

is, indeed, reason to suppose that the practice of shaving the head was universal, except among the soldiers. All the hair of the face was also shaven, except in the cases of kings and great persons, who had a small formal beard, possibly artificial, beneath the chin.

The king was distinguished from his subjects by the richness of his apparel. His head-dress was sometimes his own hair, or the wig, alone; and at others he wore the high crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, the former being a kind of conical helmet, and the latter a short cap with a tall point behind, worn outside the other. He is also occasionally represented with another form of high cap. The figure of an asp, the emblem of royalty, is often tied just above his forehead. His beard was about three inches long, and one inch broad and deep, and formally plaited.

The simplest royal dress was a kilt, usually reaching nearly to the knees, rather full in front, having a girdle above, from which hung before a broad band, richly ornamented, and peculiar to the king, like the lion's tail (natural or artificial) which was attached to it behind, and reached nearly to the ground. Sometimes a large and full shirt was worn over the kilt, descending almost to the ankles, and having wide sleeves reaching to the elbow: this outer dress is occasionally simply a skirt. Both these dresses were usually of white linen, and the outer dress was apparently very fine and transparent. Sandals were worn on the feet, and the ornaments were armlets, bracelets, both flat and broad, and deep necklaces.

The ordinary costume of men of the upper and middle classes was the same as that of the king, the short kilt, with sometimes the long shirt or skirt of fine linen above it, tied in various forms. Their beards were very short, scarcely exceeding an inch in length, and of a formal square shape, and they wore the full hair or wig, or a skull-cap. They generally went barefoot, but sometimes used sandals. The priest was occasionally clad in a leopard's skin, either tied or thrown over the shoulder, or worn as a shirt, the fore-legs forming sleeves. Military personages are often represented with helmets, and sometimes with short coats or corslets of plate-mail. The royal princes were distinguished by a side-lock apparently curiously plaited.

The men of the lower class wore the kilt and girdle alone, or, especially when engaged in laborious work, went altogether naked. They shaved the head and face, and had no head-covering but the skull-cap. The soldiers had kilts of different kinds, and coats or corslets of plate-mail, and either wore full hair or helmets.

The dress of the queen consisted of a tight skirt, descending to the ankles, supported by shoulder-straps, and bound at the waist by a girdle, with long ends falling in front. Over this was usually worn a full shirt of fine linen, with wide sleeves reaching below the elbows, and having a broad skirt falling to the ground. It much resembles the upper dress of the king, or of men of the richer classes. The queen was distinguished by her head-dress, which was in the form of a vulture with outspread wings, the bird's head projecting over the forehead, and the wings falling on either side, while the tail extended behind. Sometimes the queen is also known by the royal asp above her forehead, and at other times she is represented with various forms of head-dress. The queen also wore sandals. (For illustrations of royal dress see *COSTUME*, vol. vi., p. 457-8.)

The dress of ladies was the same as that of the queen, without the distinguishing ornaments, but they frequently appeared in the under garment or skirt alone. The women of the lower class wore that garment only, and sometimes it was much shorter than that of the ladies, particularly when they were engaged in manual labour. The women's hair was worn in the same manner as the men's, but it was of greater length, usually reaching about half-

way from the shoulders to the waist, being rarely longer, and sometimes much shorter. It was ornamented in various ways, but the general form was always the same.

The children of all ranks were very simply dressed, when clad at all, though those of rich persons were sometimes attired as their elders. Boys were distinguished by the side-lock, which the princes, as before mentioned, wore in a peculiar fashion.

Religion.—The credit which the Egyptian priests enjoyed in antiquity for a knowledge of philosophy led to the expectation among modern scholars that, when hieroglyphics were read, the world would recover a lost body of human speculation. The first results disappointed this expectation, but later studies have gone far to justify it. The statement of what those studies have achieved may be divided into the two main subjects—the teaching as to the gods and that as to man's duties and destinies, rites and ceremonies coming under both heads.

Had the Egyptians any idea of one God?—in other words, is their religion a complex structure raised upon a recognized monotheistic foundation? The Egyptian religious writings are held by M. de Rougé to give an affirmative answer to this question. They speak of one supreme being, self-existent, self-producing, the creator of heaven and earth, called the double god or double being, as the parent of a second manifestation. From the idea of a supreme deity, at once father and mother, producing a second form, probably originated a first triad like the triads of father, mother, and son frequent in Egyptian mythology. To the local divinities the attributes of this supreme deity are given, as though they were mere personifications: that they were originally so is, however, not certain. Ra, the sun, is indeed spoken of as this supreme being, but this appears to have been a later phase of opinion. (De Rougé, "Études sur le Rituel Funéraire," *Rev. Arch.*, n. s., i. 356 seqq.) It was probably an attempt to substitute a popular materialistic belief for a philosophical creed. A significant instance of this tendency is perhaps seen in the endeavour of a king of Dynasty XVIII. to abolish all worship but that of the solar disk—sun-worship in its most material form.

A very ancient moral tract, the papyrus of Ptah-hotep, composed under Dynasty V., although a purely Egyptian work, mentioning Osiris and a divinity who may be a form of Osiris, yet speaks constantly of God as if the author had the idea of one God.¹

It also appears from one remarkable fact that this idea prevailed in Egypt before the conversion of the nation to Christianity. The Copts took care to eliminate from their vocabulary all the words connected with the religion of their forefathers, substituting for them Greek equivalents. Their term for God is, however, not Greek but Egyptian, *NOY*, the hieroglyphic neter. They also used it for heathen objects of worship, god or goddess. These uses must therefore have been prevalent in the vulgar dialect when it was first written in Coptic.

Though it cannot reasonably be doubted that the Egyptians had a distinct idea of monotheism, this idea was mixed up with the basest polytheism. The double character which we perceive in the race and the language, both partly Nigritian, partly Semitic, is equally evident in the religion. Every town in Egypt had its sacred

¹ "L'idée abstraite de la Divinité intervient fréquemment dans le texte, comme si l'auteur avait la notion de l'unité et de l'indivisibilité divine. Mais cette manière de parler n'appartient pas exclusivement à cet antique document. On la rencontre fréquemment dans les textes plus modernes et notamment au Rituel. D'ailleurs le nom d'Osiris et celui de Dieu double crocodile suffisent pour nous démontrer que nous avons affaire à un monument de pure origine égyptienne." Chabas, "Le plus ancien livre du monde" *Rev. Arch.* xv. 40.

animal, or fetish, and every town its local divinities. As the animal worship was associated with higher ideas by the union of an animal's head with the body of a man in the figures of divinities, so the local divinities were connected with the monotheistic idea by intermediate forms, principally identifying them with Ra, who thus was the generally received form of the notion of one god. According to this view monotheism was not the parent of polytheism, but in a later phase connected with it.

One great change affected the essential ideas of the Egyptian religion. For many centuries Seth, specially the divinity of Lower Egypt, who seems to have represented then, as certainly afterwards, the destructive power of nature, held a place in the Pantheon, although regarded as the adversary of Osiris and thus of mankind, whom, however, he finally befriends. He seems thus to have a character of necessary evil. At length, after the Empire, he was expelled from the Pantheon. This may have been because the worship of Seth was repugnant to a reigning house of Asiatic origin, which might have held the Persian dualism which identified physical and moral evil. It may have been because Seth had been considered to be the divinity of the eastern neighbours of Egypt, and with their success and the fall of Egyptian supremacy had come to be thought hostile to that country. If this were the cause, the kings who proscribed his worship could have had no relation to the nations supposed to reverence Seth. In effect the change identified physical and moral evil and destroyed the earlier philosophical notions on the subject, besides introducing some confusion into the Pantheon.

