

If they were marked by barbarity, there is no boast of ought but conquest and the levying of tribute. The tribute no less than a contemporary painting shows the great material civilization of the Asiatic states. Throughout, the Ruten are the most formidable enemies; the Kheta only appear. The first great achievement was the defeat before Megiddo of a confederacy led by the prince of Ketesh, or Kadsh on the Orontes. In the battle only 83 of the enemy were killed, and 340 taken prisoners; but the magnitude of the success is proved by the capture of 2232 horses, 924 chariots, and the speedy surrender of Megiddo. This town, as in Josiah's time, was the key of the route to the Euphrates, and on its capture the king of the Ruten and the king of Assur are mentioned as becoming tributaries. In the course of the wars Kadesh was captured twice, and the king of Egypt marched as far as Nineveh, and the name of Babel is mentioned. The reign of Thothmes was also marked by expeditions in Ethiopia, and then we first meet with the supposed Egyptian name of the Danai, with whom he came in contact during some expedition in the Mediterranean. Great buildings commemorate this active reign, and we have a glimpse of the personal character of the king in the eccentric architecture of one of his additions to the temple of Amen-ra at Thebes. After a reign of 54 years 11 months, reckoning from the accession of Hatshepu, Thothmes III. was succeeded by his son Amenophis II.

The accession of the new king was marked by a war in Assyria, in which he captured Nineveh. An incident of his eastern campaigns is remarkable for its Oriental barbarism. He brought back to Egypt the bodies of seven kings whom he had slain with his own hands. The heads of six were placed on the walls of Thebes; the seventh was sent to remote Napata in Ethiopia to be hung on the walls to strike terror into the negroes. After a prosperous but probably short reign, Amenophis II. was succeeded by his son Thothmes IV., of whom we only know that he maintained his father's empire during a reign that probably did not exceed the nine years assigned to him by Manetho.

Amenophis III. succeeded his father, and, during a long and it seems mainly pacific reign, occupied himself in great architectural works. Two temples at Thebes owe their origin to him, that on the western bank, which was the funeral temple of his tomb in the western valley beyond, and of which little now remains but the two great statues in the plain, the Vocal Memnon and its fellow, and also the temple of El-Uksur on the eastern bank. In his time the dimensions of the structures of the earlier kings are surpassed, and the proportions of the greatest monuments of the Empire are almost attained. Probably he was the first of the family after Aahmes who took a foreigner to wife. On the great scarabai which commemorate his marriage with Queen Tai, we are informed that his rule extended from Mesopotamia to Southern Ethiopia.

Amenophis IV., the son of this foreign marriage, is the most perplexing character in ancient Egyptian history. Under his mother's influence he introduced a new religion, the worship of Aten, the solar disk, and after a time wholly suppressed the national religion, even changing his name to Khu-n-aten. Abandoning Thebes as the capital, he founded a new city in Middle Egypt, where he constructed a chief temple to Aten, and near which his officials excavated their tombs in the mountain. The type under which the king and his family and subjects are represented is unlike any other in Egyptian art. They are all of emaciated and distended figure, and surpassing ugliness. The king is treated with a servile respect nowhere else seen on the monuments. His troops are mixed with foreign mercenaries. But we do not hear of foreign expeditions; every one is occupied in the duties of the new religion, without polytheism or idols. Flowers are the chief offerings and adorn the

temple throughout; hymns chanted to the sound of harps are the form of worship. Was this a foreign religion, or an Egyptian restoration of primitive belief? If it were Egyptian why was the sun called Aten, not Ra? The king was the son of a foreigner, and his type and that which marks his court, probably because some were of his mother's race, and art assumed the fashionable type for the rest, is not recognizable in any of the characteristic representations of foreign races. It is neither Ethiopian nor Shemite nor Libyan. The names of his mother and of her parents, the name of the sun-god, which is Egyptian, and the character of the worship, do not as far as we know point to any of these races. Certainly they are not Semitic. For race and religion we must probably look beyond the horizon of the Egyptian conquests. The type is not without an Indian aspect, and the religion has in its simplicity and the character of its worship a striking likeness to Vedism.

