

must be reduced, and as supplying fragments of historical chronology which may ultimately be fitted into a complete system. It has indeed been supposed that they enable us to construct an approximate chronology on genealogical evidence. This system, however, breaks down where we can test it, and it is therefore dangerous where it must stand alone. The great genealogy of the official architects gives 21 generations from the contemporary of Setes I. (Dynasty XIX. 2), to the contemporary of Darius I. (XXVII. 3); and thus, allowing three generations to a century, we should bring the birth of Setes and the beginning of Dynasty XIX. to about a.c. 1200.¹ It is, however, quite certain that, reckoning from the synchronism of Sheshonk I., or Shishak, with Rehoboam, we must allow for the intervening period at least a century more. The historical events require this. We must therefore suppose that generations, either of architects or of other persons who did not hold the office of architect, are dropped. If this method of computing by genealogies thus fails where we have a genealogical list, obviously it cannot be applied to dynastic lists which we do not know to be genealogical. The average length of reigns is usually different from and less than that of generations, and we cannot tell the most probable average length of reigns without knowing the law of succession of the country, and its political conditions in the period under consideration. It is therefore especially hazardous thus to measure the Egyptian chronology before Dynasty XVIII., at which time ascending genealogical evidence fails us. (See, however, Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2 ed. 25-27.)

The preceding observations will prepare the reader to find in the following pages no definite chronological system for the period before the synchronism of Egyptian and Hebrew history at the beginning of Dynasty XXII. The essay would, however, be incomplete without a short account of the chronological views of the leading Egyptologists. M. Mariette accepts Manetho's numbers with some modifications, and makes all the dynasties but one consecutive. He thus dates the beginning of Dynasty I. a.c. 5004. Dr Brugsch, following the genealogical method, proposed by Prof. Lieblein, and treating the reigns of the Tablet of Abydos as generations, but making an exception for the distracted age of the XIII.-XVII. Dynasties, when he adopts a series of years derived from Manetho, places the beginning of Egyptian history cir. B.C. 4400² (*Hist.*, 2d ed. 179). Professor Lepsius adopts the 3555 years as the true duration of the thirty dynasties, and thus lowers the date in question to B.C. 3892. He reduces the length of the dynasties by making some in part or in whole contemporary.³ M. Chabas proposes with much hesitation the 46th century B.C. (*Études sur l'Antiquité Historique*, 2 ed. 15, 16). The following table gives the date of the beginning of each dynasty according to M. Mariette and Professor Lepsius. The less definite schemes of Dr Brugsch and M. Chabas cannot be tabulated in the same manner.

	M. Mariette.	Prof. Lepsius.
Dynasty I.	a.c. 5004	a.c. 3892
II.	4751	3639
III.	4449	3337
IV.	4235	3124
V.	3961	2849
VI.	3703	2744
VII.	3500	2592
VIII.	3500	2522
IX.	3358	2674
X.	3249	2665
XI.	3064	2423
XII.	2851	2380
XIII.	2851	2136
XIV.	2398	2167
XV.		2101
XVI.	2214	1842
XVII.		1884
XVIII.	1703	1591
XIX.	1462	1443
XX.	1288	1269
XXI.	1110	1091
XXII.	980	951
XXIII.	810	787
XXIV.	721	729
XXV.	715	716
XXVI.	695	685
XXVII.	527	525
XXVIII.	406	525
XXIX.	399	399
XXX.	378	378
Second Persian Conquest.....	340	340

¹ Dr Brugsch escapes this difficulty by adding to the genealogy the reigns of Dynasty XVIII. (*Hist.*, 2 ed. 26) as generations, and as these reigns had a shorter average length than generations, he recovers lost time.

² The apparent disagreement of this date and that given p. 27 as the result of the genealogical method is due to the higher date given in the table cited above to the beginning of Dynasty XVIII. on chronological data (for XVII. read XVIII. p. 180). The lower date of this epoch is due to the strictly genealogical method in the earlier statement, but it must be admitted that the difference is large.

³ It must be remarked that he modifies the numbers of Manetho where they can be tested by monumental evidence, but in the great periods for which that evidence fails he is forced to accept them as they have come down to us. This system is developed with much skill in the *Chronologie der Aegypter* and *Königsbuch der Aegypter*.

There are two weak points in all these systems. They rest to a greater or less degree upon numbers either occurring but once or due to a single authority. The sum of 3555 years, which is the foundation of Professor Lepsius's system, occurs in but a single passage, and the same is the case with the round number of 500 years adopted by Dr Brugsch for the doubtful period of Dynasties XIII.-XVII.; it is taken from Manetho's 511 years of the Shepherd dominion. How if both these numbers are corrupt? If they are not their escape is a marvel, considering to what authors and copyists we owe them. Again, the sums of most individual dynasties rest on Manetho's sole authority, and his lists are in a state which is at present hopeless. It is equally unfortunate that while certain dynasties are represented by monuments from which Manetho's numbers have been verified, others have left little or no records. Thus we have no monuments of Dynasties I.-III. until the close of the last. Then there is an abundance of monuments of Dynasties IV., V., VI. A blank follows without a monument that we can assign to Dynasties VII., VIII., IX., X. Records reappear under Dynasty XI.; of Dynasty XII. they are abundant. Under Dynasty XIII. they become scanty, and of XIV., XV., XVI., XVII. there are but a few, which may be of XV., XVI., or XVII. We have therefore three blank periods, the age before known monuments, the interval of Dynasties VII.-X., and that of Dynasties XIII.-XVII. It is significant that whereas M. Mariette's reckoning exceeds that of Professor Lepsius 1112 years in the whole sum of the thirty dynasties, the excess is no less than 966 years in the sums of Dynasties VII.-X. and XIII.-XVII. Such a difference between two such great authorities is a proof of the want of even probability for solving this part of the problem. Dr Brugsch, in applying the genealogical method to the lists of the monuments for the first and second blanks, while he rejects it for the third, is manifestly unwary. The evidence of the Turin Papyrus proves that we must not apply any such method to the third blank. How do we know that it can be applied to the other two? It may be argued that Manetho's numbers for the reigns of the first blank are probable, but neither his lists nor the monuments throw any light on those of the second, to which, notwithstanding, Dr Brugsch allows no less a period than about 500 years. His system has also the special fault that it rests on the supposition that the Egyptian reigns are equivalent to generations, which, as already shewn, is by no means proved.

In the following sketch of Egyptian history no dates before the Christian Era will be given until the beginning of Dynasty XVIII., when approximative chronology becomes possible. Where, however, we may reasonably conjecture the length of a particular part of history, this will be stated.