Herodotus speaks of orders of gods, Manetho of divine dynasties. The explanation is to be found in the worship at each town of a cycle of gods. This cycle is called "the society of the gods," or "the nine gods." M. de Rougé does not admit the second rendering except as a plural of excellence ("Études," *Rev. Arch.*, n. s., i. 237). The number varies at different places and in different lists at the same place, but is always nearly or exactly nine. The Egyptians themselves explained this cycle as the self-development of Ra; the other gods were in this view his attributes (De Rougé, *l.c.* 236, 237; *Rit.* xvii. 2, 3). Two forms of the cycle acquired the highest importance as representing the systems of the learned men of Memphis and Thebes, the successive great capitals of Egypt.¹

The two systems are thus given by Professor Lepsius:²—

MEMPHITE SYSTEM.	THEBAN SYSTEM.
1. Ptah (Ἡθᾶ, Ἡφαιστος.)	1. Amen (Ἄμμων, Ζεὺς.)
2. Ra (Ἥλιος.)	2. Mentu (Μένθ.)
3. Shu (Σῶς)	3. Atmu (Τόμ.)
Tefnet.	4. Shu.
4. Seb (Κρόνος)	Tefnet.
Nut (Ἦρα.)	5. Seb.
5. Hesiri (Ὅσιρις, Διονυσος), and	Nut.
(6.) Hes (Ἥσις, Δημήτηρ.)	6. Hesiri.
6. (7.) Set (Σέθ, Τυφών), and	Ἥρα.
Nebti (Νέφθυσ.)	7. Set.
7. (8.) Har (Ἦρος, Ἀπόλλων), and	Nebti.
Hat-har (Ἄθῶρ, Ἀφροδίτη.)	8. Har.
	Hat-har.
	9. Sebek.
	Tennet [consort of Mentu?]
	Penit (or Pit?) [consort of Atmu?]

The views of Professor Lepsius on the origin and constitution of these systems, with such modifications as later

¹ These have been called the systems of Memphis and Thebes. The local cycle of Memphis was, however, not the system of Manetho which has been called Memphite, and has a distinct local character (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 237).

² Shu, true spelling since discovered, is here put for Mu.

researches have suggested, may now be given. We first observe that the two systems are but variations, and may be treated as one. They consist of male divinities, most of whom are associated with goddesses. These goddesses hold an inferior place, and are not to be counted in reckoning the number of the order, except perhaps Isis, whose importance is much greater than that of the others. An examination of the various forms of the two systems immediately suggests that they increased in course of time, Ptah and Amen, the chief gods of Memphis and Thebes, having been added for state reasons. The order thus reduced consists of two groups, the group of Ra, and that of Osiris. The group of Ra is wholly of solar gods, the group of Osiris begins with Seb and ends with Hathor. Sebek then stands alone, but he is wanting in the older lists, and is only an addition of the Theban system.

The solar group consists of Ra, or else Mentu and Atmu, and Shu. Mentu and Atmu are merely a division of Ra into his two chief phases, the rising and the setting sun, the sun of the upper and of the lower world. Both are solar divinities (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 254.) Shu, the solar light, is the son of Ra or of Mentu or Atmu; Tefnet, the goddess associated with him, is the daughter of Ra.

The Osiris group is not genealogically connected with the solar group. The central point of the group is found in Osiris, with his consort Isis and his opponent Seth. Seb and Nut are merely extensions of the group upwards. They are, however, spoken of as parents of the gods, showing that they represent the commencement of a series. Osiris, Isis, Seth, and Nephthys were usually considered their children, and Horus, the child of Osiris and Isis. Hathor is associated with Horus, but her genealogical place is not clear. It is, however, certain that she is of the family of Osiris. The characteristics of this group are predominantly cosmic; this is true of the myth of Osiris, and consequently of the whole group, and is especially evident in the cases of Osiris and Isis, Seth, and Seb and Nut.

How did these two groups come to be united in a single series? Professor Lepsius argues that this was due to the influence of Thinis, the oldest Egyptian royal seat, from which the first historic king Menes came to Lower Egypt and founded Memphis. Thinis at a very early time merged into the more famous Abydos. Abydos was the great seat of the worship of Osiris, which spread all over Egypt, establishing itself in a remarkable manner at Memphis. All the mysteries of the Egyptians and their whole doctrine of the future state attach themselves to this worship. Osiris was identified with the sun, and the union of the two groups was thus not forced. Both had indeed a common origin. Sun-worship was the primitive form of the Egyptian religion, perhaps even pre-Egyptian. The first development was the myth of Osiris, due to the importance of Thinis, just as the rise of Memphis put Ptah, an abstract idea of intellectual power, even before Ra. So the rise of Thebes introduced Amen, who was identified in the form Amen-ra with Ra, and as an intellectual principle placed before the physical solar powers. This argument derives great weight from the relative position given to the two groups, the solar divinities coming first, and from the circumstance that the religious reform under Dynasty XVIII. suppressed everything but material sun-worship, as though this had been the primitive belief of Egypt.³ M. de Rougé, in his examination of the Egyptian *Ritual*, comes to a similar but more definite result in treating

³ See Lepsius, *Ueber den ersten Aegyptischen Götterkreis und seine geschichtlich-mythologische Entstehung.* Berl. Akad., 1851.

of the mythological elements of the important seventeenth chapter. He traces the solar gods to Heliopolis, and considers the Osiris myth as probably derived from Abydos, and added at a later time.¹ Professor Lepsius does not admit the Heliopolite origin of the solar group, on account of the small political importance of Heliopolis. Yet the circumstance that the chief divinities of that city, which had the sacred name Per-ah, the abode of Ra, were Atmu, Shu, and Tefnet (*Rit.* xviii. 4, *ap.* Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 254, *cf.* 255) seems conclusive.²

Some account may now be given of these divinities in the order of the lists, the later additions being noticed last and then lesser divinities. It will be impossible to give more than the simplest particulars, and many names in the Pantheon must be omitted altogether.

Ra, the sun, is usually represented as a hawk-headed man, occasionally as a man, in both cases generally bearing on his head the solar disk, round which the uræus, symbolic of royal power, is sometimes coiled. His symbol is either the solar disk or the hawk. Ra had the most general worship of any Egyptian divinity, except Osiris. The worship of Osiris under his own name was more common than that of Ra under his, but this was in some degree compensated for by the union of Ra with other gods besides solar ones, such as Amen, Num, Sebek, forming the compound divinities Amen-ra, Num-ra, Sobek-ra (Lepsius, *Erst. Aeg. Götterkreis*), and by his being the type of sovereignty, so that each king was a Ra son of Ra. This importance of his worship was due to the adoption of Ra as the leading representative of the supreme being, from whom indeed he is sometimes undistinguishable in the *Ritual*, though as already noticed this does not seem to have been the primitive opinion, for there are evidences of his inferiority to the supreme god and to Osiris (De Rougé, "Études," *Rev. Arch.*, n. s., i. 353).