Khu-n-aten had seven daughters and no son. His successor Ai was his foster-brother and the husband of his eldest daughter. Under him the national religion was tolerated. Two other sons-in-law succeeded. Their line then or soon after came to an end, on the accession of Har-em-heb, or Horus, who claimed to be the legitimate successor of Amenophis III., either by descent or on account of the innovations of Khu-n-aten, who with the kindred kings does not appear in the monumental lists, in which Har-em-heb is seen as the immediate successor of Amenophis III. The same order is followed in Manetho's list, in which the house of Khu-n-aten follows Horus. What time this line lasted we do not know. Probably it did not exceed a generation. Horus occupied himself in destroying the monuments of Khu-n-aten and his successors, and no doubt in fully restoring the national religion.

Another family gained the throne after the reign of Horus, that of the Ramessides, forming Dynasties XIX. and XX.¹ Ramses I., who seems to have been of Lower Egyptian extraction, and not impossibly connected by ancestry with the Shepherd kings, seized the royal power, maintained his authority abroad by campaigns in the south and the east, and concluded a treaty of peace with the king of the Hittites. After a very short reign he left the crown to his son Setee I., or Sethos, who strengthened his rights by marrying Tai, a granddaughter of Amenophis III. Ramses II., the son of this marriage, thus became legitimate king, and Setee made him his colleague at a very early age, no doubt to conciliate the Egyptians, a position at first ignored, evidently owing to the difficulty of defining it, but which ended in the virtual abdication of Setee (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 215-217). The troubles that preceded the reign of Ramses I. must have weakened the foreign dominion of Egypt. Wars in the east occupied the earliest years of Setee. The Kheta had now succeeded to the Ruten in the supremacy of Northern Syria. Although Setee conquered the Kheta and captured Kadesh, now their chief town, the war ended by the conclusion of a second treaty between the Egyptian and Hittite kings. It is not necessary to suppose, with M. Maspero (*Hist. Anc.*, 215), that the Egyptian Empire was already waning, because it was thus barred off from Further Asia and obliged to meet the Hittite king on

¹ The chronology of Dynasty XIX. presents one great difficulty. We cannot determine the length of the reign of Setee I. Manetho assigns him more than 50 years, which is most improbable, as Ramses reigned 67 years, and his father and mother were married before his father's accession. Ramses dates from his accession as sole king, and therefore we cannot include a period of co-regency in the Manethonian numbers for Sethos. The size and beauty of Setee's tomb would imply a reign of not under 30 years. The length of the Dynasty cannot have been less than 130 years, and was perhaps as much as 150. It comprised three generations and the rest of the probably long life of the king (Setee II.) whose birth marked the third, which would give 100 + 40 = about 140 years for the total duration.

equal terms. The conditions were no doubt changed from those of the time of Thothmes III., but the list of the confederacy which the next king of the Kheta led against Ramses II., compared with that which Thothmes defeated at Megiddo, shows that the Kheta could bring into the field much more formidable allies than did the Ruten. Moreover there was a change in the foreign policy of Egypt. Phœnicia and Palestine were ruled by means of a chain of fortresses held by Egyptian garrisons. (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 1 ed. 135; Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 215.) If the Empire was narrowed in its limits, it was more solidly ruled; and this is quite consistent with the conclusion of a treaty with the Kheta. As a builder Setee I. is only equalled by Ramses II. He constructed the great hall of columns of El-Karnak, on the outside of the north wall of which he commemorated his victories in a series of most interesting sculptures. His splendid tomb is in the Valley of the Tombs of the Kings.

