophet Ezekiel, and the threatened judgment had fallen on them. Standing near the river Chebar, in a strange land, the prophet turns for a while from his unfortunate countrymen, and, looking towards the neighbouring nations, predicts that some day the storm will burst upon them. The curse of Egypt is one of the most striking and the most terrible. Thus saith the Lord God: "I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause the images to cease from Noph; and there shall be no more a prince out of the land of Egypt; and I will put a fear in the land of Egypt. And I will make Pathros desolate, and will set a fire in Zoan, and will execute judgments in No. And I will pour my fury upon Sin, the stronghold of Egypt; and I will set a fire in Egypt; Sin shall be in great anguish, and No shall be broken up: and Noph shall have adversaries in the day-time. The young men of Aven and of Pi-beseth shall fall by the sword: and these cities shall go into captivity" (Ezek. xxx. 13-18).

It is interesting to notice the cities which are mentioned by

the prophet. They are clearly the most important, and those which were best known to his countrymen. I shall not insist here on several of these names, which differ according to the translations, but I should like to direct your attention to this sentence: "The young men of Aven and Pi-beseth shall fall by the sword." Aven (Heliopolis) is well known; but what is Pi-beseth (Bubastis)? It is one of the localities which are most frequented by travellers, or at least near which hundreds and thousands constantly pass. Whoever goes from Cairo to Suez is obliged to stop at Zagazig, a junction of several lines. Before reaching the station and after leaving it, the railway skirts large mounds covered with ruins of brick walls, which mark the site of Bubastis. The mounds, even now, cover a considerable surface, though they are much reduced from what they were. Of the 4,000 acres which they occupied at the beginning of this century, the greater part has been levelled, and is now cultivated; there are now only 800 acres left, and they are diminishing every day.

Several Egyptologists have visited the place. The opinion generally prevailing being that the temple had entirely disappeared, leaving no other traces than a few blocks scattered here and there in a great depression, which was the site of the building. Mariette had attempted excavations, which had proved fruitless; and one might reasonably think that the temple of Bubastis, which, according to the description of Herodotus must have been of considerable size, had suffered the same misfortune as many others; that it had been quarried out entirely, and the stones all carried away for building or for agricultural purposes. I shall not recall here the reasons which induced me to settle at Bubastis with Mr. Griffith in the spring of 1887, and to begin excavations. Our first attempts soon showed that the temple had not disappeared; on the contrary, the earth concealed heaps of granite blocks and gigantic columns, which reminded one of what is seen in the ruins of Sān. Our task, therefore, was to lay bare all this field of ruins, the extent of which we could judge to be considerable, and we applied ourselves to this work during the winters of 1888 and 1889. Not only did we remove all the earth which covered the stones, but in order to be quite certain that nothing was left hidden we pulled down the heaps of stones which had been piled up by the fall of the walls of the two first halls. We rolled and turned every block, and this long and costly, but sometimes most exciting, proceeding has given us inscriptions and monuments of the greatest value.

Standing at the entrance on the eastern side, one overlooks

now a field of ruins, which is still most impressive, although not so much so as last year, since a great many interesting monuments have been carried away. A space of the length of 600 feet is covered with enormous granite blocks, capitals of columns, fragments of Hathor heads and broken statues of colossal size. The general form of the temple is still discernible. It consisted of four halls, the dates of which differ. The first, from the east, which is perhaps the most ancient, had at the entrance two enormous columns with palm capitals; outside the door were the two great Hyksos statues, one of which is now in the British Museum. Beyond was a second hall, also very old. After the time of Osorkon II. it was called the "festive hall," in memory of a great religious ceremony which took place in the twenty-second year of his reign. Further west still was the most luxurious part of the temple: a hall supported by columns with lotus or palm-leaf capitals, and by pillars ending in a beautifully-sculptured Hathor head, the best specimen of which is now in the Boston Museum. The termination of the temple was a room of a very extensive area, probably the largest of the four; it was never finished, and at the end was the shrine of the goddess Bast, an exquisite piece of sculpture, fragments of which are to be seen in the British Museum.

Except Tanis, a city which in many respects has a great resemblance to Bubastis, there is no city in the Delta which has yielded so many monuments, of such very different epochs, varying from the Fourth dynasty to the Ptolemies. I must say I do not believe one could easily find excavations more interesting, and at times more exciting, than these. A circumstance which added to the surprises and to the unforeseen, is, that there is no temple which has gone through such frequent and complete transformations, and where the usurpation is so easily discernible and has been practised on such a large scale. You have heard of the mania of Rameses II. for writing his name everywhere, no matter who was the author of the monument on which he desired to record his memory. The occasions in which the name of Rameses II. is met with in the temple of Bubastis are nearly innumerable. I have examined with the greatest care the colossal architraves on which his name is written in hieroglyphics more than two feet high, and I have not found one of them which was not a usurpation; everywhere an old inscription had been erased; what Rameses II. really added to the temple is probably not considerable, though at first sight one would think that hardly anything had existed before his reign.

One of the results of the excavations is to show that

Bubastis was already a large city at a very remote date, and that it went through the vicissitudes which have marked the history of Egypt. It must rank between Tanis in the north, and Heliopolis further south; and in the narratives of the events which took place in Lower Egypt, we must take account of the presence of a great city at the entrance of the valley called the Wadi Tumulât, the high-road from Egypt to Syria.

Let us go back to the dawn of the history of Egypt. Manetho says, that under the first king of the Second dynasty, a chasm opened itself near Bubastis, in which a great many people lost their lives. We do not go quite so far back in our discoveries, but the Old Empire has left important traces in the two first halls. Before having moved one single block, we could see on the top of the ruins of the entrance hall a stone where was sculptured a false door, such as is constantly met with in the tombs of the Old Empire, namely, two door-posts, between which is a large roll generally bearing the name of the deceased. How that kind of ornament occurs in a building without funerary character, I cannot explain; however, it is to be traced to the Old Empire, but I could not make out which king had it made, for his cartouches have been so carefully erased, that there remain only the top of the oval and a disk. The subsequent researches in that part of the building have not been fruitless; we have unearthed the standard of Cheops, and the standard and name of Chefren, the constructors of the two great pyramids, who have both written their name in the temple of Bubastis in large and beautiful hieroglyphs; the great antiquity of the temple is thus well established. In the second hall we found, in 1887, the cartouche of a king of the Sixth dynasty, Pepi, and not only his name, but his titles which he engraved on what must have been the entrance of a room. At the beginning of this century, Burton had discovered the name of Pepi further north, at Tanis; a doubt had been expressed whether it was the king himself who had extended his constructions so far north, or whether perhaps in later years a stone bearing his name had been brought to Tanis with building material, by Rameses II. or some other king; but now the doubt is no longer possible. It is not in Tanis only, but also in Bubastis, that stones bearing the name of Pepi are found, and here there are several, fitting together, and the remains of a construction may be traced; besides, Pepi is in company with two other kings, a great deal more ancient. Thus the foundation of Bubastis carries us back to the beginning of the historical times of Egypt, and is contemporary with the pyramids, its oldest monuments.