In the religious paintings he is the supreme being, carrying on in his course a constant warfare with and triumph over evil, represented by the great serpent Apsu, a wholly evil being, not a divinity. His career resembles that of Osiris, but with notable differences. Ra is purely solar. He is rarely associated with any consort, and if so associated his consort is a female Ra (Lepsius, *Erst. Aeg. Götterkreis*). He is always victorious. He protects mankind, but has nothing in common with them. Osiris on the other hand is only solar because he is the beneficent power of nature. He is constantly associated with Isis. He has a life-long conflict with a maleficent power, his brother or son Seth, who is not wholly evil. Vanquished and killed he recovers his life and wins, but it is rather Horus his son who wins, and Horus, a sun-god, is the direct link with Ra in the Osiris family. Osiris protects mankind because his life resembled theirs: if he did not live on earth, at least his tomb was shown there. At Heliopolis two animals sacred to Ra were revered, the black bull Mnevis, sacred to Ra and Atmu, and the Phoenix (Bennu) sacred to Ra. Both are connected with Osiris, the bull by the worship of Apis at Heliopolis, the Phoenix as also representing Osiris (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 257, 258). In addition the sacred Persea-tree was revered at Heliopolis.

In the attempt under Dynasty XVIII. to establish sun-worship in an original or ideal simplicity, the only representation is the solar disk with the uræus entwined round it, and rays ending in human hands, one of which offers the symbol of life to the worshipper. The great sun-temple then founded contained no statue whatever (Lepsius, *Erst. Aeg. Götterkreis*).

Mentu and Atmu may best be noticed together as merely two phases of Ra, representing, as already stated, the rising and the setting sun, the sun of the upper and the lower world. Their twin-character is seen in the circumstance that Mentu was worshipped at Southern An (Hermonthis) and Atmu at Northern An (Heliopolis, the On of the Bible). Mentu, or Mentu-ra, is represented as Ra with the tall plumes of Amen, Atmu in a human form. Both cannot be distinguished from Ra except that probably their attributes were more restricted, and while Mentu seems to be within limits identical with Ra, the human form of Atmu may perhaps hint a relation to Osiris.³

¹ "Il est facile d'apercevoir, dans tous ces caractères, les symboles osiriens, qui composaient probablement la doctrine primitive d'Abydos, se superposant aux emblèmes d'Héliopolis" (*Rev. Arch.*, n. s., i. 359, 360). M. Mariette, on the other hand, writes "Originairement Osiris est le soleil nocturne, il est la nuit primordiale; il précède la lumière; il est par conséquent antérieur à Ra, le soleil diurne" (*Atus. Boulaq*, 1869, 100).

² Shu is, however, not mentioned among the divinities of Heliopolis in the great Papyrus of Ramses III. *Records of the Past*, vi. 52 *seqq.*

³ In the 17th chapter of the *Ritual* the justified dead is called in his new condition Tum, equivalent to Atmu. This may be merely

Shu is light, and is a type of celestial force, for he is represented supporting the goddess of heaven. M. de Rougé remarks that it is curious to find in this ancient cosmogony the principle of force identified with the luminous principle ("Études," *Rev. Arch.*, i. 225, 238). His figure is human and he sometimes bears on his head the ostrich-feather, which, though the initial of his name, must here have its symbolical sense of "truth." The relation of light and truth is not less remarkable than that of light and force. Tefnet, associated with Shu in the cycle, is represented with the head of a lioness. This is the most common compound form of Egyptian goddesses, as the hawk-headed of the gods. Both are connected with solar worship. The lioness was probably chosen as the highest form of the family to which the luminous-eyed cat, one of the most popular of the sacred animals, belonged.

Seb stands at the head of the family of Osiris. He is represented in human form like his consort Nut. They are called "father of the gods" and "bearer of the gods." Seb was the god of the earth (De Rougé, *Ibid.* 238), and Nut the goddess of heaven. Her name means the abyss, though curiously the primordial abyss is called, in ch. xvii. of the *Ritual*, nu, in the masculine (*Ibid.* 359).

Osiris, in Egyptian Hesiri, is usually represented as a mummy, wearing the royal cap of Upper Egypt, which may indicate the Thinite origin of his worship, or that, as Horus and Seth were the special divinities of Upper and Lower Egypt, so he was particularly connected with the upper country. His cap is usually flanked by ostrich plumes, which probably have a reference to Ma-ti the goddess of truth and justice. The myth of Osiris is the most interesting because the most human part of Egyptian mythology. It is impossible to attempt a full account of it: the materials have yet to be gathered. We cannot accept the treatise *On Isis and Osiris* as representing the older form of the myth. In different documents we seem to trace its growth, and notably do we find in those later than Dyn. XXII. the change due to the altered theory of good and evil. Yet the general outlines are the same in what we may reasonably hold to be the earliest documents. It is these that are, as far as possible, used here.

Osiris is essentially the good principle: hence his name Un-nefer, the good being, rather than the revealer of good (Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne*, 38). Like Ra he is the creator, and like him in perpetual warfare with evil. His brother, or son, Typhon, Seth (Seb), is his opponent. They are light and darkness, physical good and evil, the Nile and the desert, Egypt and the foreign land. Osiris is certainly moral good, Seth is to a certain extent moral evil. Throughout the *Ritual* they are in conflict for right and wrong, for the welfare and destruction of the human soul. In ch. xvii., which was preserved intact from a remote age, this conflict appears. Seth is, however, not there distinctly named as the opponent of Osiris, except in the glosses, which may be as old or (like the case of the Mishna and the Gemara) older than the text, and once in the text he appears as joining with Horus his adversary in accomplishing the final condition of the deceased who had reached the abode of happiness (ver. 35); and on the other hand, one gloss explains the executioner of souls to be Seth, but otherwise Horus the elder, brother of Osiris, who is but a variation of the younger Horus (ver. 33). Yet the opposition of Osiris and Seth is a perpetual combat. Osiris is vanquished. He is cut in pieces and submerged in the water. Watched by his sisters, Isis his consort and Nephthys the consort of Seth, he revives. Horus his son avenges him, and with the aid of Thoth, or reason, he destroys the power of Seth, but does not annihilate him. The myth is a picture of the daily life of the sun, combating darkness yet at last succumbing to it, to appear again in renewed splendour, as the young Horus a solar god triumphs over Seth. It is also a picture of human life, its perpetual conflict and final seeming destruction, to be restored in the new youth of a brighter existence. In this view suffering is not wholly evil, but has its beneficent aspect in the accomplishment of final good. There are two ways of explaining the origin of this myth. Either we may regard Osiris as the sun of the night, and so the protector of those who pass away into the realm of shades, or we may suppose that once taken as the type and ruler of mankind in the after state, the hidden sun was naturally chosen to represent him, the sun being with the Egyptians the source and governor of all life. Those who make the solar idea the first form of the myth have to explain its specially human aspect, and particularly why we see no such aspect in any deep sense in the case of Atmu the sun of the night in the group of solar divinities.

It will be easily seen how such a story took hold of the affections of the Egyptians. Osiris was the type of humanity, its struggles, its sufferings, its temporary defeat, and its final victory. The living, and still more the dead, were identified with him. Under his name, without distinction of sex, they passed into the hidden place

because the word *tum* has the sense man, and may be thus a play upon the name of the divinity (*cf.* De Rougé, "Études," 350, 351), but it is more likely that *tum* is here used as Osiris everywhere to indicate the divine quality of the justified.

Ammenti, the divine world below (Ker-meter), to be protected by him in their conflict with Seth and his geni, and to have their final state determined by him as their judge. It was to Osiris that the prayers and offerings for the dead were made, and all sepulchral inscriptions, except those of the oldest period, are directly addressed to him. As Isis is a form of the female principle, Osiris, the sun and the Nile, was considered in one phase to be the male principle. The Osiris of Mendes was the name of this form, which was more especially known by the name of Mendes.