The traditional age in Egypt is extremely obscure. History begins with the First Dynasty. The earlier period with Manetho, who is supported by the Turin Papyrus, is mythological, the age of the divine reigns, an idea also traceable in the monuments which treat certain divinities as sovereigns. This age is held to be spoken of on the monuments as that of the Shesu-har, the servants, followers, or successors, of Horus, who, in mythology, aid him in his combats with Seth (Chabas, *Ant. Hist.*, 7, 8; Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed. 23). Manetho completely divests the time of any historical character by making it cyclical. It might be supposed that the Egyptians had some idea of records actually dating from this age, if we could accept M. Chabas's reading of the Ptolemaic inscription relating to the plan of the temple of Dendarah, in which it is stated that the original plan was found in the time of Pepi, of Dynasty VI., in ancient characters on a skin of the time of the Shesu-har. It appears, however, from the context that this inscription was of the time of Khufu, of Dynasty IV., and consequently the parallel expression is merely used to denote remote antiquity (Dümichen, *Bauurkunde der Tempelanlagen von Dendera*, 15, taf. xvi.; 18, 19, taf. xv.; cf., on the other side, Chabas, *Ant. Hist.*, 2d ed. 7, 8).

Egyptian mythology has not been found to contain any allusion to a deluge, nor to have any connection with the Mosaic narrative in reference to the cosmogony and the early conditions of the human race. Similar terms have been pointed out, but the leading facts are wanting. Thus the Egyptian ideas of their prehistoric age have a strange isolation by the side of those of most other nations of remote civilization, which agree in one or more particulars with the narrative of Genesis. Discoveries may, however, modify this view.

In Egypt stone implements have been recently discovered. Owing, however, to the abundance of historical monuments, the prehistorical remains have scarcely received due attention. We do not yet know whether these implements were used by the Egyptians or by savage tribes who may have made incursions into their territory. We find, however, the use of flint arrow-heads in the historical period from the paintings at Benee-Hasan (Dynasty XII.).

It is impossible to conjecture the duration of the prehistoric age in Egypt. M. Chabas has proposed a space of 4000 years before the First Dynasty as sufficient for the development of the civilization which had already attained maturity in the time of the Fourth Dynasty (*Ant. Hist.*, 9, 10). We are, however, so entirely ignorant of the causes of this civilization, and so unable to decide how far it was native to the soil of Egypt, that it is safer to abstain from any attempt to compute a period of the length of which the historical Egyptians themselves do not appear to have had any idea.

With Menes, in Egyptian Mena, the "stable," the history of Egypt begins. It is true that Manetho states cautiously of his successors of the Second Dynasty certain things that are evidently legendary. This must be the natural result of a want of monumental evidence, and a consequent dependence on tradition. At present no monuments are known before the time of the last king of Dynasty III., and this may be the limit at which inscribed contemporary records began. It is, however, agreed by all Egyptologists that the founder of the Egyptian state is no legendary personage. All we know of him wears the air of history, and is consistent with the conditions in which a state would have been formed. Menes was of Thinis, in Upper Egypt, and consequently the first two dynasties are called Thinite. Thinis, or This, in Egyptian Teni, was perhaps only a quarter of the more famous Abydos. Certainly it was obscured by the near neighbourhood of the sacred city. Menes, having gained the sovereignty of Egypt, which probably before his time was divided into two states, founded the city of Memphis. In order to gain sufficient room for the site he changed the course of the Nile by constructing a dike, which turned the stream more to the east. M. Linant believes that this dike is probably represented by that of Kusheysh. The great temple of Ptah, at Memphis, was then founded; and there can be no doubt that the seat of government was, under Menes, or not much later, removed to the new city. Menes made laws and waged a successful war. After a long reign of sixty-two years he was killed by a hippopotamus. All this has a perfectly historical aspect. Only a legislator and warrior, and so a mighty hunter, could have set upon a stable basis the long-lasting fabric of Egyptian polity. The main qualities of the man who did this could not have been forgotten at Memphis, which was great and flourishing the chief seat of Egyptian learning and wealth, before the close of the Third Dynasty. The reproach that Menes corrupted the primitive simplicity of the Egyptians is probably a perverted tradition, like that which changed the tyranny of Khufu and Khafra to impiety. In later times Menes was revered with other kings, but as far as we know had no special worship, a condition suitable to his historical character, now universally admitted.

Athothis, either Tota or Atot, the first or second successor of Menes, is related to have founded the palace at Memphis, and, being a physician, to have written anatomical books. A medical papyrus in the Museum of Berlin, composed under Ramses II. (Dynasty XIX.), curiously illustrates the second statement. It contains a portion said to have been copied from a very ancient papyrus discovered in the time of Hesp-ti, or Usaphaidos, a later king of the First Dynasty, and to have been subsequently taken to Senta, or

Sethenes, of the next line (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2 ed., 42). Under Unephes, the fourth Thinite king, a great famine, the first recorded, ravaged Egypt. He is also said to have raised the pyramids near Kochome. As Kakem is the monumental name of the part of the Memphite necropolis around the Serapeum, and north of the Pyramid of Steps of Sakkarah, Dr Brugsch and others are disposed to consider that pyramid, which is a very archaic structure among pyramids, to be here intended. The use of the plural "pyramids" by Manetho does not stand in the way of the identification, as we know a case in which a small pyramid was built at the same time as a large one. We do not know the original purpose of the monument. Under the early dynasties it was used as the burial-place of the bulls Apis. As, however, their worship was introduced under Dynasty II., it may have been at first a royal sepulchre, like all other pyramids of which we know the use. Under Semempses, the seventh king of the dynasty, Manetho speaks of many wonders and a very great plague. Thus the two chief scourges of Egypt appear in this remote age, suggesting a large population, and consequently the length of the period preceding the accession of Menes.

With Boethos, or Butau, the Second Dynasty begins. Manetho relates that in his time a great chasm opened at Bubastis and many perished. Frequent as volcanic shocks are in Egypt, it is long since an earthquake has been experienced in that country. There are, however, reasons, from the manner in which monuments have fallen and the records of earthquakes in Palestine in antiquity, for supposing that Egypt was anciently more subject to such calamities than in later times. The next king, Kaiechos, Kakau, introduced the worship of the bulls Apis at Memphis, and Mnevis at Heliopolis, and of the Mendesian goat, and his name appears to commemorate these innovations, probably a necessary step owing to the increase of population, for animals locally worshipped were thus restricted in number. We also notice that already Heliopolis and Mendes, besides Thinis, Memphis, and Bubastis had been founded. Under the next king, whose name, Binothris, Bainnuter, was probably commemorative of the new worship at Mendes, we read that a law was passed that women could hold the sovereign power. This might in a semi-barbarous condition be a relic of polyandry, but in Egypt the civilization of Dynasty IV. forbids such an explanation, and we must rather regard this new law as a proof of advancement. In consequence we find a few reigns of queens in the Egyptian lists, but only one of them, Sebek-neferura (Dynasty XII.), appears in those of the monuments. Succession through an heiress was, however, carefully respected, and it was perhaps for want of a son that Binothris made this edict. It may be chance, but Manetho calls each king of Dynasty I. after Menes, son of his predecessor, whereas under Dynasty II. he drops this characterization. Nothing more is told of this line but two marvels, that under Manetho's seventh king, Nepercheres, the Nile was fabled to have flowed mixed with honey for eleven days, and that the eighth, Sesochris, was said to have had a height of 5 cubits and 3 palms, which is not improbably a confused account of a colossal statue.