It is to be noticed that the three early kings whose names we met with were conquerors, or, at least, warriors, who fought against the inhabitants of Sinai. What may have been the motive of these struggles? Perhaps the possession of mines of copper, which have been worked from a high antiquity in the peninsula, or perhaps also the quarries; for it is an interesting question, and one which has not yet been solved in a satisfactory way, where the stones came from with which some of the Egyptian monuments are made, especially black granite. It has always been admitted that it came from the quarries of Upper Egypt, situated in the Arabian desert, at a place now called Hamamât, between the present cities of Keneh and Kosseir. This explanation, which holds good in the case of kings who had the command over the whole land of Egypt, is not to be accepted for kings like the Hyksos, who ruled only over Lower Egypt, and were at war with the native princes of Thebes. Where was the stone quarried for the great statue which is now in the British Museum? The solution of this question is rendered more interesting by the fact that in the last discoveries of very early Chaldæan monuments, at a place called Telloh, in Lower Babylonia, it has been noticed that for several of them the stone is the same as that used for some Egyptian statues. The eminent Assyriologist, Dr. Oppert, maintains that this material was found in the country, called in the cuneiform inscriptions *Maggan*, namely, the Sinaitic peninsula and the part of Egypt near the Red Sea, while other Assyrian scholars think that it came from the coast of the Persian Gulf. The question is an open one, to be settled only by geologists, who will allow me to direct their attention to the search for the quarries of the Sinaitic peninsula.

Two of the kings whose names have been recovered at Bubastis, Cheops and Pepi, are mentioned in a text of a much later epoch relating the construction of the temple of Denderah. We read there in two Ptolemaic inscriptions the following words: "The great foundation of Denderah. The repair of the monument was made by King Thothmes III., as it was found in ancient writings of the days of King Cheops." And further: "The great foundation of Denderah was found on decayed rolls of skins of kids in the time of the followers of Horus. It was found in a brick wall on the south side, in the reign of the King Pepi." We must not attribute too great an importance to inscriptions which have a legendary character, but they indicate that the authority of Cheops and Pepi extended over Upper Egypt: and we know now, through the excavations at Bubastis, that Cheops and Chefnen reigned

also over the Delta, certainly over the eastern part. Before our excavations their names had never been found north of Memphis; it appears now that at this remote epoch their kingdom had already reached what I should call the natural limits of Egypt.

The Fourth dynasty,—the dynasty of Cheops and Chefred,—was one of the most powerful of the Old Empire, and it seems that under the succeeding one the kingdom was rather weakened; but there is a marked revival under one of the first kings of the Sixth dynasty,—Pepi Merira. As I said before, his cartouche has been found twice at Bubastis, in a different form from what it is at Tanis. There he gives himself only as the son of Hathor, the goddess of Ant (Denderah). At Bubastis, on the contrary, he is anxious to affirm that he is son of Tum, the god of On (Heliopolis), and of Hathor, the goddess of Ant. The geographical names must not be taken in a literal sense, as meaning only two cities; they must be interpreted in their mythological sense, as meaning the two parts of Egypt. Pepi indicates in this way that he is lord of the whole country.

Under the Old Empire there was a temple at Bubastis, but although we found traces of it in the two first halls, it is not possible even to conjecture what were its forms and dimensions. It lasted very late down to the Twelfth dynasty; one of its kings,—Useratesen I.,—wrote on one of the stones a small inscription, not very deeply cut, such as the kings often did to record that they had gone through a city and presented offerings to the gods, but not that they had made any great building. The venerable sanctuary of Cheops and Pepi was still standing at his time.

Here arises a question which I am obliged to answer in a different way from what I have recently seen printed in several papers. Among the numerous statues discovered at Bubastis—Is there one which may be considered as a work of the Old Empire? The opinion that this is the case has been expressed at a meeting of the Egypt Exploration Fund. It has been said that we have a portrait of Cheops in one of the statues now in the British Museum. Among the monuments brought from Bubastis you will notice the colossal torso, in red granite, of a standing king who holds in his left hand a standard. The statue has no head-dress; it has very thick and crisp hair, not unlike what we see on sculptures or statues of the Old Empire. The figure was destined to support something, for the top of the head is quite flat, showing that some piece of architecture rested upon it. It is not the only one of its kind. We found four absolutely

alike in type, workmanship, and size; two of them have been carried away, one to Boston, the other to the British Museum; two others are still *in situ*. They all bear the name of Rameses II., but we know well enough that this does not prove anything as regards their origin. However, I do not believe that they belong to the Old Empire. What strikes one in looking at those monuments is the total absence of all that constitutes the portrait: there is nothing individual, nothing characteristic of one person. The face is broad, very short, rather flat with projecting eyes: there is no finish in the workmanship. It is true that the statue being of colossal size, the features were to be seen at a distance, and the effect would probably be better if we saw them replaced at the height at which they originally stood. It is very likely that they were placed on each side of two doors in the festive hall. Statues of the same kind have been found at Sān, at Ramleh, at Tel el Yahoodieh; one which is in the museum of Turin is supposed to come from Sān; thus, they were all discovered in the Delta. In my opinion they are statues which had only an architectural purpose, and which are no more portraits than the caryatids which adorn some of our buildings; they are mere ornaments on which Rameses II. wrote his name, although the features are as different as possible from the fine type of the Ramessides. I am ready to admit any amount of usurpation from Rameses II.; but I do not believe in the high antiquity of those statues; theirs is a style which dates from the Nineteenth dynasty, from Rameses II., and which was continued by his son Menephtah, and even later; and this peculiar style was executed by artists of the Delta, whose skill at that time was still sufficient for the requirements of architecture. I am led to this conclusion by the fact that these statues are too much alike; they are all cast in the same mould, it is a common type of face, which is copied from the one to the other without individual character. It is in accordance with the custom of Rameses II., whose main desire was to have a great number of monuments; he did not look too closely at the artistic side, provided they were numerous. In this case, when he wrote his name on these statues, he did not speak an untruth; they are his work. As for the workmanship, it must not be forgotten that such statues are seen only in the Delta. Local taste and local fashion are very important factors in Egyptian art, which have been too often overlooked; they existed in former times as they are still to be found at the present day. Evidently the taste of the sculptors of Bubastis or Tanis was not exactly the same as among the artists of Thebes or Abydos.



The Twelfth dynasty is certainly one of the most powerful in Egyptian history. Let us consider its political action—its conquests carried far on the Upper Nile—and we shall form a high opinion of the character of its kings; but our admiration will be increased if we look at the immense constructions raised by them all over the country. Manetho calls them Diospolites, giving them Thebes as birth-place. They were the founders of the great temple of Amon, and they worked most actively in the province called the Fayoom. I need only mention the Labyrinth and Lake Moeris. The recent excavations made by Mr. Flinders Petrie and myself have shown that they gave a great importance to the Delta, especially to its eastern part. Tanis was already known as a locality where their monuments were abundant; but we have added three more: Amem, a dependency of the nome of Tanis excavated by Mr. Flinders Petrie, and some monuments of which are at the British Museum; Khataanah, of which we do not know the old name; and lastly, Bubastis. It is probable that further explorations will reveal more monuments of the Twelfth dynasty in the Delta, either by actual discoveries or by showing that usurpation has been practised on their work by later sovereigns, who attributed to themselves the work of their glorious predecessors.

Amenemha I. is the first king of the Twelfth dynasty whose name occurs at Bubastis. It is engraved on a stone removed from its original place, and employed by Nectanebo I. in the construction of the western part of the temple. The name is not complete; we have only the standard and the beginning of an inscription saying that "he erected a statue to his mother Bast; he made the hall. . . ." Evidently he enlarged in some way the sanctuary of the Old Empire. After him Usertesen I., well known by the obelisk of Heliopolis, did not go on building; his name occurs on what was very likely part of the temple of Cheops and Pepi.

The most important transformation of the temple seems to have been made by Usertesen III., whose cartouche occurs several times and in very large proportions. Not only did he enlarge the two halls, of which this temple consisted, but he added to it what must have given to the whole building that character of beauty which struck Herodotus so vividly, for the Greek traveller says that "though other temples may be grander, and may have cost more in the building, there is none so pleasant to the eye as this of Bubastis" (Rawlinson, *Herod.*, ii. ch. 137). In my opinion, Usertesen III. added to the temple the hypostyle hall, the magnificent building of which remains are now in the British Museum and at Boston.