The three most famous of those more sacred animals which were worshipped as individuals, not as a class, were the bulls Apis and Mnevis and the Mendesian goat. Of these Apis and the Mendesian goat were connected with the worship of Osiris. Manetho says that all these animals were first reckoned among the gods under a very early Egyptian Pharaoh, Kaiechôs, in Egyptian Ka-kau, second king of Dyn. II.¹ It is very characteristic of the Egyptian religion that the reverence for Osiris should have taken this grossly-material form.

The bull Apis, who bears in Egyptian the same name as the Nile, Hâpi, was worshipped at Memphis. Here M. Mariette discovered a series of the tombs of these bulls, with tablets recording the reigns in which they were buried, and in several cases further exact particulars of date, thus affording important chronological evidence. Apis was considered to be the living emblem of Osiris, and was thus connected with the sun and the Nile, and the chronological aspect of both explains his being also connected with the moon. On the death of an Apis, a successor was sought for and recognized by certain marks. He was then inaugurated and worshipped during his lifetime. (See APIS.)

Sarapis, or Serapis, in Egyptian Hesiri-Hâpi, is the defunct Apis, who has become Osiris. The great extension of the worship of Sarapis, after the importation of his statue by Ptolemy I., was merely a development of long existing Egyptian ideas. Hence the rapid spread and great popularity of this worship. (See SERAPIS.)

The Mendesian goat had no special name. He is called the Ram. He was considered an emblem of Ra and Shu as well as of Seb and Osiris, but probably he was chiefly sacred to Osiris, and in his solar aspect, which would thus introduce the relation to the more markedly solar gods. The seat of his worship was Mendes in the eastern part of the Delta, where Dr Brugsch has discovered a very interesting stele of the reign of Ptolemy II., Philadelphus, giving the history of the finding and inauguration of a sacred ram, and of the honour paid to him and to his temple. His worship was similar to that of Apis, but of a grosser form, inasmuch as the goat or ram was a symbol of the productive force of nature.²

Isis, or Hes, represented as a woman bearing on her head her emblem the throne, or the solar disk and cow's horns, is the female form of Osiris. Unlike Ra, the Osiris family have consorts; but no one is so distinctly as Isis a counterpart and of equal importance. Though the place of Isis is not as significant as that of Osiris in the myth to which they belong, she is necessary to it, and this is probably the reason why she attained an importance beyond the other Egyptian goddesses except only Hathor, who is but another Isis.

Seth, the Egyptian Set, usually called by the Greeks Typhon, is represented with the head of a fabulous animal, having a pointed snout and high square ears. He was the brother or son³ and opponent of Osiris, the divinity of the enemies of Egypt, and the chief of the powers which fought with the human soul in the after life. He certainly represents physical evil. It would be easy to account for his worship in Egypt were it not for his appearing as the enemy of gods as well as of men. There is indeed something illogical in his holding a place in the Pantheon, which gains consistency by his expulsion, though the consequent confusion of moral and physical evil was detrimental to ethical ideas. It is remarkable as showing the Egyptian notion of Seth while he was still worshipped, that in the Tombs of the Kings at Thebes, those whose names are composed with his, Setee I. and II., and Set-nekht, use instead the name of Osiris. This seems to have been sometimes done afterwards by a change in the inscriptions, but still at the time when the tombs were first completed, and thus while the reverence of Seth, as is shown

¹ M. de Rougé has noticed that the name of this king, "the male of males" or "the bull of bulls," may be connected with the cultus of the sacred bulls, while that of Binôthris, his successor, contains a symbol, the ram, interchangeable with the goat, which makes it look like a second commemorative medal (*Six Prem. Dyn.*, 243, 244). If this be so the names of these early Pharaohs must have been taken on their accession or on some remarkable event, like the throne-names after the introduction of that second name. A change of name during a king's reign for a religious reason is seen in the case of the sun-worshipping Amenoph IV., who took the name of Khu-en-aten.

² *Records of the Past*, viii. 91 *seqq.*, where the stele of Mendes is translated.

³ It has been usual to call Seth the brother of Osiris; Dr Brugsch prefers to style him his son (*Hist.*, 2 ed. p. 20, 22). This double relationship is the key to the similar position of Horus, and the identity of Hathor and Isis.

by these royal names, was in full bloom (Lepsius, *Erst. Aeg. Götterkreis*). The subsequent change of opinion as to Seth, his identification with moral evil, and his consequent expulsion from the Pantheon have been already noticed. In consequence his figure and name are usually effaced on the monuments, and other gods take his place in the cycles in which he had a position. In later times Seth is the enemy of all good, feared and hated, but no longer revered. The date of the change is as yet undetermined. It has been usually assigned to the Bubastite kings who composed Dyn. XXII. M. Mariette has discovered the curious fact, that one of those kings, a hitherto unknown Osorkon, altered the figure of Seth in the legends of Ramses II. at Tanis to that of a Set-Ra (*Musée Boulaq*, p. 273). Was this the beginning of the change?

Nephthys, or Nebti, the sister of Osiris and Isis, and consort of Seth, does not, as far as the Egyptian documents tell us, share his character. It is rather as the sister of Isis that she there appears, aiding her in her labours to recover and revive Osiris. Thus like Isis she is a protector of the dead, and her figure and worship escaped the fate of those of Seth.

Horus, or Har, is in the cycles the son of Osiris and Isis. There is also a Horus the elder, Harôris, Har-er, brother of Osiris, and a Horus the child, Harpocrates, Har-pe-khruti, son of Osiris and Isis, and two other forms, Har-Hut, the Horus of Hut or Apollinopolis Magna, and Har-em-akhu, "Horus in the horizon." Horus is generally hawk-headed, and thus a solar god connected with Ra. This connection is perhaps strongest in the form Har-em-akhu, worshipped at Heliopolis sometimes even as Ra-Har-em-akhu. The most interesting form is that of Horus as the son and avenger of Osiris. Osiris being identified with the sun of the night, Horus is naturally the sun of the day. From this identification arose the idea of an infant Horus as the rising sun. As Horus took the place of Osiris in the contest with Seth, he became the elder Horus, to be on an equality with his opponent, who seems often the brother than the son of Osiris. Specially Horus is the ruler of Upper Egypt, and the typical king of Egypt as much as Ra. It is indeed so hard to distinguish Horus from Ra that it seems impossible to hold any opinion but that they had their origin in separate religious systems.

Hathor, Athor, or Hat-har, whose name means "the abode of Horus" is hard to distinguish from Isis.⁴ She was worshipped with Isis at Dendarah (Dâmichen, *Bauwerkunde der Tempelanlagen von Dendera*, 3, 4) and Dr Brugsch even supposes the local goddess to have been Isis-Hathor (*Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 202, 203), but this he has not proved, for the representations and titles are different for the two goddesses (*cf.* Dâmichen, *l.c.*). The cow was sacred to both Hathor and Isis, and both wear the disk and cow's horns. Hathor in the form of a cow plays an important part in Ammenti (*cf.* Dâmichen, *ibid.* 21; Mariette, *Musée Boulaq*, 118, 119). Curiously she is more widely revered than even Isis. She is really the female counterpart of Osiris. She was, like him, worshipped throughout Egypt, and the great temple of Adfoo contains a list of over three hundred names of the goddess in her local forms (Dâmichen, *ibid.* 20). Still more remarkably, in late times, the cow, here the symbol of Hathor, not seldom takes the place of the name of Osiris as applied to women deceased: instead of taking the form of Osiris, they take that of Hathor (*ibid.* 21). It is characteristic of the Egyptian religion that this irregularity should occur, and we may well hesitate to attempt to define the place of Hathor in the Pantheon (Mariette, *Musée Boulaq*, 118), though M. Dâmichen has made this endeavour in a very interesting passage, that could be accepted had he given sufficient authority from the monuments, and not shown traces of the influence of Greek interpretation, besides too great a tendency to reason on the negative evidence of the simple statements of the earlier monuments (*ibid.* 20, *seqq.*).