Ramses II. is without doubt the greatest figure in the long line of the Pharaohs, and at the same time he is the one of whose character we have the best idea. His early training was in war and in government, for it cannot be a pure figure of speech by which the tablet found near Dakkeh in Nubia says that when he was but ten years old no monuments were executed without his orders (Brugsch, *Hist.*, 1 ed. 137). This position was due to his superior right to the throne. Before the death of Setee I. the maritime nations of the Mediterranean made a descent on Egypt. The Shardana, or Sardones, and the Tuirsha, or Tyrseni, allied with the Libyans in this enterprise. Ramses defeated them so effectually that they do not seem to have again attacked Egypt till the reign of his son Menptah, about seventy years or more later. The captives of the Shardana instead of being employed in public works were enrolled in the king's guard. After an expedition against Ethiopia, Ramses, on the death of Setee, returned to Egypt. Early in his sole reign the peace between the Egyptians and the Hittites was broken. The king of the Hittites formed a great confederacy. The nations of Asia Minor, the Mysians, the Lycians, the Dardans, the people of Ilium, are found in the list of the poem of Pentaur, the Egyptian Ramesseid, which appropriately records the oldest war in which Troy had a part. To bring together the army of the confederates time must have been needed. Probably the war was determined on by the Hittites on the accession of the new king. The great campaign was that of the fifth year of Ramses. The decisive battle was preceded by a repulse, when the Egyptian army, deceived by the Arabs (Shasu), were suddenly, while on the march, attacked and routed by the enemy, who numbered no less than 2500 war-chariots. It was only by the personal bravery of Ramses that the Egyptians escaped destruction. This incident is the main subject of the poem of Pentaur. But on the next day the great battle was fought; the confederates were beaten and retreated into Kadesh. The Hittite king now sued for peace, which was granted. It was speedily broken. In his eighth year Ramses took Shalam, probably Salem or Jerusalem, Maram (Merom), and Tapur (Dabir? near Mount Tabor), Bethanath, and Kamon. In his eleventh year he captured Ascalon. The war does not seem to have been ended until the Hittite king Khetasar proposed conditions of peace which he brought to Ramses written on a silver tablet. The treaty concluded on these bases in the twenty-first year of Ramses is sculptured at El-Karnak. It is a most interesting document, being an alliance offensive and defensive, with articles of extradition, remarkable for their humanity, and others for the protection of commerce (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 222, 223). Both kings swore to observe the compact, which was a renewal of the previous treaties. It is remarkable that in this document the Hittite

prince, instead of being called the "vile chief of the Kheta," is now the "great king," the style given to Ramses also. The eldest daughter of the Hittite king was taken in marriage as queen by Ramses, in whose twenty-third year Khetasar visited his son-in-law in Egypt. This alliance does not seem to have been broken for full a century, and then by conquerors who overcame the resistance of the Kheta and carried them with them. The remainder of the reign of Ramses appears to have been undisturbed by great wars, and given up to those vast buildings which are found throughout Egypt and Nubia, and which give him the first place among the architect Pharaohs. About the thirtieth year of his reign, his fourth son, the eldest surviving, was made regent, and on the death of this prince in the fifty-fifth year, Menptah the thirteenth son, now heir, took this post, holding it for the rest of his father's reign, which ended in the sixty-seventh year. Ramses must then have been at least near a hundred years old, perhaps more.¹ He married three queens, and apparently had by them 23 sons and at least 13 daughters. The whole number of his children was 170, of whom 111 were sons and 59 daughters. All are styled princes or princesses, but probably only the children of queens had the right of succession.

Menptah succeeded Ramses II. There are but few monuments of his reign. The principal event they relate is a great incursion into the Delta of the maritime nations of the Mediterranean allied with the Libyans. By this time the Pelagic tribes had wrested the dominion of the sea from the Phœnicians. Some causes, perhaps famines, had already disposed them to move from Asia Minor and the Greek islands, seeking new establishments in Egypt. The attempt that Ramses II. defeated in the lifetime of Setee I. was now renewed, apparently on a more formidable scale. The king of the Rebu (Libyans), with the warriors of several tribes joined the Shardana (Sardones), the Shakalasha (Sikels), the Leku (Lycians), the Tuirsha (Tyrseni), and the Akaiusha (Achæans). They had already entered Egypt and spread themselves over the west of the Delta, where they intended to settle, when the Egyptian forces attacked them and put them to rout after a battle of six hours' duration. It is remarkable that in this confederacy the Shakalasha and Akaiusha are added to the former list, and the Leku, who were in the Hittite confederacy against Ramses II., now appear on the west. Everything indicates the growing strength of the maritime nations and that power of united action which marked the period of the Trojan War. For the time the invasion was checked, but the Empire was evidently failing. The Hittites, indeed, were true to the treaty, and during famine were supplied with corn from Egypt, and the external provinces seem to have continued quiet. But side by side with the kingly power that of the high priests of Amen-ra had grown to formidable dimensions, owing probably to the interest Ramses II. and Menptah showed for Lower Egypt, which put the weight of Thebes on the side of the highest local functionary. Menptah was not immediately followed by his son Setee II. There intervened two reigns, those of Amenemes and Siptah, the first of the Ramses family by descent, the second, apparently, by marriage. They appear to have