Unfortunately it is now so much ruined, having been so long used as a quarry, that it is difficult to obtain an exact idea of its form. It is nearly certain that the roof was supported by alternate rows of columns and square pillars, ending in a Hathor head. In the centre were four large columns of red granite, with capitals in the form of lotus buds, and with shafts representing a bundle of those plants. The inhabitants of Liverpool had the opportunity, a short time ago, of seeing on the quay two fragments of one of those columns, a perfect capital, and the piece of the shaft fitting immediately underneath, the whole having a length of about 20 feet; and I dare say they will have been struck, not only by the size of the monuments, but also by the vigour of the work and the beautiful polish, which has lasted to the present day. Outside of those columns were square pillars surmounted by the head of the goddess Hathor, a woman's face surrounded by great locks and having ears of a heifer. The head was sculptured on two opposite sides of the pillars; on the two others was seen the plant of Upper and Lower Egypt standing between two crowned asps. One specimen only of these fine pieces of art has been preserved complete; it is now in the Museum at Boston. Next to these pillars came again columns of polished red granite, with graceful capitals representing palm-leaves. One of them is in the British Museum; it is nearly complete. We read on it the names of Rameses II. and Osorkon II., but the column is much older, for an inscription of Rameses is cut through an ornament of the shaft. These columns bear witness to the changes which took place in the gods to whom the temple was dedicated. Rameses II. had the name of Set sculptured on the top; Osorkon changed the figure of the god, made him a lion's head, and gave him the appearance of Mahes, the son of the cat goddess Bast. To the palm columns belonged a second set of pillars with Hathor's head, but neither so large nor so beautiful as the others. One of them has gone to the Museum at Sydney.

At the end of the Twelfth dynasty the temple consisted of the first two halls and the hall of columns (some of them were gigantic monoliths). I shall only mention that the Thirteenth dynasty, a series of princes very little known, appears also at Bubastis. The first king, Sebekhotep I., has engraved his cartouche on some large architraves. It is the first time that his name is met with in a temple. It is inscribed also on rocks in Nubia, showing that under his rule the power of Egypt was not diminished. In excavating buildings like the temple of Bubastis, it is impossible not to be struck by the facility with which the old Egyptians carried enormous

blocks of granite from the quarries of Assooan to localities in the Delta, which, no doubt, were then more accessible than now, but which could only be reached at the cost of much labour. We know what the difficulties are in our time of steam-engines and railways; my friend, Count d'Hulst, might write a book on all the troubles he experienced in the ungrateful task of transferring monuments of a total weight of about a hundred tons from Tel Basta to an English steamer in Alexandria. But in the time of the ancient Egyptians, thousands, tens of thousands of enormous blocks, colossal statues weighing near nine hundred tons, obelisks, etc., were taken out of the quarries of Assooan, floated down the Nile, and dragged through the marshes of the Delta, where they adorned the temple of Sān, Bubastis, or Behbeit. I can assure you that when I unearthed the magnificent columns of Bubastis I did not know which was most to be admired, the perfection of the work or the power of the men, who, with scanty and imperfect mechanical means, had achieved such stupendous results.

Let us now give the dates of the principal facts which we have ascertained. In opposition to the generally-prevailing opinion, we saw that Bubastis went back as far at least as King Cheops; that is, to the year 3700 B.C., according to Brugsch's chronology. After him, Pepi, about 3200 B.C., has left important traces in the temple. We described the transformation which took place eight hundred years afterwards under the kings of the Twelfth dynasty. With the end of the Fourteenth dynasty, we have reached the 24th or 23rd century B.C., one of the most obscure periods of the history of Egypt, but also one of the most interesting, and on which the excavations of Bubastis have given us most unexpected information—I mean the invasion of the Shepherds, or Hyksos.

We read in Manetho, quoted by Josephus, the following words: "The so-called Timaos became king. Egypt during his reign lay, I know not why, under the Divine displeasure, and, on a sudden, men from the East country of an ignoble race, audaciously invaded the land. They easily got possession of it, and established themselves without a struggle, making the rulers thereof tributary to them, burning their cities and demolishing the temples of their gods. All the natives they treated in the most brutal manner; some they put to death, others they reduced to slavery with their wives and children.

"Subsequently also they chose a king out of their own body, Salatis by name. He established himself at Memphis, took tribute from the Upper and the Lower country, and placed garrisons in the most suitable places . . . The general name

of their people was Hyksos, which means shepherd kings ; for *Hÿk* signifies in the sacred language a king, and *Sōs* in the demotic is shepherd and shepherds. Some say they were Arabs . . .”

Arabs or Phœnicians are the names most frequently applied to them by the ancient authors. Recent researches seem to point as their native place to Mesopotamia, where at that time important events took place. We know that about that epoch, the King of Elam, Khudur Nankhundi, invaded Babylonia, plundered the country and carried away from the city of Uruk to his capital Shushan a considerable number of statues of divinities. We cannot affirm that the invasion of Egypt by the Hyksos is connected with this particular war ; but it is probable that the struggles between the Elamites and the Mesopotamians brought about the invasion of Egypt. I do not suppose that the Elamites went as far as the Nile, but they drove out of their country a mixed multitude belonging to different races, and it overran Egypt, too weak to resist. If, as I believe, the Hyksos were Mesopotamians, they were not barbarians : they belonged to nations which had already reached a high degree of civilization, and which in particular were well skilled in the art of sculpture. There is no doubt that the conquest of Egypt must have been signaled by devastation and ruin ; it never was otherwise in the wars of Eastern nations ; but as the invaders were not barbarians, as they came from a civilized country, it explains why they soon submitted to the influence of the more refined Egyptians, and why they easily adopted the principal features of Egyptian civilization, which was not unlike their own.

The chronographers have preserved the name of several of their kings ; they are called Silites, or Salatis, Beon, Apachnas, Jannas, or Janras, Asseth and Apophis, in Egyptian Apepi. The interesting point to ascertain was whether the Egyptian documents agreed with the statements of the Greek writers as to the barbarity of the Hyksos. Were they the cruel and brutal conquerors described by Manetho ? Very likely they were at first when they attacked the country, but certainly not at the end of their domination. The name of Apepi was known long ago from a papyrus relating his struggle with a Theban prince. To Mariette belongs the honour of having first discovered his name on stone monuments. In his very successful excavations at Tanis he found the name of Apepi written on the arm of a statue, evidently older than the Hyksos king. At the same time he noticed the name on monuments of a special kind, which have since been called Hyksos monuments. They are

sphinxes with bodies of lions and human faces. The head is surrounded by a very thick mane, and the type of the features is quite different from the Egyptian. The cheek-bones are high and strongly marked, the nose wide and flat and aquiline, the mouth projecting forward with stout lips. At first sight, it is impossible not to be struck by the fact that we have there the image of a foreign race and not of native Egyptians. Thus there has been an art of the Hyksos, or rather the conquered have made the education of their masters ; for, except the characteristic foreign type, the workmanship, the style, and the attitude are absolutely Egyptian, and these monuments must have been made by Egyptian sculptors.

Besides the art, the Hyksos adopted also the writing, the language of the Egyptians ; the names of their kings are written like those of the native Pharaohs with two cartouches, the first of which was taken by them on the day of their coronation, and always contained the name of Ra. Nevertheless, they remained faithful to the worship of Set, an Asiatic divinity often called also Baal, and worshipped as well by Semites as by nations of another race like the Khetas or Hittites. Thus, under the reign of the last Hyksos rulers, except that the sovereign belonged to a foreign race, Egypt must have presented an appearance very much like what it was before : a well ordered and governed state.