Pthah, or Ptah, the Egyptian Hephæstus, is the first to be noticed of the divinities introduced into the chief cycles after their formation. His name is one of the Egyptian words which can be recognized letter for letter in Hebrew (פֶּתַח "he opened, began," and Piel "carved"); and the sense is similar. Ptah is thus the divine architect (*cf.* Brugsch, *Histoire*, 2d ed., 21). He was the chief god of Memphis, worshipped under a human form, sometimes as a pigmy, supposed to be an embryo. He was the creative force, but seemingly not as the sun. Though when connected with the local form of Osiris worshipped at Memphis under the name Sekeri-Hesiri, and then called Ptah-Sekeri-Hesiri, he is sometimes hawk-headed, this is rather with a reference to Horus than to Ra. Perhaps Professor Lepsius's view that he is put before Ra in the Memphite form of the cycle as an abstract idea of intellectual power is the true one. If so, it seems probable that the worship of Ptah was of foreign origin.

Ammon, the Egyptian Amen, "the hidden," probably owed his importance to the greatness of Thebes, the chief Egyptian seat of his worship. He seems to derive his characteristics from his association with other gods. As Amen-ra he takes the qualities of

⁴ Dâmichen considers Hathor as the female principle to be identical with Isis (*Bauwerkunde von Dendera*, 20).

the sun; as Amen-ra ka-mut-f, "the husband of his mother," he takes those of Min or Khem, the productive principle. Rarely he has the ram-headed form that Greek notions would lead us to expect.

Sebek, the crocodile-headed god, seems to have held a similar place to Seth. There may have been a time when he was revered throughout Egypt, but in the Græco-Roman period he was a local divinity so disliked in most parts of Egypt that, as already noticed, the Arsinoite nome where he was worshipped does not appear in the geographical lists. His sacred animal the crocodile was held in abhorrence and hunted wherever Sebek was not revered (*cf.* Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d. ed., 106, 107).

Thoth, or Thaut, is the head of the second cycle in the two principal forms of the cycles. As the chief moon-god he thus takes an inferior place corresponding to that of Ra. He is generally represented as ibis-headed, and frequently bears the disk and crescent of the moon. He is the god of letters and of the reckoning of time, and thus sometimes has solar attributes. The ibis and the cynocephalus were sacred to him. As the deity of wisdom he aids Horus in his conflict with Seth, and records the judgment of the deceased before Osiris. He appears in Phœnician mythology, though not at a period early enough for us to infer that his worship was not borrowed from Egypt. Yet it is not impossible that here, as in the case of Ptah, we have a trace of early Eastern influence. It is at least remarkable that the great seat of his worship, Hermopolis Magna, bearing in ancient Egyptian the civil name Sesennu, also Pe-sesennu and Ha-sesennu, Eight, or the Abode, or House of Eight, is called in Coptic $\Upsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\eta$, or $\Upsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\eta \text{ } \bar{\epsilon}$ (- $\sigma\eta\alpha\upsilon$, two), where the numeral eight approaches the Semitic form (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 219). Was the change in the Coptic numeral due to an ancient form of the name of this celebrated city?

Ma-t, the goddess of truth, succeeds Thoth in a fragment of the list of the dynasties of the gods in the Turin chronological papyrus. She is characterized by the ostrich-feather, the emblem of truth, upon her head. She thus corresponds to Shu, holding the corresponding place. Thoth is called her husband (Lepsius, *Königsbuch*, taf. iii. 22), but she is not his consort at Hermopolis (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 220). She is the daughter of the sun. Her place in the myth of Osiris is very important, for it is in her hall, where she is called the Two Truths, that the deceased are judged.

Anubis, or Anup, jackal-headed, probably held in one system the next place to Ma-t. He belongs to the family of Osiris, being called the son of that divinity. He presided over mummification. In the earliest sepulchral inscriptions the divinity addressed is Anubis, not Osiris. No reason has yet been discovered for this. There can be little doubt that Osiris was always intended, and that the earliest inscriptions, for some reason connected with the Egyptian reticence as to this divinity, address Anubis.

The four genii of Amenti were inferior divinities connected with embalming. They were called Amsset, Hâpi, Tu-mut-f, and Kebhsenuf. The vases found in Egyptian tombs which bear covers in the forms of the heads of these genii were intended to contain the viscera of the mummy, as it was held to be of importance that every part of the body should be preserved.

The rest of the principal Egyptian gods may now be noticed as far as possible in the order of their importance. It must, however, be remembered, that we are likely to be misled by the abundant monuments of Upper Egypt, and the scantiness of those of Lower Egypt, and that therefore we cannot yet decide which were insignificant members of the Pantheon.

Ohnuphis, or Khnum, represented with a ram's head, and to whom the ram was sacred, is the soul of the universe, and thus is spoken of as the creator (Mariette, *Musée Boulaq*, 113). He was specially worshipped in Nubia, and at the First Cataract, with his consort Sati, the goddess of the inundation (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 150, *seqq.*). He is closely connected with Amen.

The Egyptian Pan, the god of Panopolis, or Chemmis, was Min, or Khem, the productive principle, a form of Osiris. He was worshipped at Panopolis with a form of Isis as his consort (Brugsch, *ibid.*, 212, *seqq.*). It is remarkable that he was connected with Amen at Thebes, for the myth of Amen and that of Osiris are singularly apart.

Mendes, or Ba-neb-tet, is merely a local form of Osiris, lord of Mendes, connected with the worship of the sacred ram, or Mendesian goat (Brugsch, *ibid.*, 267, 268, 271, 272; *Records of the Past*, viii. 91).

Neith, or Nit, worshipped at Sais, identified by the Greeks with Athena, is one of the few goddesses who held the first place in local worship. From the idea of a supreme being, single and self-producing, arose that of a female aspect of this being. Thus Khnum is called, as representing this being, "the father of fathers, the mother of mothers" (Mariette, *Musée Boulaq*, 113). This would suggest the personification of a female principle. This principle seems specially represented by the higher goddesses, like Neith, who is called "the mother who bare the sun, the first born, but not

begotten, born" (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 247). She wears the crown of Lower Egypt, where she was principally worshipped.

Pakht, or Sekhet, and Bast, are two forms of one goddess difficult to distinguish. They are both usually lioness-headed, though sometimes they have the head of the cat, their sacred animal. Pakht was worshipped at Memphis as the consort of Ptah; Bast seems to have held a place at her city Bubastis like that of Neith at Sais. The monuments identify Hathor with Bast, and Isis with both Pakht and Bast, Hathor being called "Lady of Bubastis," while Isis is spoken of as "bringing misfortune as the goddess Pakht, bringing peace as the goddess Bast" (Champ., *Not. Man.* 192, *ap.* Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 276). Pakht and Bast thus represent a double nature, not unlike the two principles in the Osiris myth (Mariette, *Musée Boulaq*, 1106; Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, i. 275, 276). Pakht and Bast were identified with Artemis (Brugsch, *ibid.*, 224, 275).