The royal house now changed by the accession of Dynasty III., the first of Memphites. Manetho relates how, under its head, Necherophes or Necherochis, the Nebka of the monumental lists, the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians but returned to their allegiance terrified by a sudden increase of the moon. It is useless to speculate on the character of the phenomenon which, unless it be legendary, was probably an eclipse; but the glimpse we thus obtain of an Egyptian dominion beyond the Nile valley at this remote age is most valuable. In Genesis the Lehabim, or Lubim, appear as a race kindred to the Egyptians. In the

Egyptian inscriptions they are called Rebu, or Lebu, and appear on early monuments as a dark people. Under the Empire they have Caucasian characteristics. The change was probably due to the great maritime migrations of the Pelagic tribes, in which the Libyans had an important share. To the next king, Tosorthros, Manetho assigns the invention of building with hewn stones and cultivation of letters, and says that for his medical knowledge the Egyptians called him Æsculapius. If the Pyramid of Steps dates from an earlier king, the first statement must be qualified, though it is to be remarked that the difference of constructive skill between that monument, if so early, and the works of Dynasty IV., would almost justify the historian; and again the discovery of inscriptions of a less accurately ordered kind than those of Dynasty IV. may support the second statement; the third seems at variance with the Memphite worship of the Egyptian Æsculapius, Imh-ep. On the monuments contemporary history begins with the last king the lists assign to this dynasty, Senoferu, probably Manetho's last but one, Sefhuris. We may now take a retrospect of the age. It is in some respects curiously primitive in comparison with that which immediately follows it. Dr Brugsch has remarked the general absence in the kings' names of the name of Ra, afterwards essential to throne-names, which from the medallic character of some of these they seem to have been, and the equally general absence of the names of other gods, Ra occurring once in the three dynasties and Sekeri once. Again he has observed the somewhat plebeian aspect of these names, as proper to men who sternly ruled the masses. Mena is "the stable," he who resists; Tota, "he who strikes;" Senta, "the terrible;" Huni, "he who strikes." Senoferu is "the betterer." As "the striker of the peoples," for so he is called in his inscription at Wadec Maghârah, in the Sinaitic peninsula, he is a foreign conqueror.¹

From Senoferu, at the close of Dynasty III., to the end of Dynasty VI., we have a succession of contemporary monuments by which history can be reconstructed, not only in its political events, but in those details of the condition of the population which make an essential part of all real history. Under Senoferu we find great material prosperity, and the arts already in that condition of excellence which makes the Pyramid age in some respects the most remarkable in the annals of Egypt. We also find foreign conquest, not as in the time of the Empire for glory, but with the view of extending the Egyptian rule to countries whose products were valuable for the arts. It is thus that this Pharaoh is the earliest who has left a tablet in the Sinaitic peninsula, where perhaps he, as Dr Brugsch thinks, was the first to plant military colonies to protect the workers in the mines of copper and the valuable blue stone called "mafkat," and this idea is supported by his being afterwards worshipped there. He is also the first king whose pyramid is found with its special name on the monuments. Dr Brugsch thinks it is that now called the Pyramid of Meydoom, near which chapels of tombs bearing his name have been discovered, and a group consisting of two statues, remarkable as a splendid specimen of Egyptian archaic art. The subjects, it may be remarked, were usually buried near the pyramid of the reigning king. Senoferu the betterer left a good name as a beneficent king, and his worship was maintained until the Ptolemaic period.

Khufu, the Suphis I. of Manetho and Cheops of Hero-

¹ The chronological length of this first unknown period in the thirty dynasties cannot be determined. In the Turin Papyrus three durations of reigns are preserved. They are each less than Manetho's numbers of the same reigns, however we fit the two lists together. It is further remarkable that while the length of Dynasty I. gives nearly a generation of 33½ years to each reign (253 ÷ 8 = 31.6) that of Dynasty II. gives almost exactly this average (302, Afr. ÷ 9 = 33.5; 297, Eur. ÷ 9 = 33.)

dotus, immediately succeeds Senoferu in the lists of the monuments, so that he may be regarded as the legitimate head of Dynasty IV. The list of that dynasty is as follows:—Khufu, Rataf, Khafra, Menkaura, Shepseskaf, corresponding to eight kings in Manetho, in whom also the order is different, Rataf (Ratoises) following Menkaura (Mencheres), a natural consequence of the association in fame of the builders of the three most celebrated pyramids, Khufu, Khafra, and Menkaura.²

The age of the pyramid-builders is the most brilliant before the Empire. We can judge from the royal tombs of the magnificence of the kings, and from the sepulchres around of the wealth of the subjects. The construction of the pyramids has perhaps been unduly marvelled at: we should know in what other manner the kings employed the vast amount of manual labour at their disposal, if we would estimate how much they could have effected by it in pyramid-building in the long period of time for which they ruled. If the two reigns of Khufu and Khafra extended over more than a century and a quarter, we may measure what we know them to have done against the works of other states during a like interval, and the comparison reduces our wonder.

The regal power at this time seems to have been very strong. So at least may we infer from the phraseology of the inscriptions, and from the fact that the kings threw much, if not all, of the force of the nation into personal monuments for their own memorial. Never in later times is the royal tomb the chief object of the king's reign, or is he so completely detached from the welfare of Egypt. The pyramids with their priesthoods are proofs that then the Pharaoh was more positively worshipped than ever afterwards.

It must, however, be admitted that the great men whose tombs are planned around the pyramids enjoyed abundant wealth and ease. Their time was passed not in war or in state affairs, but in the management of large estates, probably royal gifts, and in superintending the handicrafts of their people, and giving no small share of their leisure to the pleasures of the chase, to hospitality, and to the enjoyment of musical performances. In the thapels of their tombs these occupations of everyday life are portrayed. There is no sign of war, no great military class. It is true that the common folk seem to have been very poor, but their life in that land of abundance is at least represented as happy. On the other hand, it is significant that the nobility include a large number of the royal family, and that the king is