It has been questioned whether the Hyksos had really attained a high degree of civilization, and whether the monuments attributed to them by Mariette were really their own work. Some Egyptologists have suggested that the strange monuments of Tanis were, perhaps, the produce of local art, or that they belonged to a much older period ; in this last case Apepi would only have usurped what had been done before him, and there would be no Hyksos style. I must say that when I went for the first time to Tanis, I very nearly adopted this view ; but the discoveries made in the excavations of 1888 have convinced me that Mariette's opinion was the truth. There has been a Hyksos art, and kings of later time have not hesitated in taking possession for themselves of what the so-called barbarians had made. I had the good fortune in 1888 of finding three of the most interesting Hyksos monuments which have been preserved.

We were working in the eastern part of the temple of Bubastis near the entrance, when the workmen unearthed first the head-dress of a statue, in black granite, wearing the royal asp ; underneath were only the forehead and the eyes, for the head had been broken horizontally at the height of the origin

of the nose. The head-dress was absolutely that of an Egyptian king, and the height of the whole head could be estimated as more than three feet. The next day, to our great joy, the lower part of the head was discovered; it was complete, except a fragment of one of the cheeks and one of the ears, and we recognised at once the Hyksos type; there was the projecting mouth, the thick and curved nose, the strongly-marked cheek-bones, the cheeks themselves being rather hollow. It was the first time that the head of a Hyksos king was discovered wearing a thoroughly Egyptian head-dress, which rendered more conspicuous the strange type of the foreign race. At the distance of a few feet a broken fragment of black granite was emerging out of the ground, and on digging a few inches it was easy to recognise that it was the lower part of the legs of a colossal statue, which clearly belonged to the same monument as the head. I could not excavate immediately. It was the beginning of March, and the soil was still so full of infiltration-water that beyond a certain depth we were in ponds of water, which hampered the work considerably. I waited a few weeks; the water sank, and my impatience grew in proportion. At last, although there was still much water, I ordered that the base of the statue should be cleared and dragged out. The first thing to be done was of course to make room around it. Our surprise was immense when this revealed to us the lower part of a colossal torso close to the base we were endeavouring to drag out; and a few feet to the south, very near the place where we had found the broken head, the base of another statue of the same size, lying on the side and showing the whole of one leg. Thus it was not one but two statues which had stood there; we had two bases, we could reasonably hope that we should discover another head. The one we had, the Hyksos, was broken, perhaps the other might be intact. From that moment the researches grew intensely interesting. I promised a good *baksheesh* to the workmen if the head was discovered; and a few hours afterwards, while I was in another part of the temple, I suddenly heard them shouting: *rās, rās*,—the head, the head! I shall never forget this sight, nor this hour, perhaps the most impressive I went through during my five winters of excavation. It was late in the afternoon; out of a pond of water, between the base and the torso, emerged the top of a head and the royal asp, the upper part only had been cleared and was visible above the water. There was no place for us to stand, or rather to kneel, except on that head, which we did in turn, Count d'Hulst and I; and while the excited workmen drove out with their hands the water which was coming

out of the earth in streams, or took away the mud in which the face was buried, we felt anxiously with the hand how far the features were preserved. There is the forehead, the eyes, the origin of the nose, but here a fracture. . . I had one instant of despair, but no, it is only a slight wound; here are the nostrils, the mouth, the beard! The head is perfect! It was nearly dark; we let the water cover it again entirely, and the next morning we raised triumphantly our treasure, which now stands in the British Museum.

A few days afterwards two illustrious visitors,—Dr. Schliemann and Dr. Virchow,—came to see the excavations. Dr. Virchow had careful measurements taken of this head, which he published shortly afterwards in his paper on the royal mummies. His conclusion is that the Hyksos monuments must be considered as representing Turanians, without being able to determine with which branch of this very large stock they must be connected. It was the same as the conclusion put forward in this country by Prof. Flower, who sees in the monuments of Sān a Mongoloid type. Turanians or Mongols,—such is the racial origin attributed to the Hyksos by high authorities; but that does not mean that the population itself was Turanian. The worship of Set Baal, the influence of the Hyksos invasion over the customs of Egypt, and especially over the language, points clearly to a Semitic element which was prevailing among the conquerors, though their kings,—at least those who left us their portraits,—were evidently not Semites. I believe, generally speaking, that too much importance has been given to the question of race; too often sharp distinctions have been drawn between nations, or, in the midst of one people, distinctions which were perhaps true originally, but which afterwards, if they were not quite obliterated, were only to be traced in political or social life. Races have become mixed and have amalgamated much earlier than we think. I said that I believed the Hyksos to be Mesopotamians. The researches of Assyriologists all agree that from a very early epoch the population of Babylonia consisted of several strata of populations having each a different origin. It was then what it is now; and I believe that the conquest of Egypt by the Hyksos is not unlike what would happen at the present day if the population of Mesopotamia overran the valley of the Nile; you would have masses, in great majority of Semitic race, speaking a Semitic language, having a Semitic religion, and being under the command of Turks, who are not Semites but Turanians.

I revert to the two Hyksos heads. The first, which was broken in the middle, is in the Boulak Museum; it is of exactly

the same type and proportions as that in the British Museum, but the face is not quite the same; it is evidently an older man; it has the advantage of having preserved the curve of the nose. If the two heads represent the same man at two different ages, the Boulak head was made the last. We took also to Boulak all that remains of the statue, the base, which turned out to have been split in two in the direction of the height, so that there is only one leg left. As for the statue of the British Museum, unfortunately it is not complete. Although last winter we left not an inch of ground unturned in the vicinity of the place where we had found the other fragments; although we went to a great depth; we could not discover the only piece wanting, the upper part of the torso from the waist to the neck. Nevertheless, I have no hesitation in saying that such as it is the statue is one of the most precious Egyptian monuments which have been preserved. Allow me to recommend you to go to the British Museum to look at it. You will notice that the Hyksos artists, or at least the Egyptians who worked for the Hyksos, followed the traditions of the early sculptors who had portrait statues to make. The workmanship of the lower part of the body is much inferior to that of the upper part, and especially of the head. This fact is general in the statues of the Thirteenth dynasty, whether they have preserved their original name, like the Sebekhotep of Paris, or whether they have been usurped by Rameses II., like the statue of this king which I found at Bubastis, and which has been given to my native city. All the care of the artist has been bestowed on the head, all his skill has been devoted to making a likeness as good as possible. Consider attentively the face, look at the beautifully-modelled features, the special care which the artist has taken to reproduce all the characteristic signs of the race, the strongly-marked cheek-bones, the stout and projecting lips, the somewhat hollow cheeks, the fleshy corners of the mouth; if you bear in mind that this has been cut in an extremely hard stone, you will agree with me that this head, regardless of its historical value, is a work of art, and even a masterpiece.

But whose portrait is it? which name are we to give to this statue? There is no doubt that it represents a Shepherd king, but has his cartouche been found anywhere on the monument? Unfortunately not. The two statues which were near each other at the entrance of the temple had both the cartouches of the king who raised them engraved on the throne along the legs. But they shared the common fate which befel so many interesting monuments; the names were cut out.



Rameses II. when he worked at Bubastis, finding that the two statues made a good effect, and that it was unnecessary to have new ones of such a large size, erased the name of the Hyksos king, and put his own instead. A long time afterwards, Osorkon II. treated Rameses II. in the same way as he had done his predecessor; he erased Rameses II., but not so completely that we may not discover a few signs, and he put his own on the base. What has completely disappeared is the name of the Hyksos king, which would be most interesting to us. Fortunately, in another part of the temple I discovered on a door-post a very large cartouche containing the name of Apepi, the same who had been found by Mariette at Tanis, with a fragment of inscription saying, that "he raised pillars in great number and bronze doors to this god,"—we do not know which. Quite recently, in the first hall not very far from the great statues, I discovered the first part of his name, what is called his standard. As Apepi was a powerful king, though he was one of the last Hyksos, and as we know from the inscription that he raised important buildings at Bubastis, it is probable that it was he who erected the great statues, and that the fine head which is now at the British Museum is the portrait of Apepi. This interests us particularly, because the Byzantine chronographer, Syncellus, relates that Apepi was the king in whose reign Joseph rose to the high position described in Genesis. According to the Christian tradition, Apepi was the Pharaoh of Joseph.

