But J. C. J. proceeds to a further misstatement, which involves a censure upon others. He says that, the throne "being in a dilapidated condition, notwithstanding the great interest attaching to the historical fact, it was thought wise to restore it; in other words, to destroy the historical and most interesting original, and put up a copy in its place." This is simply not the case. The massive substructure of the episcopal chair (which is, in my view, part of the throne) needed no restoring, being as solid and substantial as on the day it was built; of the chair itself only a fragment of the right arm and a very small piece of the seat remain. These fragments have neither been moved nor touched; nor, though I would not be understood to pledge my colleagues of the Chapter and myself to any line of action, am I aware that there is any intention of restoring the chair. Doubtless the design of restoring it has been discussed and found favour with some, though not (so far as I know) with any one who has a voice in the matter.

J. C. J. concludes his note with the (as it stands) totally irrelevant sentiment, "What a happy thing it is that the old Romans" (does he mean Normans?) "were builders instead of restorers!" I will conclude mine with a sentiment at all events more pertinent to the subject in hand:—"What an unhappy thing it is that critics do not, before putting forth their criticisms, take pains to inform themselves of the correctness of their facts!"

EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBRDN,  
Dean of Norwich.

The Passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea (5th S. iii. 347.)—Surely the concluding words of the twenty-eighth verse of the fourteenth chapter of Exodus cannot leave any reasonable doubt that Pharaoh himself perished with his army,—"There remained not so much as one of them:"—a meaning which is borne out by the Hebrew text, "yôh là yôh bâr wâziy;", and the LXX., οὐ κατελείψει ἤκ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ ἂς. To describe the total destruction of "the host of Sisera," we find the very same words in Judges iv. 16:—נְאָשָׁר יָאָשָׁר, "there was not a man left" (lit. "unto one"). Comp. 2 Sam. xvii. 22.

This tragic end of Pharaoh and his host forms a portion of the Mohammedan belief:—"Pharaoh and his army followed them (viz., Israelites) in a violent and hostile manner, until when he was drowning."—"Donec apprehendit eum submersio" (Maracci Koran, x. 90-92). Upon this event the commentator Jelalloddin remarks that, some of the children of Israel doubting whether Pharaoh was really drowned, Gabriel, by God's command, caused his naked corpse to swim on shore that they might see it (Sale's translation, vol. ii. p. 12; Lane's Selections from the Koran, p. 203).

William Platt.

The following is from F. Lenormant's Manual of the Ancient History of the East:—

"It is generally added that Pharaoh perished in the waters with his army, but this is one of those interpretations, one of those developments, which are too often added to the Bible story. The sacred volume says nothing of the kind, nor do any of its expressions justify or give any ground for such an assertion. The army, not the king, was engulfed; and, in fact, we shall see that the Pharaoh Merenptah survived this disaster and died in his bed."

This is in p. 95, on the Exodus; and farther, on p. 261, when treating of Egypt:—

"The official monuments are silent on this subject, as they are on all disasters that were not retrieved by subsequent successes. But the Bible narrative bears unmistakable marks of historical truth, and agrees perfectly with the state of things in Egypt at this period [end of 19th dynasty, Merenptah, son of Rameses II., 14th cent. B.C.]. Thus the continual coming and going of Moses and Aaron to the presence of Pharaoh, from the land of Goshen, necessarily supposes the residence of the king at Memphis. Now, Merenptah is precisely the only king of the 19th dynasty who made his second capital of Egypt his constant residence. . . . He reigned thirty years, and his tomb is to be seen among the royal sepulchres at Thebes."

H. F. Woolrych.

I would submit that the one verse (16) in Psalm cxxxvi. is conclusive in the matter:—"But overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea." As far as I can understand, the fact otherwise is only inferential.

David Witherspoon.

In a sterling little book on Ancient Egypt just published (one of a series entitled Ancient History from the Monuments), the author, Dr. Birch, of the British Museum Department of Oriental Antiquities, the distinguished Egyptologist, assigns the exodus of the Hebrew people to the period of the Middle Empire (i.e., from the seventh to the eighteenth dynasty). He is of opinion that it took place in the reign of Menephtah, the thirteenth son of Rameses II. It may be noted that the beautiful obelisk now standing in the Place de la Concorde in Paris was a monument of this Rameses, who seems to have been a munificent donor of statues and restorer of temples. His mummy was found in the Serapeum at Memphis. In the book on Ancient Egypt I have named, Dr. Birch gives a portrait of the son Menephtah, the supposed hero of the Hebrew exodus, taken from a statue. Dr. Birch, p. 133, states:—"It is generally admitted that Menephtah was the Pharaoh addressed by Moses and Aaron, and was finally drowned in the Red Sea, while pursuing the Hebrews after their departure from the land of bondage." Without any refinement, the words of Scripture, by implication, plainly set forth that the host and their leader perished in this pursuit.

Whilst writing, I may add the note that the Song of Moses and the refrain of the Hebrew