² The numbers of Manetho are irreconcilable with those of the Turin Papyrus assigned by scholars to this period. There is evidence that they cannot be considered to be consecutive in the inscription which mentions a lady, a Queen Meritites, as a great favourite of Senoferu and Khufu and attached to Khafra. M. de Rougé remarks that she must have been very old at the time of Khafra (*Six Prem. Dyn.*, 256 seqq.), but in the list of Manetho the intervening reigns (Ratoises 25, Suphis [II.] 86) amount to 91 years. If we allow her to have been 14 years old at the end of the reign of Senoferu and to have lived a year into that of Khafra, her age would not be less than 106 years. This is very near the extreme limit of human life in the Egyptian inscriptions, 110 years, and it is based on the minimum of time possible in the case. The length of early kings' lives in the Turin Papyrus supports this view. Probably the reigns overlapped one another. This idea is supported by the two chief chambers in the Great Pyramid, which has already made M. de Rougé suspect that it was the tomb of two kings (*Id.* 261, note 1). A sound argument for the chronology of the time might be found in the size of the three chief pyramids. A pyramid was the great work of a king's reign, and it was so constructed that it might be continually increased in size and yet easily completed at any time. The Great Pyramid would indicate a reign of maximum duration; so, too, the Second; whereas the Third would, in its original size, mark a shorter time. By this method we should be induced to accept Manetho's numbers for Khufu, 63 years, and Khafra, 66, but to doubt the long reign of Menkaura, 68. It would be reasonable on the other evidence to make Rataf contemporary with Khufu or Khafra.

not represented in the tombs, and when he is spoken of it is in terms of the most distant respect. Similarly there is an extraordinary reserve as to worship. Religious subjects are wanting, and the religious inscriptions are usually limited to the formula of dedication. The priesthood is already numerous, but it is connected with the service of the chapels of the pyramids. In the vast court a baneful bureaucratic class is already growing, in future to destroy the welfare of the people.

The reign of Khufu is principally marked by the building of the Great Pyramid. We learn from a curious inscription of a later date that he rebuilt the temple of Isis, near the Sphinx, carved out of the rock by some earlier king, and that he made a pyramid for the Princess Hent-sen in the same neighbourhood. The charge of impiety which the local tradition reported by Herodotus brings against Khufu thus fails, and the charge of tyranny associated with it, may be equally groundless. The cost of life in building the Great Pyramid can scarcely be compared with that of a long war under conditions resembling those of modern China. It should be noted that Khufu, as well as Khafra and Rataf, were still objects of worship under Dynasty XXVI. (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed. 57, 58). The only record of foreign conquest is a tablet in the peninsula of Sinai, commemorating what was probably no more than a successful maintenance of the posts already there established to guard the mines.

The reign of Khafra is commemorated, like that of Khufu, by the royal sepulchre and the tombs of subjects. From the latter we are able to contradict the tradition of his hostility to the national religion, in which Herodotus associates him with Khufu. The most interesting remains of the time are the statues of this king found in a well near the Sphinx, into which they were probably thrown either by a foreign invader or by early Christians or by Arabs, rather than in a popular revolt after his death (*cf.*, however, Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne*, 73). A statue and a bust of Khafra from this find have been published by M. de Rougé (*Six Prem. Dyn.*, pl. iv. v.). Both are remarkable works, showing a naturalistic style that makes them far superior to later statues. The king's head is evidently a portrait, and the type is more Caucasian than the generality of later subjects.

Menkaura, or Mencheres, the Mycerinus of Herodotus, and the founder of the Third Pyramid, does not seem to have been specially revered in later times, in contradiction to the report of Herodotus. It is, however, interesting, in connection with the tradition of his support of religion, that the Egyptian *Ritual* speaks of its 64th chapter as found by Har-tot-ef, son of Mencheres, at Hermopolis Magna, when he made an inspection of the temples of Egypt, and brought as a precious document to the king (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed. p. 59, 60). It would thus appear that the *Ritual* was not then completed, and Manetho's statement that Suphis I., Khufu, wrote the sacred book may be another hint as to its date. It may also be noticed that the queen of Khafra was priestess of Thoth (*Six Prem. Dyn.*, 277 seqq.), and a noble, probably son of Khafra, was high-priest of Thoth at Hermopolis, a dignity held by another prince in the same reign (*Id.* 280, 281).

The most interesting record of Menkaura is his wooden mummy-case, found by General Howard Vyse in the Third Pyramid. In the disappointing silence of those vast monuments, without a single ancient Egyptian writing save the graffiti of workmen and the inscriptions of native visitors, this solitary record of the time is the one authoritative voice from the royal sepulchres, and it tells us in its short archaic formula that the whole myth of Osiris in its relations to human destiny was already matured. The king

as Osiris has become divine and has vanquished his enemies (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed., 58, 59).

The next family, Dynasty V., continued to rule at Memphis.¹ Of its sovereigns we know but little. The last but one, Assa, is the first Pharaoh whom we know to have had two names, the throne-name as well as the ordinary one. To his son Ptah-hotep is assigned the ancient moral treatise already noticed in speaking of Egyptian literature, which is on the whole the best fruit of Egyptian thought that time has spared. The last king, Unas, varied the form of royal tombs, by constructing the great truncated pyramid now called Mastabat-Faraon, or Pharaoh's Seat, north of the Pyramids of Dahshoor. (*Id.* 67.)

The Sixth Dynasty was probably a family of a different part of Egypt.² It has left many records which indicate less centralization at Memphis than those of the earlier sovereigns, and mark the beginning of wars for predatory purposes and extension of territory. This change is accompanied by a less careful style of sculpture, and less pains in the excavation of the tombs, as though the Egyptians were gaining a larger horizon, or, it may be, exchanging religion for ambition. The interest of the dynasty centres in the undoubtedly long reign of Pepi, second or third king of the line, and the inscription of Unas. In this inscription we first read of great wars, and foreign conquered nations are spoken of by name. A military system had already begun, for we read how the king sent with Unas an officer and soldiers to transport a sarcophagus for the royal tomb from the quarries of Turâ. A war is then undertaken against the nomads of the eastern desert—the Amu (Shemites?) and the Herusha, "those who are on the sand." An army is levied from the whole population of Upper and Lower Egypt, as though there were no military caste. Negroes are also enrolled from several countries mentioned by name, which must have been subject to Egypt, and are drilled by Egyptian officers, including priests. Unas is appointed general in chief. Five separate expeditions are conducted by him into the country of the Herusha. It seems an error to suppose that this nation were Arabs of the desert, for the Egyptian general cut down their vines and their fig-trees (?). Another expedition was conducted by water against the same nation in a country called Takheba? (De Rougé) or Terehba? (Brugsch), which M. de Rougé conjectures may be Arabia Petraea, or a part of Syria, remarking that it was near Egypt, for the expeditions seem to have been annual. The external activity of the reign of Pepi is also attested by a tablet at Wadec Maghârah, and his public works by many inscriptions, among which we must not omit the occurrence of his name at Tanis, and in the inscription relating to the building of the temple of Dendarah. He founded a city called the "City of Pepi" in Middle Egypt, which has wholly disappeared, and tombs of his time are found in various parts of the Nile valley. His pyramid, which, like Memphis, was called the "good station," Men-ofer, was probably at the ancient capital, and may be one of the two great pyramids of Dahshoor, which

¹ This Dynasty appears to have consisted of nine kings, who probably reigned nearly 200 years (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 1 ed., 288).