Mut, the "mother," consort of Amen-ra at Thebes, is, as her name implies, another embodiment of the female principle, though not in so important a form as Neith, so far as our present knowledge goes.

Khuns, worshipped at Thebes as the son of Amen and Mut, is a lunar divinity wearing the disk and crescent of the moon, his hair being plaited in the side-lock of a child. Sometimes he is hawk-headed, and thus connected with the sun. As a divinity mainly lunar his inferior place is accounted for.

The goddess Suben, identified with Eileithyia or Lucina, was worshipped at the town Eilethya. She was especially the mother-goddess, and the goddess of southern Egypt; her symbol, that of maternity, was the vulture (Mariette, *Musée Boulaq*, 121).

The goddess corresponding to Suben was Uati, or Buto, who was the protector of the north, and whose emblem was the uræus serpent.

Onuris, or Anher, was the local deity of the ancient city of Thinis. His functions are not clearly defined.

Imhotep, identified by the Greeks with Æsculapius, was the son of Ptah and Pakht, and with them formed the triad of Memphis. He is probably the god of the sciences, and similar to Thoth (Mariette, *ibid.*, 117, 118).

The Nile as a divinity bears the same name as the sacred Memphite bull, Hâpi, probably meaning "the concealed." He is represented as a man with pendent breasts, to indicate the fertility of the river. A hymn to the Nile by Enna, who flourished under Menptah, the successor of Ramses II. (Dyn. XIX.), shows how completely even an inferior Egyptian divinity was identified with the supreme god, and with the principal members of the Pantheon (*Selected Papyri*, xx.-xxiii., cxxxiv.-cxxxix.; Maspero, *Hymne au Nil*, a critical edition, and *Records of the Past*, iv. 105, *seqq.*, an elegant translation by the Rev. F. C. Cook).

The Egyptian divinities were frequently associated in triads, temples being dedicated to one of these lesser cycles, consisting of father, mother, and child. The child is almost always a son. It is extremely difficult to make out a local triad in several cases, where there were two chief local divinities, or where the chief divinity was a goddess. At Thebes the triad was Amen-ra, Mut, and Khuns; at Memphis, Ptah, Pakht or Sekhet, and Imhotep; at Ombos there were two triads, Sebek, Hathor, and Khuns, and Haruer, Tases-nefert, and Pnabeto-pkhrut; the triad of Nubia and at Elephantine was Num, Sati, and the goddess Ank-t; at Apollinopolis Magna, Har-Hat, Hat-har, and Har-pkhrut; at Latopolis, Num, Nebut, and Har-pkhrut; at Hermonthis, Munt, Ra-ta, and Har-pkhrut; and Osiris, Isis, and Horus, throughout Egypt. The third member of the triad always belongs to an inferior rank, and is sometimes a child-god (khrut), as will be observed in the three cases in which Har-pkhrut (Harpocrates) occurs, and the similar instance of Pnabeto-pkhrut. Much of our knowledge of the Egyptian triads is founded on late documents of the Ptolemaic and Roman temples, and it is possible that the idea may have not been as much developed in earlier times. The whole subject requires a careful investigation.

The Egyptian notions as to the cosmogony are too closely identified with mythology to be very clearly defined. It seems, however, that they held that the heavenly abyss was the abode of the supreme deity, who there produced the sun and the moon as well as the rest of the Pantheon. Yet it is stated in one gloss in the *Ritual* that the abyss itself was the supreme deity. (*cf.* De Rougé, "Études," *Rev. Arch.*, n.s., i. 235, *seqq.*). The aspect of the passages of the *Ritual* in which these ideas are developed seems as if due to the attempt to introduce philosophical ideas into the mythology, as though the Egyptians had some notion of the origin of things independent of that mythology.

The worship of the Egyptian deities was public and

private—that of the temples and that of the tombs. Every town had at least one temple dedicated to the chief divinity of the place, with certain associated gods, and usually, if not always, a living symbol in the form of a sacred animal supposed to be animated by the chief local divinity. The services were conducted by priests, and on occasions by the king, and by scribes, who sometimes formed a college and lived at the temples, the various duties of which required the services of learned men. It is probable that the common people had a very small share in the religious services, the most important of which took place in the smaller inner chambers, which could never have admitted many worshippers. The outer courts, and still more the great inclosures containing the whole group of temple-buildings, must, however, have been the chief public resort for business and pleasure. There were no other public buildings, or, apparently, market-places. Like the modern mosque, the temple must have been the chief centre of the population.

The worship in the tombs was not local. It was always connected with Osiris or a divinity of the same group, and had the intention of securing benefits for the deceased in the future state. It took place in the chapel of each tomb of the wealthy; and though properly the function of the family, whose members officiated, the inscriptions invite all passers-by, as they ascend or descend the Nile, overlooked by the sepulchral grottoes, to say a prayer for the welfare of the chief person there buried.

The sacrifices were of animals and vegetables, with libations of wine, and burning of incense. Human sacrifice seems to have been practised in early periods. The monuments do not mention it, but Manetho speaks of its having been abolished, at least at one place, by Amôsis, no doubt the first king of Dynasty XVIII. The reference is probably to some barbarous usage during the great war with the Shepherds.¹

The origin and destiny of man in the Egyptian religion is now known to us on the authority of its own documents, which in the main confirm what Greek writers had already stated on the subject. The aspect of the Egyptian teaching is either that of a simple theory, which was afterwards mythically interpreted, or of a union of such a theory with a superstition existing side by side with it. In the famous seventeenth chapter of the *Ritual* it is possible, as De Rougé has done with extraordinary skill, to extract from the text a consistent theory which the glosses confuse by the mythological turn they give to the simple statements of the text. Notwithstanding this difficulty, it is sufficiently clear that the Egyptians attributed to the human soul a divine origin, that they held that it was throughout life engaged in the warfare of good and evil, and that after life its final state was determined by judgment according to its doings on earth. Those who were justified before Osiris passed into perpetual happiness, those who were condemned into perpetual misery. The justified took the name of Osiris, the judge, under which they indeed already appeared for judgment.

Had this plain outline been left unfilled by the priests, the Egyptians might have been credited with a lofty

¹ According to Plutarch, Manetho stated that human sacrifices were anciently practised at Eilethya (*De Is. et Osir.* l. cap. 73); whereas Porphyry says, on the same authority, that Amôsis abolished them at Heliopolis (*De Abst.*, p. 199). As, however, according to Porphyry they were sacrificed to Hera, who would well correspond to Suben, goddess of Eilethya, not to any goddess of Heliopolis, it is probable that Heliopolis is an error for Eilethya (Ἡλιού τόλει for Εἰλεθούλει τόλει , as in the other passage where this is a correction for Ἡλιού τόλει), but the two citations are very different. According to Porphyry, Amôsis substituted waxen figures for the victims. The figure called the "Bride of the Nile," now annually thrown into the river at the cutting of the Canal of Cairo, is said to represent a girl annually sacrificed in former times.

philosophy. Unfortunately, however, a thousand superstitions took the place of the attempt to lead an honest life. In the tombs we find every one who could pay for a sculptured record characterized as justified, every mummy already an Osiris. How was this determined? Possibly there was a council held, which decided that the deceased could be treated as one who was certain of future happiness. It is, however, more probable that the learning certain prayers and incantations, the performance of ceremonies, and the whole process of embalming, together with the charms attached to the mummy, and prayers said by those who visited the tomb, were held to secure future happiness. In reading the *Ritual* we are struck by the small space given to man's duties as compared with that filled by incantations and charms. The human mind must have lost sight of the value of good and seized upon the multifarious equivalents which needed nothing to be done by way of either self-restraint from evil or active benevolence. Thus as we look at the documents we see a noble idea lost in a crowd of superstitious fancies; as we look at the Egyptians as they lived, we trace the effect of the in-domitible good, and yet find it always greatly alloyed with evil. The Egyptian idea of the future state is the converse of that of Socrates. It is no little incident of human weakness, like the request to sacrifice a cock to Æsculapius, which injures but does not destroy a harmonious whole; a mere glimpse of truth is seen through thick mists peopled with the phantoms of the basest superstition.