But we were not at the end of our surprises. Close to the block bearing the name of Apepi, there appeared one day the corner of a black granite stone, which, after being cleared, turned out to be the base of a sitting statue of natural size, but broken at the waist. The cartouches were intact; the coronation name reads Userenra, which is not unknown, but the second Raian, or Ian-Ra, was absolutely new. The style of the statue pointed to the Thirteenth or Fourteenth dynasty. When I afterwards showed the cartouche to a learned Mohammedan, Ahmed Effendi Kemal, the only Egyptian who can read hieroglyphics, he exclaimed at once: "You have found the king of Joseph"; and when I answered that in my opinion it was Apepi, he explained to me, what I totally ignored, that, according to Arab books, the king of Joseph was an Amalekite, called Raian Ibn el Walid. I must say that I have no great faith in Arab traditions, and although at the time of the discovery my eminent countryman, Dr. Rieu, of the British Museum, wrote a letter in the *Times*, saying that he believed that there was some historical fact at the bottom of the Arab tradition, I am not quite convinced;

there are some details of the legend which shake one's confidence ; for instance, this fact, which is mentioned by one of the Arab authors, that Joseph converted the king to the faith of the Mohammedans. However, it is certainly a curious coincidence to have found at the same spot the two kings who are considered as the protectors of Joseph, one by the Christians and the other by the Mohammedans. This valuable base, which is all that remains of Raian, is now in the Boulak Museum.

Between the two traditions I incline to adopt that of the Christians, as reported by Syncellus, who adds that on this point the historians are unanimous. I know we have no Egyptian monumental evidence that it was so, but until the contrary is proved, I see no reason to question the statement of Syncellus. Apepi was the Pharaoh in whose reign Joseph became the powerful minister described by Scripture. I need not dwell at great length on this subject, which was laid before this society a few years ago in a learned paper by the Rev. H. G. Tomkins. Let me only mention that Joseph was a purely civil officer, entrusted with the control and collection of revenue and of rents chiefly paid in kind. Such officers frequently occur in Egyptian inscriptions, or even in pictures, and they bear this telling title : "The Eyes and the Ears of the King."

We saw that the Hyksos raised at Bubastis great constructions, probably larger than at Tanis, the city which had been called their capital because of the monuments discovered there by Mariette. Bubastis was an important Hyksos settlement, and we have every reason to believe that the kings often stayed there ; that it was one of the places of resort of Apepi and the other kings. They were thus very near the land of Goshen. I think I have proved through the excavations which I made at a short distance from Zagazig, in 1885, that the original land of Goshen was the region situate between the present city of Belbeis and Tel el Kebir, and that at the time when the Hebrews settled there it was not part of one of the provinces of Egypt. It was an uncultivated district, not divided among Egyptian inhabitants regularly settled and governed, a kind of waste land sufficiently watered to produce good pasturage, and which might be assigned to foreigners without despoiling the native inhabitants. This agrees with the information given by the two most ancient Arab translators of the Bible,—Saadiah and Aboo Saïd. I believe even that there is an allusion to it in an Egyptian inscription of the time of Menephtah, the king of the Exodus, in which it is said that "the country

near Bailos (Belbeis) was not cultivated, but left as pasture for cattle because of the strangers." Thus there was only a short distance between the royal residence and the territory allotted to the Hebrews. Joseph settled his family near himself, in the part of the country which was best fitted for the breeding of cattle, and where probably dwelt the herds of the king, with the keeping of which they were entrusted.

But the Hyksos domination was drawing towards its close, and it is likely that Apepi was the last of the foreign rulers. We have only very scanty information on the wars which broke out between the native princes who had maintained themselves in Upper Egypt and the foreign invaders. In spite of the successes of the kings of the Seventeenth dynasty, Sekenen-Ra and Amosis, the expulsion of the Hyksos and the restoration of the Egyptian rule over the Delta took place only gradually. A queen of the Eighteenth dynasty alludes in one of her inscriptions to the harm done to the country by the strangers, and which she endeavoured to repair. An alleged proof of the fact that the Egyptian dominion was not yet regularly re-established was the supposed total absence of monuments of the Eighteenth dynasty in the Delta. Until now there was only one known,—a stone serpent found at Benha,—or a few scarabs of Amenophis III. dug out by the fellaheen at Tel Basta. The desire to settle, if possible, the question of the presence of the Eighteenth dynasty in the Delta, was one of the chief reasons which induced me to dig at Bubastis; and in this respect my expectation has not been disappointed; we have discovered important monuments of the Eighteenth dynasty at Tel Basta. Last summer, also, the fellaheen came across a large tablet of the same dynasty at Samanood, further north. In both places the monuments are later than Thothmes III. It seems very probable that the final conquest of the Delta, and the complete expulsion of the Hyksos, dates from the great wars of Thothmes III., justly called "the great," or sometimes the Alexander of Egypt. His campaigns had lasting results, not only in Egypt, but also abroad, as we know now from the curious find of cuneiform tablets made by the Arabs at Tel el Amarna last year,—that under the successors of Thothmes III. a great many Syrian cities were still tributary to Egypt, and had Egyptian governors. The most ancient mention of a king of the Eighteenth dynasty, at Bubastis, is on a stone of Amenophis II., who is sculptured standing before Amon Ra and making him offerings. We notice here, as under the following kings, that the chief divinity of the place is not Bast, but Amon. The king of the Eighteenth dynasty, who seems to have taken the

greatest interest in Bubastis, is Amenophis III. We discovered four monuments of the reign of this king: two of them are statues of the same man; unfortunately they are both headless. They are unequal in workmanship; one of them,—the largest and the finest,—is in the Boulak Museum; the other is in London. They both represent a man sitting with crossed legs, and who unrolls on his knees a papyrus, on which is written his title and his employment. The man was “prince of the first order, a friend loving his lord, chief of the works of his king in the provinces of the marsh land of the North, the chancellor and city governor, Amenophis.” The name of his king is found on the back; the braces which support his garment are tied together by a brooch, on which is engraved the name of Amenophis III.; another statue has it engraved on the shoulder, as has also a very graceful torso of a woman, which was part of a double group of a priest and priestess. Thus the Eighteenth dynasty is well represented at Bubastis,—its high officers and priests put their images in the temple. Even the heretical King Amenophis IV., or Khuenaten, who endeavoured to destroy the worship of Amon, desired his name to be at Bubastis. On a stone, usurped afterwards by Rameses II., we read the name of his god, his one cartouche having been erased.

In what state did the Eighteenth dynasty find the temple of Bubastis? Had it been ruined by the Hyksos? Not likely; on the contrary, we have seen that Apepi raised there, as he says, pillars in great numbers and bronze doors. If it did not suffer in the wars between the Hyksos and the Theban princes, the temple must have been standing and even of a remarkable beauty when the contemporaries of Amenophis III. put their statues in its halls.