² Manetho assigns to Dynasty VI. a duration of 203 years. The monumental lists, themselves in discord, the Turin Papyrus, and the contemporary inscription of Unas, show that Manetho's list is here hopelessly corrupted. Unas was in office under the immediate or second predecessor as well as under the immediate successor of Pepi, usually identified with Phiops, to whom the Egyptian historian assigns a reign of 100 or possibly 94 years. M. de Rougé has seen this difficulty, and discussed without finally resolving it (*Six Prem. Dyn.*, 361 seqq.). M. Maspero has proposed a most ingenious restoration of the dynasty, on the idea that Neferkara is the long-lived Phiops, and that his family-name must therefore have been Pepi (*Hist. Anc.*, 96). This conjecture seems to us to be confirmed by the name of the later Neferkara Pepi of the Tablet of Abydos being qualified by the title "sneb," as if to distinguish him from an earlier king of otherwise identical name.

are of later date than Dynasty IV., if we may judge from their structure, and both of which from their size imply reigns of the greatest prosperity and of long duration.

Pepi was succeeded by his son Merenra. The new king made Una governor of Upper Egypt, and employed him to bring blocks of granite from Elephantine for his pyramid, and in various other works of which the inscription already referred to gives most curious details. He was charged to obtain wood, which was provided by the prince of four Ethiopian nations already mentioned among those furnishing negroes to the great army of Pepi. We thus learn that tributary Ethiopia was ruled by a native prince or princes under the governor of Upper Egypt, who also had the power of establishing posts in the dependency. Una made four docks and timber-yards in Ethiopia for building boats, and attached a chapel to each. We may thus expect to find some record of Egyptian rule at this early time, long before the complete reduction of Lower Nubia, in territories far south; for the timber-growing country does not begin for some distance within the tropics.

Merenra was followed by his younger brother Neferkara, and, according to Manetho, the dynasty ended with the beautiful Queen Nitocris, whose name appears in the Turin Papyrus, but whose exact historical place is not certain. If she was buried in the Third Pyramid, of which Manetho, according to the copyists, makes her the builder, she enlarged the original work of Mencheres, and certainly no pyramid is so evidently not merely a double structure but one of double design. Nitocris is almost the only Egyptian whose historical character has been lost in a succession of legends. One version of her story is the most ancient form of that of Cinderella; in another, she still bewitched the Arab of the Middle Ages when he approached her pyramid (*cf.* Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 94).

With the later part of Dynasty VI. the second great chasm in Egyptian history begins, and we have no monuments to guide us until the time of Dynasty XI. According to Manetho, Dynasties VII. and VIII. were of Memphites, and IX. and X. of Heracleopolites, the Diospolite or Theban line comprising Dynasties XI, XII, and XIII. Whether the dynasties which intervened between the VIth and XIIth were contemporary or successive, and how much time they occupied, cannot yet be probed. In the Tablet of Abydos, a series of kings unknown from other monuments follows Dynasty VI., and precedes two kings of Dynasty XI. In the Chamber of Kings of El-Karnak other and earlier kings of Dynasty XI. are named, with curious indications that it was first but a local line. To the period of the earlier kings of Dynasty XI. belongs Entef-aa, who reigned at least fifty years. It would appear that the Memphite kingdom waned, and that another line arose at Thebes, the house of the Entefs and Mentuhoteps. The power of these kings gradually increased, and at last one of them reunited under a single rule the whole of Egypt. (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 98, 99.) Probably the Heracleopolite line, Dynasties IX., X., was a local house contemporary with the Memphites or Thebans, or both.

With Dynasty XII. the Theban line was firmly established over all Egypt. In the circumstances referred to in the "Instructions" of Amenemhat I., its first king, to his son Usurtesen I., we have a glimpse into the unquiet condition of the country when the line arose (*Id.*, 101). Similarly the custom of associating the heir apparent as king with his father, the peculiarity of this dynasty, indicates the dangers that then surrounded the throne (*cf.* *Id.*, 105).

It is to the grottoes of Benee-Hasan that we owe most of

¹ The length of Dynasty XII. appears to have been 213 years 1 m. 24 d. (Lepsius, *Ueber die Zweite Aegyptische Königsdynastie*, Akad. Berl. 1853.)

our knowledge of the manners and arts of Egypt under Dynasty XII., and much of its history is there told in the memoirs of a family of governors under the first five kings of this house. No one can have examined these beautiful tombs without being struck by the advance in architecture which they show, and the evidence of prosperity and cultivation afforded by their paintings. The subjects resemble those of the tombs of the earlier dynasties, but there is a greater variety, partly due to a more luxurious condition of society, partly to a more flexible art. It is sufficiently evident that the preceding dynasty (XI.) cannot have been weak, and the country under its rule distracted. A time of prosperity must have preceded this bright period of Egyptian history.

Amenemhat I., probably a successful minister of an earlier king (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed., 79, 80, 84), had an active and prosperous reign, ruling like Pepi beyond Egypt to the south, and occupying himself in the construction of various monuments. As the head of a new line he paid special attention to the boundaries of territories, to the regulation of the inundation, and to the confirmation of hereditary governors (Benee-Hasan inscr.; Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed., 94, 95). A very curious view of the state of Egypt in his time is given us by the story of Saneha in a hieratic papyrus of the Berlin Museum (translated by M. Goodwin, in *Records of the Past*, vi. 131, *seqq.*). It is the history of an Egyptian who fled from the king and took refuge with a neighbouring prince, whose territory unhappily we cannot as yet determine, and after a long sojourn sought his sovereign's pardon and returned home to be taken into the favour of Amenemhat. The reception of the fugitive abroad, his home-sickness, and the kindness of the Pharaoh, who at the same time is described in terms of the most abject respect, form an interesting picture, and one remarkably illustrating several events in the history of Egypt.