In the long course of ages the Egyptian ideas as to the future state seem to have undergone changes, not in themselves, but in the manner in which they were regarded. The vast labour expended on the Pyramids, and their solid simplicity, are in striking contrast with the elaborate religious representations of the tombs of the kings of Dynasties XIX. and XX. So, too, the sculptures on the walls of the tombs of subjects of the earlier kings, representing the everyday life of duty and pleasure, give place to funereal and religious scenes in the later periods. These were fashions, but they show the changed mood of the national mind. It is only in a tablet of the age of the Ptolemies that Greek ideas assert their pre-eminence in a touching lament addressed from the land of shades, which no longer speaks of active happiness, but in its place of purposeless oblivion (Birch, "Two Tablets of the Ptolemaic Period," *Archæologia*, xxxix. 22, 23).

Laws and Government.—We are gradually gaining an insight into the Egyptian laws. This is principally due to M. Chabas, the third volume of whose *Mélanges Égyptologiques* mainly consists of essays, nearly all by himself, on texts relative to the administration of justice under the Pharaohs. His general results confirm the accuracy of what Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch state on the subject. It was to be expected that their evidence would have been good as to matters which could not have been easily misunderstood, and which must in the case of Diodorus have been personally observed. In this matter the two sets of authorities may fairly be combined.

The government of Egypt was monarchical. It was determined as early as the rule of Dynasty II., according to Manetho, that women could reign. Accordingly we find instances of queens regnant. Their rule, however, seems to have been disliked, and they are passed over in the lists made under Dynasty XIX., when, it may be observed, the royal family seems to have been affected by Shemite influences. The royal power can scarcely have been despotic, although under certain kings it became so. It is sufficient to compare Assyrian and Babylonian with Egyptian history and documents to perceive a marked difference. The earliest monuments indicate a powerful local aristocracy holding hereditary functions. Those of

the Empire (Dynasties XVIII.-XX.) scarcely indicate any such class. Even the princes are no longer a royal clan, but the children of the reigning sovereign. The whole system of government rests with the king, who appoints all the functionaries and dismisses them at his pleasure. Hence arose a vast and corrupt bureaucracy, to which the decay of Egypt may have been mainly due. At all times the country was governed by nomarchs and lesser-officers. In the earliest period these were local magnates whose office was at least sometimes hereditary, and whose interest it was to promote the welfare of their districts. Under the Empire governments seem to have been mere places of profit given by favour and held by force and corruption, according to the Turkish method.

The laws were administered by judges appointed by the king. It is certain that commissions for an occasion were thus formed. We do not know that there were judges appointed for life; but it is probable that such was the case, as it must have been the duty of a class to be thoroughly acquainted with the written laws. A legal scribe may, however, have been attached to each commission.¹ All the particulars of each case, though not necessarily submitted in writing, were recorded, and the decision was written. The process was conducted with great care, and the culprit examined on his oath. The punishments probably were not extremely severe. For murder, but not for manslaughter, death was the penalty. Adultery was severely punished, perhaps rather by custom than by law. Theft was rigorously prosecuted. For sacrilegious theft the criminal was punished with death. The laws relating to debt are not yet well known. They appear to have been complicated by a system of loans and pawning, and to have been subject to modifications. Of the tenure of land we know little. The temple-lands seem to have been held in perpetuity, and this was probably the case with private domains in the earliest period (De Rougé, *Six Prem. Dyn.*, 255, note 1).

Army.—We know little as yet of the organization of the Egyptian army, but much of its arms and mode of conducting warfare. It consisted from very early times of foreigners as well as Egyptians. The Egyptian troops seem to have been a military caste, though not in the strictest sense, and to have had certain lands allotted to them. There were two main divisions of the army,—a chariot-force, in which each chariot contained an archer and a charioteer, and was drawn by two horses; and a force of foot-soldiers variously armed, chiefly heavy infantry, armed with shield and spear, sword, axe, or mace, and light infantry, with bow, and axe or falchion, as well as slingers. It may be noticed that flint-tipped arrows were used in the chase. We know nothing of the military manoeuvres, but it is evident that the troops were drilled to move in formations, and that the art of besieging was as well understood as by the Assyrians, in the mode of attacking the enemy's fort as well as in that of protecting the soldiers.

Manners and Customs.—The subjects of the walls of the Egyptian tombs and the hieratic papyri tell us much of the domestic life of the ancient people. The education in the earliest age seems to have been more manly and more simple than in that of the Empire, when the college of a temple or the miniature court of a great officer was the school instead of the estate of the landed proprietor. This system, however, gave almost his only chance of advance-

¹ M. Chabas has given the constitution of a tribunal under Dynasty XX. It was held at the great assizes of Thebes, and presided over by the poliarch, with nine inferior judges, including his three assessors, who were a royal controller, a majordomo, and another royal controller, the first prophet of Amen-ra and an inferior prophet, a royal scribe, a captain of cavalry, an ensign of the navy, and the commandant of the city. The last was the prosecutor, and was himself condemned by the other judges on the acquittal of the defendants (*Mélanges*, iii. i. 131, &c.).

ment to a poor man's son, for the very highest posts were open to the successful scholar. (Cf. Brugsch, *Hist.* 2d ed. 16, 17.) Circumcision was practised from the earliest times, but apparently not as a religious rite, and not until the earlier years of childhood had passed. Of the education of girls there is no indication, but, as they afterwards shared the public life of men, and even held posts of importance in the priesthood, it could not have been neglected. It has not been proved that the Egyptians had any definite marriage law. We find, however, that they married but one wife, who is termed the lady of the house, and shares with her husband the honours paid to the deceased. Concubinage was no doubt allowed, but it is seldom that we find any trace of children more numerous than those of legitimate wives could be. The family of Ramses II. is an instance of an Oriental household, and the fifty-two children of Baba, whose tomb is found at Eilethya, may also be cited, though the term children may in this case include other descendants (cf. Brugsch, *ibid.* 176, 177). Ordinarily the aspect of the family is that which it wears in civilized countries. The women were not secluded, and, if they did not take the place of those of republican Rome, it was due to faults of national character rather than the restraints of custom. There was no separation into castes, although many occupations were usually hereditary. As there was no noble caste, there was nothing to prevent the rise of naturally able persons but the growth of the official class, which gradually absorbed all power and closed the avenues to success. The corruption of this class has been remarkably shown by the researches into the Egyptian administration of justice by M. Chabas, who cites lists of robbers of tombs and houses containing the names of scribes and priests, besides a higher grade of servants (*Mélanges*, iii. i. 144, *seqq.*). There are other indications of the social condition of Egypt under the Empire in the complaints of the lower class against the brigandage to which they were subject on the part of persons who found means to interest the highest functionaries, and so escape merited punishment. At the same time it is to be remembered that they had the right of direct appeal to the king (*Ibid.* 173-216). This part of the picture of Egyptian life is strikingly like that of China, and the dislike of foreigners is consistent with the comparison. The lower class being uneducated, and for the most part very poor, was held in contempt by the higher, and this was especially the case with labourers and herdsmen. All handicrafts were considered unworthy of a gentleman, and even the sculptor and painter were not raised above this general level. The only occupations fit for the upper class were priestly, civil, and military, and the direction of architectural and other works which required scientific knowledge, not skill of hand. The servants were of a higher grade than the labourers: not so the slaves, who were generally captives taken in war.