Seti I., the second king of the Nineteenth dynasty, and the father of Rameses II., inscribed on the stone of Amenophis II. that “he renewed the abode of his father Amon.” He seems to have made some repairs to the temple. But with his son Rameses II. we reach a period of great changes, which consisted chiefly in usurpations. There is no name which occurs so frequently in the ruins of the first three halls, which up to the Thirtieth dynasty constituted the whole building. As is the case in Tanis, the local divinity seems to have occupied only a secondary rank; all the principal offerings or acts of worship take place before the great gods of Egypt, Amon, Phthah, called Phthah of Rameses, and chiefly Set, the god of the Hyksos, who had the most prominent place. Enormous architraves in the second hall bear dedications to Set; elsewhere he is styled Set of

Rameses, and his face was engraved on all the palm-capital columns, where it was afterwards transformed to Mahes. Nevertheless, Bast appears sometimes in the inscriptions of Rameses II.,—for instance, on a great tablet, of which we found only a part, and which is a dialogue between the king and the goddess, who makes his eulogy in words like the following: "I take in my hand the timbrel, and I celebrate thy coming forth, for thou hast multiplied the sacred things millions of times." There is no question that Rameses II. worked much in Bubastis, but in the way which best illustrates his personal character and the tendency of all his acts. An extraordinary vanity and self-conceit, a violent desire to dazzle his contemporaries by his display, and posterity by the immense number of constructions bearing his name, seems to have been the ruling power of his conduct during his long reign. In the second hall of Bubastis there are many colossal architraves where his cartouche is engraved in letters several feet high; but there is not one of them where an older inscription has not been cut out—sometimes the old signs are still visible. In one instance, very likely because something concealed the end of the stone, the workman did not take the trouble to erase completely, and at the end of the cartouche of Rameses II. appear the first letters of the name of User-tesen III. of the Twelfth dynasty.

There is no doubt that Bubastis was a place for which Rameses felt a special liking; he was anxious that the whole temple should appear as built by himself, from the great statues of Apepi at the entrance to the columns of the hypostyle hall at the western side. I do not believe that there is any other temple with so many statues bearing the name of Rameses II. as Bubastis. Undoubtedly they have not all been made for him; two of the finest which we discovered, both in black granite, were certainly not his portrait. One of them, which is complete, has been given to the Museum of Geneva; the head of the other, a fine piece of art, has gone to Sydney; none of them has any likeness to the well-known type of Rameses; they are kings of the Thirteenth or Fourteenth dynasty. Besides those statues, there were a great number in red granite, of various proportions, and standing in different parts of the building, which have merely an ornamental purpose; we are not to look for portraits on any of them. I spoke before of the four statues with crisp hair, one of which is in the British Museum. Another, now at Boulak, wears a fine head-dress called the *atef*, two feathers resting on the horns of a ram. There were also groups representing the king sitting with one or two gods; groups of that kind were

often put outside the entrance on each side of the road. Generally speaking, it is near the entrances that the statues were more abundant. A great many disappeared already in old times, or were broken in the destruction of the temple, which must have taken place between the Ramessides and the Bubastites; a large number of them were employed by Osorkon I. and Osorkon II. as building material when they repaired the temple.

The more we study the remains of Bubastis, the more we are convinced that the place must have been one of the favourite resorts of Rameses II., where he stayed repeatedly. Bubastis and Tanis were the two great cities of the Delta, and no doubt the court came frequently to both. Rameses was accompanied by his sons; one of them, Khaemuas, who had a high rank in the priesthood, and who was inspector of the temples, has recorded his visit to Bubastis on a statue of his father. We found also mention of two others who had military commands. One, whose statue is in Boston, was "first cavalry officer of his father, the chief of the horse of his majesty, Mentuhershopshef;" the other, Menephtah, who became the king of the Exodus, was at that time a general of infantry, and he appears several times on sculptures making offerings to the god Amon.

Not far from Bubastis was a foreign nation, which from a small tribe had grown to be a large multitude, and which had never amalgamated with the Egyptians. I have already alluded before to the vicinity of the land of Goshen, only a few miles distant; but the restricted limits of the original land had been broken through, and the Israelites must have spread in the south towards Heliopolis, and in the East in the Wadi Tumulât, the road through which foreign invaders would enter Egypt. One may well conceive that Rameses who, in spite of his outward show, must have felt how much his kingdom was weakened, grew rather anxious at the presence of a great number of strangers occupying the very gate of Egypt, and that he desired to turn their presence to a benefit for Egypt. Therefore he employed them to build fortresses destined to protect the land against invaders. The Exodus describes in the following way the fear which took hold of the king: "And he said unto his people: Behold, the people of Israel are more and mightier than we: come let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they also join themselves unto our enemies, and fight against us, and get them up out of the land. Therefore, they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh store cities,

Pithom and Raamses" (Exodus i. 9-11). It was the result of my first campaign of excavation to discover the site of Pithom, not very far from the present city of Ismailiah; Raamses is not yet known; it is very likely between Pithom and Bubastis in the Wadi Tumulât. I cannot dwell at great length here on the events of the Exodus; yet I should like to mention that the successive discoveries made in the Delta have had the result of making the sacred narrative more comprehensible in many points, and especially in showing that the distances were much shorter than was generally thought. For instance, I consider it important to have established that Bubastis was a very large city and a favourite resort of the king and his family. It is quite possible that at the time when the events preceding the Exodus took place, the king was at Bubastis, not at Tanis, as we generally believed.

Menephtah, the king of the Exodus, who is represented as general of infantry, also executed statues in the temple after he became king, but they are very much broken.

The Twentieth dynasty, the dynasty of the Ramessides, whose kings all bear the name of Rameses, is also represented at Bubastis. It is natural that the most powerful of them, Rameses III., should not be absent; but what is more interesting, we met with one of the later ones, who was thought to be an idle prince reigning only nominally, and entirely in the hands of his vizier, the high priest of Amon. For the first time monuments of Rameses VI. have been discovered in the Delta, showing that the power of the king still extended over the two parts of the country. I found three statues of this king: one of red granite of heroic size, standing, has been removed to the Boulak Museum; another, in black granite, is headless and is still on the spot. The kings of the Twentieth dynasty seem to have erected a construction of their own in the western part of the temple, a kind of entrance to the hypostyle hall.

After them, in the obscure period of the Twenty-first dynasty, the temple must have gone through great vicissitudes; I believe that for some reason which we do not know, perhaps in some war or rebellion of which no record has been left, it was destroyed and partly ruined. I said before that in my opinion the beautiful Hathor capitals of the hypostyle hall must be attributed to a period much more ancient than the Twenty-second dynasty. Several of these capitals have underneath, on the part which rested on the square pillow, a dedication to Bast, written by Osorkon I., a king of the Twenty-second dynasty. This dedication was not visible, and could not be

read, but it is a lasting record of the fact that Osorkon I. had done some work in connexion with these capitals. In the same way also Rameses II. put his name under the base of the obelisks he erected, in order that his memory should not perish altogether in case one of his successors should erase all the visible inscriptions of the sides. In my opinion, the inscription of Osorkon I. records, not that the king had these capitals sculptured, but that he raised them a second time, and he could not have done it if they had been standing, while if they were overthrown, and the temple was more or less in ruin, the fact is easily to be explained.