Under Usurtesen I., the co-regent and successor of Amenemhat I., Egypt had reached its highest prosperity after the age of the pyramid-builders of Dynasty IV. The obelisk which still marks the site of Heliopolis, a fragment of a statue at Tanis, inscriptions on the rocks of the Sinaitic peninsula, and a stele from Wádee Halfeh, recording foreign conquests in the south, now in the Naples Museum, attest the splendour of this reign. The records of private individuals are, however, its most instructive memorials. Mentuhotep has given us a picture of the power and status of an Egyptian prime minister, holding all or nearly all the functions of the members of a modern cabinet, a position singularly parallel to that of Joseph, to the detail that even great men bowed before him. To his stele we owe the information that he gained successes against the Asiatics, the Herusha, and the negroes. (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed., 91, *seqq.*)

Of Amenemhat II. and Usurtesen II., the next kings, there is little to relate but that Egypt continued to prosper. It was under Usurtesen III. that a great step in advance was made by the fixing of the boundaries of the Egyptian dominion beyond the Second Cataract, at Semneh and Kummeh, where this king built sanctuaries and fortresses, and placed great boundary-marks in the form of tablets. These in their inscriptions define the limits of the kingdom, and regulate the passage of negroes by the river (*Id.*, 102). Here and throughout Nubia, Usurtesen was worshipped in subsequent times. He had introduced a settled government into the country, which long after was virtually a part of Egypt rather than a dependency. His successor Amenemhat III. is chiefly famous for his great engineering works. That care which the first Amenemhat bestowed on the regulation of the inundation seems to have been the great object of his reign. The rocks of Semneh and Kummeh bear registers of the height of the Nile in several

years of his reign. His great enterprise, the most successful of its kind ever carried out in Egypt, was the construction of a vast artificial reservoir, Lake Moeris, in the province now called the Feiyoom, which received the waters of the Nile by a canal, and after the inundation spread them over the country. Its fisheries were also very valuable. Through the neglect of ages the site of Lake Moeris was forgotten until, in our time, M. Linant traced it. Near the lake, Amenemhat III. built the famous Labyrinth, of which the remains were discovered by Dr. Lepsius during the Prussian Expedition to Egypt, and there raised a pyramid. The use of the Labyrinth is unknown; the pyramid was no doubt the royal tomb. Its moderate dimensions and the vast size of the lake show a remarkable contrast to the earlier great pyramids, with apparently no corresponding work of public usefulness. At the time which produced the Lake Moeris civilization had reached a point far above that of the age of Khufu, perhaps the highest Egypt has ever known. Of the short reigns of Amenemhat IV. and Queen Sebek-nefru-ra we know nothing, but that with the latter the dynasty came to a close.

With the accession of Dynasty XIII. we reach the third chasm in the Egyptian monumental records. This line, Theban like its predecessor, but with a special favour for Middle Egypt (*cf.* Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2d ed. 115), seems to have ruled all Egypt. Its power, however, was evidently weakened, either by external war or by internal dissension. Many monuments may have been lost or may yet lie hid in the mounds of towns of Middle Egypt, but the scantiness of records of public works is a proof of its weakness. Where are its tablets in the quarries? In the Turin Papyrus are preserved the lengths of several of the reigns of its kings, who generally bore the names Sebek-hotep or Nefer-hotep. The longest reign is 13 years, and but one other reaches 10, the total of 13 reigns being but 48 years 22 days, and 6 sums of months and 7 of days effaced. Putting the total at 50 years, the allowance for each reign is under 4 years. This must have been a time of disturbance, but not necessarily of disastrous wars; for if we compare the rule of the second line of Memlook sultans we obtain an average reign of 5 years each. This we know to have been the consequence of domestic disturbance, and not of great public disasters at home or abroad. Dynasty XIV., of Xoites, the next in Manetho's list, is the first which had certainly its capital in the Delta. Beyond this fact we can only conjecture its importance and chronological place.

The invasion and conquest, at least in part, of Egypt by the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, is undoubtedly the chief cause of the obscurity of this age. The event did not happen until at least some time after the beginning of Dynasty XIII., for the eighteenth king of that line in the Turin Papyrus, who bears the significant name Mer-mesha, "the general," has left a record at Tanis near the eastern frontier, which was probably the chief city of at least one dynasty of the invaders.

Manetho, as cited by Josephus, allows for the stay of the foreigners in Egypt a period of 511 years, which has been supposed to be about the interval between Dynasty XII. and Dynasty XVIII., by which they were expelled. This number, however, rests upon the single evidence of Josephus, and is moreover probably made up of sums of dynasties, which would render its evidence doubtful. A better means of measuring the period would be afforded by the monumental evidence that a Shepherd king ruled 400 years before Ramses II. could we place this foreign sovereign. All that can be said as to the chronology is that Dynasty XV. and XVI. were probably of Shepherds, and Dynasty XVII. was certainly Theban. Judging from the numbering, it is probable that there was a break in the

Theban succession, and that the two Shepherd dynasties were successive, the Xoites perhaps being but a provincial line.¹

The story of the Hyksos is thus told by Manetho. Under a king called Timaos, or Timaos (not recognized in the list or on the monuments), certain invaders from the East conquered Egypt without a battle, destroying the temples and slaying or enslaving the people. At length they made one of themselves, Salatis by name, king, who ruled at Memphis, and made all Egypt tributary. For the better protection of the eastern border he rebuilt and fortified the city Avaris, in the Sethroite nome in Lower Egypt, where he kept a great force of soldiers. He was succeeded by other kings mentioned by name, who, and their descendants, held Egypt for 511 years. After this the kings of the Thebais and of the rest of Egypt rose against the Shepherd rule, and a great and long war was waged, until Mispbragmuthosis drove the Shepherds out of all Egypt except Avaris, where his son Tuthmosis besieged them, and failing to take the place agreed to a capitulation, on the condition that they should be allowed to leave the country. Accordingly they went through the desert to Judea and founded Jerusalem. They were called Hyksos, or Shepherd kings, and, according to some, they were Arabs.

This narrative, notwithstanding a general confirmation from the monuments, is evidently not wholly correct. In particular it is inconsistent with all other evidence in attributing the foundation of Jerusalem to the Shepherds, which is evidently the result of an endeavour to connect their departure with the Exodus. Manetho seems to have preserved two Egyptian theories of the Exodus, which both explained that event as the retreat of eastern invaders. M. Mariette's researches in the ruins of Tanis have brought to light monuments of the Shepherds, and led to the discovery of others elsewhere, while M. de Rougé and other scholars have explained Egyptian documents connected with the war of independence. From these different sources we learn that the foreigners were of the Shemite or a kindred type, resembling the modern inhabitants of the north-east of Lower Egypt, who still retains the peculiarities already noticed by Greek writers. Though their conquest may have been marked by violence, we find them in their own monuments using and cultivating the manners and civilization of Egypt, and even giving a new and characteristic development to its art in their costly monoliths of granite, which show from their material that their rule extended to the southern boundary of Egypt. The war of independence arose between Apepee, one of their later kings, who is described as worshipping Seth only, and one of the three Theban kings called on the monuments Ra-skenen Taa, at this time apparently a tributary prince. The war, contrary to Manetho's statement, does not seem to have been of long continuance, having been brought to a successful end by Aahmes, first king of Dynasty XVIII., between whom and Ra-skenen Taa no great length of time can have elapsed. Manetho's text is again erroneous in making the conqueror Tuthmosis (Thothmes IV.), son (grandson) of Mispbragmuthosis (Thothmes III.), sixth

¹ The Tablet of 400 Years states that this period elapsed from some point in the reign of the Shepherd king Set-sa-pehti Nub to some point in that of Ramses II., and again Apepee, whose name corresponds to the Apophis of Manetho, almost immediately preceded Dynasty XVIII. Apophis is mentioned among the only Shepherd kings Manetho names. In the passage preserved by Josephus these are called the first Shepherd rulers, who very properly compose the first Shepherd dynasty, the XVth, in the epitome of Africanus; though Eusebius transfers them to Dynasty XVII., perhaps knowing they immediately preceded Dynasty XVIII. In Africanus, Dynasty XVI. is of Shepherds and XVII. of Shepherds and Thebans. If the identification of Apepee with the Apophis of Dynasty XV. were certain we might have a rough measure of the time of the Shepherd rule, but this is not proved.

and fifth sovereigns of Dynasty XVIII in his list; but this may be a confusion due to copyists, as there is other evidence that he placed the conquest of the Shepherds under Amosis, or Aahmes. The expulsion of the foreigners was not so complete as Manetho would have us imagine. Several names in their territory remained Shemite, or the population non-Egyptian, and under Dynasty XIX. the prejudice that appears in Dynasty XVIII seems almost removed.