The everyday life of the ancient Egyptians is abundantly represented in the pictures of the tombs from the earliest monumental age to that of the Empire. The rich passed much of their time in hospitality, giving feasts at which the guests were entertained in various ways. The host and hostess sat together, as did other married people, and the other men and women generally were seated apart. The seats were single or double chairs, but many sat on the ground. Each feaster was decked with a necklace of flowers by the servants, and a lotus-flower was bound to the head, on which was also placed a lump of ointment. Small tables were set before the guests, on which were piled meat, fruits, cakes, and other food, and wine-cups were carried round. Before the repast, hired musicians and dancers entertained the company, and often this seems to have been the sole object of invitation.

These two kinds of entertainment are precisely what are customary at the present day in Egypt. Among the amusements of the ancient Egyptians was witnessing the performance of various gymnastic feats. They had several games, one of which probably resembled draughts. Under the old kingdom the chief occupations of the rich seem to have been those of a country life, in its duties, the superintendence of husbandry, of the taking stock of flocks and herds, and of the shipment of produce, and the examination of fisheries, or again in seeing to the efficient work of the people of the estate who were engaged in any craft; and the pleasures of country life filled up the leisure. In ancient times Egypt had far more cover for wild fowl than now. Thus we see from the subjects of the tombs that the rich Egyptian was in the habit of going into the marshes in a canoe, generally with some of his children, to spear the hippopotamus, or more frequently to knock down birds with the curved throw-stick. In fowling, a cat was sometimes used as a retriever. At other times he fished in his ponds, or shot or coursed with hounds various animals of the antelope kind. Every rich man in the age of the Empire had a chariot, generally drawn by two horses, which he usually drove himself, standing up in it. The life of the ladies was not unlike that of the men, except that they only joined in the sports as spectators. They seem to have passed their time in household matters, in visiting, and in the simplest country pleasures. Occasionally they rode in heavy cars drawn by oxen. Their manners appear to have been indolent and luxurious. Among the lower orders the lighter work usually fell to the women. Both men and women led hard lives, having scanty clothing and poor food; yet the genial climate, in which the wants of the labourer must always have been few, rendered their condition not so painful as one might suppose.

Language and Literature.—The language of the people was the Egyptian, the later form of which, after they had become Christians, is called Coptic. Comparative philology has not yet satisfactorily determined its place. There can be no doubt that it is related to the Semitic family, but it has not yet been proved to belong to it. The grammatical structure is distinctly Semitic, and many roots are common to the Semitic languages. On the other hand, the Egyptian has essential characteristics which detach it from this family. It is monosyllabic, and its monosyllabism is not that from which scholars have endeavoured to deduce Semitic, but rather such as would belong to a decayed condition. This monosyllabism is like that of Syriac. Dr Brugsch strongly affirms the affinity of the Egyptian to the Indo-Germanic as well as the Semitic languages (*Hist.*, 2 ed. 6), but the former relation has to be proved. It has been supposed that the monosyllabism of the Egyptian is due to its having in part originated from a Nigritian source (*Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, 2d ed. 255, *seqq.*). Certainly this is a characteristic of some Nigritian languages, and the want of any large agreement in the vocabulary would be sufficiently explained by the changes that the languages of savage nations undergo from the absence of a literature. It can therefore scarcely yet be asserted with Dr Brugsch that the Egyptian has no analogy to the African languages (*l.c.*), by which, no doubt, he intends those which have no Semitic element. The problem will probably be solved either by a careful study of all the African languages which show traces of Semitic structure side by side with those that are without such traces, or by the discovery of the unknown element in Egyptian in the Akkadian or some other primitive language of Western Asia, which cannot be called Semitic in the recognized sense of the term. During its long history the language underwent little change until it became Coptic. It had two dialects—those of Upper and Lower Egypt.

(Brugsch, *ibid.*); and by degrees a vulgar dialect was formed which ultimately became the national language not long before the formation of Coptic. One curious innovation in the Egyptian language was the fashion under the Ramses family of introducing Semitic words instead of Egyptian ones. From the manner in which these words are spelt it is evident that the Egyptians at that time had no idea of a Semitic element in Egyptian, for they always treat them as foreign words and retain the long foreign forms. The chief change in Coptic was the introduction of many Greek words, especially to supply the place of religious terms eliminated from the vocabulary. The inscribed and written character of Egyptian was the hieroglyphic, a very complex system, which expressed ideas by symbols or by phonetic signs, syllabic and alphabetic, or else by a combination of the two methods. From this was formed the hieratic, a running hand, or common written form of the hieroglyphic, principally used for documents written on papyrus. Its oldest records are not equal in age to the earliest hieroglyphic inscriptions, but probably it is not much later in origin. The demotic or enchorial writing is merely a form of hieratic used for the vulgar dialect, and employed for legal documents from the time of Dyn. XXVI. downwards. The Coptic is written with the Greek alphabet, with the addition of six new letters and a ligature, these letters being taken from the demotic to express sounds unknown to Greek. For further details see the article HIEROGLYPHICS.

Much ancient Egyptian literature has come down to us, and it must be allowed that from a literary point of view it has disappointed expectation. What it tells is full of interest, but the mode of telling rarely rises to the dignity of style. So unsystematic is this literature that it has not given us the connected history of a single reign, or a really intelligible account of a single campaign. The religious documents are still less orderly than the historical. It is only by the severe work of some of the ablest critics during the last fifty years that from those disjointed materials a consistent whole has been constructed.

The most important religious work is the *Funeral Ritual*, or *Book of the Dead*, a collection of prayers of a magical character referring to the future condition of the disembodied soul, which has already been noticed. It has been published by Dr Lepsius (*Das Totenbuch der Aegypter*) and M. de Rougé (*Rituel Funéraire*), and translated by Dr Birch (Bunsen's *Egypt's Place*, v.). De Rougé, in his most interesting papers in the *Revue Archéologique* (n.s.), has done the utmost that a splendid critical faculty and an unusual mastery of language could achieve to present parts of the work in the most favourable form. Still it must remain a marvel of confusion and poverty of thought. Similar to the Ritual is the Book of the Lower Hemisphere. The other religious works and inscriptions are of a wider range. The temple inscriptions indeed are singularly stilted and wanting in variety; but the papyri contain some hymns which are of a finer style, particularly that to the Nile by Enna, translated by Canon Cook (*Records of the Past*, iv. 105), and that to Ra-Harmachis, translated by Dr Lushington (*ibid.* viii. 129) and Professor Maspero (*Histoire Ancienne*, 32, *seqq.*). The moral writings have a higher quality than the religious, if we may judge from their scanty remains. The historical writings fall into two classes according to their official or unofficial character. Those that are official present the worst form of the panegyric style, the others are simple though wanting in method. The letters are of more interest, from their lively portrayal of ancient Egyptian manners. In works of fiction there is a greater degree of skill, and in the "Tale of Setna" (*Records of the Past*, iv.) we even find touches of humour. Egyptian literature