The Twenty-second dynasty is called by Manetho the dynasty of the Bubastites. It is most likely that these kings were strangers of Libyan origin; their family had the hereditary command of the guard of Libyan mercenaries, called the Ma or the Mashooash; and it is natural to suppose that it was with the aid of his foreign troops that Shishak, the first of the Bubastite rulers, succeeded in ascending the throne of Egypt. Shishak is well known as the successful enemy of Rehoboam; he conquered Jerusalem and pillaged its temples; he made great constructions at Thebes, but he does not seem to have done anything in what is considered as his native city. His name has been found only on a small fragment of limestone. The first king of the Bubastites who adorned the temple with fine sculptures is a king who was little known until now, Osorkon I. As I said before, very likely the temple was in ruins in his time; he rebuilt it, or at least he began doing so; he raised again the beautiful Hathor capitals, and went to work in the first hall, building up the walls and covering them with finely-carved sculptures, for which he used the material already on the spot, as one may judge from blocks engraved on both sides; which under Rameses II. were part of the basement, while under Osorkon I. they were at a certain height in the wall. I believe it was in his reign that a change took place in the dedication of the temple. Instead of being a place of worship for the great gods of Egypt, and chiefly for Set, of whom Rameses II. seems to have been a fervent adorer, it became the temple of Bast, the lion or cat-headed goddess, with her accompanying gods, Mahes or Nefertum, called her son, and Horheken, a special kind of Horus. I should think also that the religious custom of keeping cats in the temple and of burying them in holy ground dates from his reign. There is a considerable space in the mound of Tel Basta, which is nothing but a cemetery of cats, rectangular pits made of raw bricks, which are full of the bones of these animals, among which some bronzes have



been thrown, representing either cats or the god Nefertum, a god with a human form wearing as headdress a lotus-flower, over which are two feathers. The cemetery of cats has been known for many years to the fellahen, who dug it out entirely, and supplied the dealers in Cairo with the bronze cats which fill their shops. I attempted this year an excavation in the cemetery; I was obliged to go very deep, as all the upper pits have been rifled; under such circumstances the digging is very ungrateful business, as the water and the salt have nearly destroyed the bronzes. I emptied several pits entirely full of bones, which are quite calcined, as they are the residue of bodies burnt in furnaces still visible close to the pits. It is incredible what an immense number of cats must have been burnt, judging from the number and the size of the pits. After many difficulties we succeeded in rescuing a few skulls, which are now in the hands of the illustrious naturalist, Dr. Virchow, of Berlin. It is very likely that the holy cat of Bubastis was not the ordinary domestic cat, but some larger animal of the feline tribe, either the wild cat or a kind of lynx.

Under Osorkon I. Egypt was not an impoverished country; we may judge of it from inscriptions which are unfortunately in a very bad state, but which are due to Osorkon I. Herodotus says that about three furlongs from the great temple, towards the east, is the temple of Hermes. I found the remains of it, a few scattered blocks in a clover-field, at a short distance out of the tell. I dug there several days; there is very little left: a large architrave, with a cartouche of Rameses II., and a great many fragments all bearing the name of Osorkon I. There are fragments of a large size, belonging to a long inscription, in which Osorkon I. relates the weights of silver and of *asem* (silver gilt) which he gave to several temples; and the large quantities which he mentions remind one of the considerable offerings made to the religious establishments in the time of the great prosperity of Egypt. I believe that this second temple was the treasury of the other, and that being, as were all treasuries and libraries, under the protection of Hermes Thoth, it was taken by Herodotus for a temple of Hermes.

Osorkon I. did not finish the rebuilding of the temple, and it was Osorkon II. who completed it, and who worked chiefly in the second hall. This part of the building seems to have suffered most grievously in the destruction which I presume to have taken place before the accession of the Bubastites to the throne of Egypt. When we began rolling the blocks of the enormous heap which marked the site of the hall, nearly

every one of them was found to be a fragment of a statue, or of a group which had been cut up, sometimes partly erased and afterwards walled in; one of the sides being flattened in order to engrave on it the sculptures of Osorkon II. Most of these fragments bear the name of Rameses II. Sometimes the remains of the old statue are in a fair state of preservation, such as, for instance, the block which has been given to the Museum of Liverpool, where there is on one side a very good head of Rameses; on the other, a sculpture of the sacred boat in which the emblem of Amon was carried; the piece of statue was used simply as building material, for when it was walled in, the head was turned upside down. Sometimes also we come across the feet of a colossal statue; on the base, what would be under the feet, if the statue were standing, there are sculptures of Osorkon. I do not believe all this wanton destruction was done by Osorkon intentionally; although he usurped a good number of the cartouches of Rameses, I cannot fancy that it was he who broke such a great number of statues, while he respected others bearing also the name of Rameses. I presume that the Bubastites found the temple in a state of ruin, and that they made use of what they found on the spot, leaving intact the statues which had not suffered any damage, and taking what was broken for their building, instead of fetching granite blocks all the way from Assooan. Osorkon II. was also a king very little known. I had already discovered some constructions of his at Pithom. At Bubastis he recorded one of the principal events of his life, a great festival given in the temple in the 22nd year of his reign, on the 1st of the month of Choiak. It is extraordinary that the festival is not given in the honour of Bast, but of Amon. It is evidently an old tradition which Osorkon had to follow, something which "took place since the days of his father," as he says in the inscription. It was very likely for the purpose of this festival that he re-built the second hall to which he gave the name of the "festive hall." The walls are covered with sculptures representing the scenes of the festival; unfortunately, although every block on which there was an inscription or a sculpture has been stamped or photographed, it will never be possible to make a connected description of it. The king is generally represented as a god; he sits in a sanctuary, the goddess Bast is standing before him, or he has with him his queen, Karoama, as may be seen on a large sculpture now in the British Museum. Sometimes they are accompanied by three of their daughters, whose names are given. The gods of Egypt are supposed to be present at the festival, and there are long series of them

standing each in his shrine. The priests, of whom there is a great variety, carry offerings of fishes and birds, vases,—very likely of precious metals,—or sacred standards. Sometimes they seem to execute dances, sometimes they lie quite flat on the ground, sometimes also they are accompanied by ugly dwarfs. The emblem of Amon is in his sacred boat, and is carried on the shoulders of the priests, and the king himself is sometimes borne on a litter. It is not impossible that this great festival, which, as I said, was based on an old tradition, had something to do with the calendar. Though he celebrated it in honour of Amon, Osorkon II., who in his cartouche calls himself the son of Bast, completed the dedication of the temple to the goddess; it was he who erased the name of Set, where it was still visible, and replaced it by Mahes, as it is seen on several of the columns. He had also a great desire to inscribe his name as often as possible, for it is met with nearly as often as Rameses II.

I do not insist on monuments of small importance of the Twenty-fourth and the Twenty-sixth dynasties. The most western hall, and the largest, was built by the first king of the Thirtieth dynasty,—Nekhthorheb,—the last king of the last native dynasty. In spite of the long wars which they had to wage against the Persians, the princes of the Thirtieth dynasty, said to be Sebennytes, have left us very large and important constructions, especially in the Delta. They seem to have taken as the object of their imitation the kings of the Twelfth dynasty; under their reign there is a revival of Egyptian art which is quite marvellous, and they have left us monuments which can be compared only to the works of the best period. The decoration of the western hall was not finished, but, in order to show that it was to Bast that it was dedicated, Nekhthorheb changed his cartouche, and, instead of calling himself son of Isis, as everywhere else, he is styled son of Bast. The most beautiful part of the hall was the shrine of red granite, which was at the end. Three fragments of it are now in the British Museum; the religious sculptures which cover them are of the most exquisite workmanship, and were worthy of the beautiful temple in which the shrine was deposited.

If we add to this long catalogue of monuments two Greek inscriptions referring to statues being erected by two higher officials of the time of Ptolemy Epiphanes, we shall have reached the lower limit of the period over which extend the annals of Bubastis, such as we recovered them in the excavations. We are able now to trace some of the principal events in the history of the city and the country during 3,500 years,

from Cheops down to the Macedonian kings, and we have found inscribed on statues or on the walls of the temple the names of twenty-six kings, one of whom, one Raian or Ian-ra, was absolutely unknown; besides, we have now in several museums monuments of great value, some of which, like the large statue of Apepi in the British Museum, are quite unique.

Such is the net result of a work of about six months on a spot which was thought to be absolutely exhausted, and where nothing was said to remain. This instance shows how many treasures lie still hidden in the soil of Egypt; there are even large historical cities where no serious exploration has ever been made. It is dangerous to play the prophet in matters of excavation; but who knows what may be concealed in many mounds of the Delta or of Upper Egypt, which it would be easy to name? There are still great gaps in the history of Egypt, which we hope to fill up some day, and the work of excavation is far from being closed. I trust that in relating what has been done at Bubastis I may have kindled in your minds a desire that more should be done in that way; and I beg to be allowed to warmly recommend to your interest and to your practical support the work of Egyptian Exploration.