It must be here noticed that Dr Brugsch has copied a remarkable inscription, from the tomb at Eilethya of Baba, whom he assigns to the latter part of Dynasty XVII, in which mention is made of a famine of successive years. "A famine having broken out during many years, I gave corn to the town during each famine." There are but two known instances in history of a famine in Egypt lasting several years, the seven years' famine of Joseph and the seven years' famine of the Fatimee caliph El-Mustansir. Dr Brugsch has, therefore, argued with high probability that Baba records the famine of Joseph, and that the old tradition that Joseph governed Egypt under the Shepherd King Apophis is a true one (*cf. supra*, p. 735, note 1). To this we shall recur in speaking of the Exodus. (See Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2 ed. 174, *seqq.*)

The beginning of Dynasty XVIII (B.C. 1600-1500?) is marked by two great events, the union of divided Egypt under one head, and the victorious end of the great war with the Shepherds.¹ Aahmes, probably a Theben prince, appears to have secured the supreme rule over the various princes of Egypt, without abolishing their rights, and to have gained Ethiopian support by his marriage with Nefru-ari, daughter of a king of Ethiopia. He then directed his whole power to the final liberation of Egypt. The tomb at Eilethya of Aahmes son of Abuna, an officer of the Egyptian flotillas, in an inscription relating his services, throws light on the events of this war. He passed his early youth in the fortress of Eilethya, one of the strong positions where the kings of Dynasty XVII rallied their subjects. In the reign of Aahmes he was made officer of the ship called the "Calf." Later he went to the flotilla of the north to fight. It was during the siege of the fortress of Avaris. He served in the vessel "Ruling in Memphis," a name no doubt given to commemorate the addition of the ancient capital to the dominions of Aahmes. An engagement took place on the water near Avaris. Subsequently Avaris was taken, and the young officer carried off three captives, whom the king granted him as slaves. This was in the fifth year of Aahmes; in the next we read of the conquest of Sharuhan, the Sharuhan of the book of Joshua, in the south-west of Palestine. The memoir then adds that, after having slain the Shepherds of Asia, the king undertook a successful expedition against an Ethiopian country. (See Brugsch, *Hist.*, 1 ed. 80, 81.)

This narrative, while generally confirming Manetho's story, corrects it in some particulars. It states that Avaris was taken, not that it capitulated, and indicates a pursuit of the enemy within the territory of Palestine, where they were again conquered in a city which they attempted to hold. The Ethiopian expedition was a reassertion of the Egyptian dominion to the south. Two tablets in the Turà quarries record how, in the twenty-second year of his reign, Aahmes restored the temples which had fallen into decay,

¹ The chronology of Dynasty XVIII is not yet fixed. Manetho's list is here in a very corrupt state. Certain numbers can be corrected or confirmed by the monuments, and if we provisionally accept the others, we obtain a sum of not greatly over two hundred years for the line, supposing it to end with the accession of Ramses I. It must, however, be remembered that those numbers which are provisionally accepted are manifestly unsafe. The sum may be more nearly determined when we know the place of the Shepherd-king Nub, whose reign was 400 years before that of Ramses II.

the blocks being removed by bulls under the charge of Phœnicians? (Fenkhu) (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 2 ed. 173, 174). It may be recollected that the Phœnicians appear as skilled smiths and masons in the time of Solomon, and that as early as the Exodus they were already great metal-workers.

From the time of Aahmes till the close of Dynasty XX. we may reckon the rise, fulness, and decay of the Egyptian Empire. It is a period of abundant monuments, sculptured and painted, and of many papyri, rich in records of the history, manners, and religion of Egypt. The state of the country may be glanced at in this place, where the Shepherd period closes, so as not to break the continuity of the subsequent history.

The sudden growth of prosperity at home and power abroad which marks the early reigns of Dynasty XVIII is truly surprising. The Egypt of Dynasty XVII is broken up and only slowly reuniting; that of Dynasty XVIII is at once solidly bound together, and soon to engage in designs of world-dominion never hinted at in earlier times. These conditions were the result of a great national war, in which the country discovered her hidden force, and was not content to use it only so far as was needful to make a strong Egypt like that of Dynasty XII. Having conquered her foreign rulers at home, she desired to add their native lands to her own dominions. The first effects of these designs were the enrichment of Egypt. In the early reigns of this house the wealth of the subjects as of the king rapidly grew. From the simple monuments of Dynasty XVII and the first kings of Dynasty XVIII there is a sudden advance to richness and splendour. Egypt was, however, becoming a military state. The king is constantly more powerful, and his public works more magnificent; the subjects, notwithstanding the luxury of individuals, have not that solid princely strength that we admire in those of the Pyramid kings and Dynasty XII. The appearance of the horse under this dynasty is most significant. The beasts of burden, the ox and ass, now yield in importance to the war-horse, and the landed proprietor journeys in his car whose ancestor went afoot staff in hand. Thus the military man succeeds the farmer. The priest is no longer a great man who has assumed sacerdotal functions, but one of a class immensely extended, reaching from the highest dignitaries, one of whom, strengthened by hereditary power, could at last seize the throne, down to the menial class who lived upon the superstitions of the people. To carry on the government there grew side by side with soldiers and priests a vast official body, clever, ambitious, and unscrupulous, which rapidly on the true bureaucratic principle involved the administration in an entanglement which must have mainly led to the decline of the Empire. Justice, which was difficult at home, must have been almost impossible abroad. We now cease to hear of hereditary nomarchs studying the welfare of provinces to which they were attached by ancestral connection. All posts went by the royal favour. The common people fared ill in this age. Their function was to supply soldiers for the army and navy, and at first to take their share in the construction of public works; their only hope was to rise in the official class. Handicrafts and all labour were beneath a gentleman; hence no one could rise to his grade but through success at the schools, which were open to every one, and where a boy of talent had his chance of a career (*cf. Brugsch., Hist.*, 1 ed. 16, 17).

Of the administration of provinces and conquered states we know little. Lower Ethiopia had always been ruled as a part of Egypt; this system was extended southward. At first the eastern states only paid tribute. Ultimately garrisons were placed in Palestine and Phœnicia (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 1 ed. 135). Compared with the Assyrians the

Egyptians were civilized conquerors, and the sculptures of their battles do not represent any scenes of extreme cruelty. They do not, however, seem to have known the art of effectually holding their acquisitions, which had to be reconquered over and over again, until the inevitable tide of conquest on the other side set in, and the Empire fell.

On examining the earliest monuments of Dynasty XVIII we are startled by their astonishing resemblance to those of Dynasty XI, a resemblance which would, had we no historical evidence on the other side, justify the leap of the Tablet of Abydos from Dynasty XII to XVIII. This may be partly explained as a renaissance of art due to a royal descent traced rather to Dynasty XI than Dynasty XII. Similarly under Dynasty XXVI there was a renaissance of the art of the age of the early Memphite Dynasties. We must also not lose sight of the local character of Egyptian art and its intense conservatism, which may have preserved an ancient type through many centuries. The early art of Dynasty XVIII has this character of a survival; that of Dynasty XXVI is clearly a modern imitation.

The art of this age is in some respects the finest Egypt produced; it is, perhaps, best about the time of Thothmes III and Amenophis II, the middle of Dynasty XVIII. It is inferior in naturalism to the art of Dynasty IV., and in delicacy to that of Dynasty XII., but it has a certain splendour before wanting. After it had attained its highest point it slowly declined, partly from a decay in the vigour of the national character, perhaps more from the vast size of the later monuments, which must have led to a neglect of finish in the details, though this neglect can only be seen by one who is thoroughly acquainted with the Egyptian styles. At all times there is an invincible patience in the mastery of material and the execution of detail. The temples, not the kings' tombs, are now the largest and most costly edifices; though a compromise with the old idea is effected by making grand temples as sepulchral chapels in religious connection with the royal tombs, commemorating in their sculptures the events of the reigns. The tombs of subjects do not maintain the proportion the earlier ones hold to the royal sepulchres. Their paintings have less of daily life, and religion takes a greater and growing place on the walls. We have, however, a multitude of interesting scenes, which show us a life more luxurious in the many than that of earlier times, but not as splendid in the few. There is more of feasting, of music, and the dance, less of country life and the welfare of the retainers. The royal tombs are now grottoes deeply cut in the rock, and the pictures of their walls are religious, the historical part being left to the funereal temples.

Amenhotep or Amenophis I., son of Aahmes and his Ethiopian queen, carried on the Ethiopian wars. It is of his son, the next king, Thothmes I., that the great eastern campaigns are first recorded. He advanced as far as the Euphrates, and must therefore have subdued, or at least marched through, the greatest part of Phœnicia and Syria. The prosperity of Egypt at this time is shown by the splendid works he executed in the great temple of Amen-ra at Thebes, the earliest of their kind that we can trace, and apparently the beginning of the series which was only to cease with the fall of the Empire. The employment of captives in public works was the main means by which they could be carried out. Probably after a time all that Egypt could do was to furnish men for the army, and in even this she failed when the dynasty came to an end. Before his death Thothmes I. had associated with him on the throne his daughter Hatshepu, or Hatasu (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 201), who succeeded him with her elder brother and husband Thothmes II. Her power is an evidence of the importance the

Egyptians attached to the female line. At the same time their dislike to be governed by a queen is evident in the attempt she subsequently made to assume the character of a king, being represented in male attire, a circumstance to which the monuments present no parallel.

After the seemingly uneventful reign of Thothmes II., Hatshepu was associated, apparently as regent, with her younger brother Thothmes III., and usurped the sole power. It is in this time that she appears as a king. She continued the works of the temple of Amen-ra, where the great obelisk and its fallen fellow bear her name. Her most interesting achievement was an expedition to Punt, either the Somálee country or Arabia Felix. She collected a fleet on the Red Sea, and herself commanded it. The people accepted her rule, and she brought back great tribute, including small spice-trees, which she planted at Thebes. The glimpse we thus gain into the state of the civilization of the spice-growing countries at this remote age is most valuable, and explains the facility with which the southern dominions of Egypt were held. The nations in this direction were not masses of barbarous tribes, but their civilization did not take the direction of the pursuits of war.

Hatshepu had reigned about twenty-one years when Thothmes III. succeeded her. He carefully effaced her name on the monuments, substituting that of his brother and his own, and reckoned his reign from her accession. Whether he thus included his brother's reign or not we do not know. With the sole reign of Thothmes III. a series of great expeditions begins, from the records of which we have great insight into the condition of Syria and Palestine about the 15th century B.C.

It will be well here to glance for a moment at the Egyptian geography of this territory. There is great difficulty in explaining it, probably due to the different names apparently given to the same countries and peoples at one and the same time or at different times. We may, however, gain somewhat in clearness by observing that more than one important geographical name can only be an Egyptian appellative. Thus the Shasu, who were wandering Arabs of the desert, who moved up as now into Palestine for pasturage or on predatory excursions, are nothing but "robbers." Most other names may be probably identified with Semitic equivalents. Syria is called Khal: this word is connected with Syria by the late equivalent Asher (*cf. Maspero, Hist. Anc.*, 181, note 1), which shows that the Egyptians then identified Syria and Assyria. The great nation of Syria in the time of Thothmes III. was the Ruten. These may be the Shemites of the stock of Lud, and may be also the Lydians in a primitive seat. Under Ramses II. the Kheta, a northern division of the Hittites, held the political position of the Ruten, as though the Ruten had migrated. As the Ruten probably represent the Arameans, so the Hittites represent the Canaanites. The Phœnicians appear to be the Kefa; in the time of Thothmes III. they held an insular position in the Mediterranean, probably Cyprus; under Ptolemy III., they give their name to Phœnicia. They are clearly the Biblical Caphtorim. The Philistines do not appear until the time of Ramses III. None of the primitive nations whom the Bible mentions as supplanted in the period before Joshua have been traced on the monuments, nor is there any clear notice before the time of Sheshonk I. (Shishak) of the Terahites. The period of Thothmes III. is one of Aramean supremacy, that of Ramses II. of Canaanite; together they well correspond to the age before the Israelite conquest, while the condition of the time of Ramses III. suits the latest age of the Judges. The names of towns present less difficulty. Many are traceable in Biblical geography, and here but one indication occurs which may point to Israelite occupation.

The Egyptian conquests on the east being tributary, there were constant revolts on the accession of new sovereigns. It was thus that Thothmes III., on becoming sole ruler, had immediately to reduce the Ruten and their neighbours. This caused the series of eastern campaigns, which began in the twenty-second year, very early in his sole reign, and certainly extended to the forty-second, during which whole time there was seldom a year of repose. The history of these wars is told in the Annals of Thothmes III., which contrast favourably with those of the Assyrian kings.