The PRESIDENT (Sir George Gabriel Stokes, Bart., M.P., P.R.S.).—I have now to ask you to return your thanks to Monsieur Naville for this most interesting paper, although you have already practically done so by anticipation in the applause with which the paper has been received from the beginning to its conclusion.

M. NAVILLE expressed his thanks for his cordial reception and the way in which his paper had been received.

The PRESIDENT.—I will now call on any present who may have made this subject their own to speak to the paper. Perhaps Sir Charles Newton will begin the discussion.

Sir CHARLES T. NEWTON, K.C.B., D.C.L.—All that I can claim with reference to Egyptian Exploration is the fact that I have supported it with such influence as I possess; but as for offering any remarks on the results which M. Naville has so ably put before us, I confess myself quite unfit. I think all will agree that M. Naville, having gone through all this toil in investigating and pushing his discoveries to the very farthest point that he could go, and then presenting to us this most lucid statement, makes us feel what a deep obligation he has laid us under (cheers). I can only

hope that he may have the help, health, and energy to follow up his researches, and that we, the British public, will provide him liberally, without stint, with the means to go on. I say this because I have too often seen, with extreme regret, the manner in which the public of this country take up a thing, and then drop it when half finished, in contradistinction to the extraordinary perseverance of the German people, for when they make excavations they do them thoroughly. Let us try to show the same dogged perseverance, and go on with these Egyptian discoveries (cheers).

Mr. REGINALD STUART POOLE, LL.D.—I have been extremely gratified by this paper, which is the best justification, if it were needed, of the work of M. Naville. It is not only a learned paper, but the most cautious one I have ever heard from a learned discoverer, and herein lies M. Naville's great merit,—he never takes you beyond where he can safely go. All I can add with reference to the paper is, that with all that M. Naville has said I cordially agree, and where I have, unfortunately, differed from him I am perfectly sure that he is right and I am wrong. As to the places where the monuments he has discovered have gone to, I think I ought to say that the Americans contributed, last year, £1,000 towards the Egyptian Exploration Fund, and England £1,100. The arrangements made were to give the artistic monuments to the Art Museum at Boston and to retain the historical ones ourselves; for, although we gave £1,100, and were supported by a strong committee, with names like my colleague amongst them, they had only an able secretary, Dr. Schliemann, and they trusted their £1,000 to us without any conditions whatever. It was very hard to send away what we did, but, under the circumstances, we could not do otherwise. I am exceedingly gratified that the fine statue referred to by M. Naville in his paper has been given, with great heartiness, to his native place. With great satisfaction he will set up that monument in his native town, which will record what an eminent archæologist has done for England and other countries (applause).

Mr. W. ST. C. BOSCAWEN (F.R.Hist.Soc.)—The paper that has been read this evening is one of particular interest, for by it M. Naville has done a great deal to weld together two of the oldest civilisations in the world. More than ten years ago I expressed in the rooms of this Institute the opinion that we should find that the Elamite invasion of Babylonia was an element exercising con-

siderable influence in the Hyksos invasion in Egypt. It was the beginning of a great tidal wave which swept across Western Asia and burst in the lower provinces of Egypt. The discoveries which M. Naville has made seem thoroughly to confirm that opinion. The head which is now in the British Museum I regard as one of its greatest treasures, and the importance of which we cannot too highly estimate. I think we shall find that it is a monument which will take its place side by side with those remarkable statues found by M. de Sarzec in South Chaldea. The more one studies the early civilisation of Chaldea, the more one is convinced that there was an Egyptian influence in Babylonia at the time of Gudea and the Kings of Sergul, and I am persuaded it will be found that there was a very early and close intercourse between the Babylonian and Egyptian people at that period. One point that M. Naville has referred to is extremely interesting, and that is, the fact that those early kings fought in Sinai for the possession of the copper mines and for the possession of the stone quarries, and of this there seems to be no doubt, as out of a number of Assyriologists there are only two who hesitate to identify the land of Maggan, of which he spoke, with the Sinaitic inscriptions. It is called the land of the Turquoise, which we know was found there in ancient times, and we know that the turquoise is always associated with copper, and that copper is found there, and these facts are confirmed by the discoveries of Professor Hull in his investigations into the Sinaitic peninsula referred to by him in a paper read before this Institute.\* It was from this region that the stone for the statues I referred to came, and it was in this region of Sinai that the contact between the two civilisations took place. Then there is another point in this paper of particular interest, not only to Egyptologists, but to all students of the history of Western Asia, and that is a point which M. Naville has hardly emphasised as much as he might have; viz., the fact of the certainly isolated position which the Hebrew people held in Egypt. Though they were in power at court at the time of the Hyksos, and during the period when the Semites were in power in the Delta, yet they came very little into contact with the thoroughly highly-educated Egyptians, and this accounts in a great measure for the little Egyptian influence that has been found in the Pentateuch, and the discovery is made still more important to us in another point of view. What

---

\* *Transactions*, vol. xxi. p. 11.

has been done is about one-tenth of what may be accomplished. There are mounds throughout the whole of the district of the Delta which will yield, probably, as much as these have yielded. There are mounds, not only in Northern Egypt, which require to be excavated, but, as Professor Sayce said in his Annual Address, throughout the whole of Southern Palestine. Any one who has travelled through the country cannot doubt for a moment that the mounds in the south of Palestine, and even Hebron itself, have something to yield if the spade of the explorer be applied to its great mass of artificial as well as natural mounds.

Mr. T. H. BAYLIS, Q.C.—I was much gratified to receive an invitation for to-night. I was asked this evening by a very learned man how it came to pass that Bubastis had been so long neglected. Why were discoveries not made at an earlier period? Professor Naville has given us an answer at the commencement of his most interesting paper. Discoveries in connexion with Scripture should interest every man who takes an interest in the Bible.

Captain FRANCIS PETRIE, F.G.S. (Hon. Sec.)—A very large number of letters have been received from those distinguished in science and literature who at this time of the year are on the wing, and, therefore, deeply regret that they are unable to be present to hear M. Naville—who was only able to arrive in England six days ago—give an account of his discoveries. At this late hour I will only select one to lay before you, it is from Major C. R. Conder, R.E.; who is well known in connexion with the splendid work of the exploration of Palestine, and also his investigations as regards the early inhabitants of the East:—

*Southampton, 4th July, 1889.*

“M. Naville’s paper is most interesting, and the existence of a Turanian ruling caste in the Delta seems to me to be supported not only by the valuable discoveries he has made, but also by the existence in the Egyptian language of about 150 Turanian words, apparently loan words, for the language itself is certainly not Turanian. I believe that Mariette’s view, which connects the Hyksos with the Hittites, has been much strengthened by recent discovery.

“I have, however, been unable to discover any very forcible argument in favour of placing the Exodus as late as Egyptologists who have followed Dr. Brugsch are inclined to suppose.

“While the existence of this Turanian population in Egypt is, I believe, beyond dispute, it must not be forgotten that Semitic loan words also occur in the language (some sixty or more have been discovered), which show that there was a Semitic (probably Phœnician)

element in the Delta before the time of the Nineteenth dynasty. This has been recognised by Dr. Brugsch and by Pierret.

“M. Naville’s suggestion that these Asiatic immigrations were due to the contemporary troubles in Mesopotamia seems to me interesting and important.”

The Institute is to be congratulated on having had two such papers from its members in one week as the Annual Address of Professor Sayce and this paper by M. Naville. The one bearing on early Assyrian, the other on early Egyptian, history ; and it is an additional gain that they should have been brought together in the Transactions of our Society, whose objects, I may add, they both further.

The PRESIDENT then announced the meeting closed, and the members and their guests adjourned to the Museum, where refreshments were served.