¹ M. Maspero thinks Ramses II. was at least 50 in the 21st year of his reign (*Hist. Anc.*, 250). This would make him at least 90 at the time of his death, and 30 at his accession. The latter age is barely reconcilable with the fact of three of his sons of the restricted class, which is evidently composed of the children of successive queens, being engaged in the campaign of the 5th year. Putting his marriage at 16, we must allow at least 4 years for the birth of these three sons, and cannot suppose the youngest to have gone to war in his chariot under the age of 14. If so (16 + 4 + 14 =) 34 is the lowest age for the fifth year, and 29 for the accession, or 49 for the 21st year. But it is obvious that probability is against these extreme limits, and the fact that Ramses outlived twelve of his sons of the shorter list is in favour of a greater age.

been of a branch holding a local principality. Setee II. succeeded them and restored the legitimate line. His reign closed in anarchy. There was no longer one king: the chiefs of the nomes ruled and engaged in civil war. A worse period followed. A Syrian, Arisu by name, became chief of the nomarchs, society was dissolved, and the temple-services neglected. We are as yet unable to say how this revolution began. It seems to have had nothing to do with foreign wars, but to have been brought about by internal weakness. The time it lasted must have been long, according to the Papyrus of Ramses III., from which alone we know of it. There "many years" are assigned to the period of the nomarchs and "years" to the rule of the Syrian.

As the Exodus is now generally held to have occurred in the later years of Dynasty XIX., its place in Egyptian history may best be here noticed. The view referred to was first carefully worked out by Prof. Lepsius. It rests upon chronological and historical grounds. Manetho, apparently adopting a tradition, placed the Exodus in the reign of Menptah. The number of generations assigned in the Bible to the interval from the Exodus to Solomon would bring the former event to about the same time. This approximative date is in accordance with that of the Rabbinical chronology, B.C. 1314-13. The coincidence is, however, valueless, for the interval from the Exodus to the building of Solomon's Temple, in the Rabbinical chronology, is that of the Hebrew text, 480 years. The date of the Exodus should therefore be about B.C. 1480. The difference between 1480 and 1314-13 is caused by an error in the date of the building of the Second Temple, which is put B.C. 354, only 46 years before the date of Alexander's death, which is dated B.C. 308, or 15 years too late. There is thus a mistake of more than a century in so cardinal a date as the building of the Second Temple. If an event of this importance, occurring only 800 years before the drawing up of the chronology, is thus incorrectly dated, and a period of Jewish history obliterated, surely the date of the Exodus cannot rest upon any accurate information. The historical grounds are far stronger than the chronological. Manetho, relating, if we may trust Josephus, a current tradition (*ὑπερ ὧν δ' ὁ Μανέθων οὐκ ἐκ τῶν παρ' Ἀγυπτίους γραμμάτων, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸς ἀμολόγηκεν, ἐκ τῶν ἀδεσπότης μυθολογουμένων προσέθεκεν, ὅστερον ἐξελέγξω κατὰ μέρος, κ. τ. λ., Contr. Ar., 16*), and Josephus is here confirmed by the evidence which the narrative shows of historical inaccuracy, has given an account of the Exodus from an Egyptian point of view. This story is the fullest version of one current in various forms in antiquity. As Manetho tells it, the chief points are these. King Amenophis, identified by him with Menptah, who occurs in his lists as Amenophis and Ammenephtis, determined, under the advice of a priest of the same name as himself, Amenophis the son of Papis, to cleanse Egypt of all lepers and other unclean persons, whom, accordingly, he set to work in the quarries. On their petition he gave them the city Avaris, left in ruins by the Shepherds. Having occupied the city, they chose one of themselves, a priest of Heliopolis, by name Osarsiph, as their ruler, who changed his name to Moyses. He made laws particularly directed against the Egyptian religion, and sent messengers to Jerusalem to the Shepherds, who had been expelled by the Egyptians, asking their aid and promising to give them their old territory Avaris, and to assist them to subdue Egypt. Accordingly the Shepherds invaded Egypt, when Amenophis came against them, but for superstitious reasons did not fight them, and withdrew to the friendly king of Ethiopia, in whose country he remained thirteen years, his ally protecting the southern Egyptian border. Meanwhile the people of Jerusalem and the unclean Egyptians ravaged Egypt, and destroyed everything connected with the national religion. Afterwards Amenophis

and his son Sethos, also called Ramesses, returned and expelled the Shepherds and the unclean people. Chærenon gives a similar account with the same name for the king. Lysimachus and Tacitus vary in calling the king Bocchoris.

The Egyptian evidence for the date of the Exodus would place it about this time. The geographical inquiries of Lepsius have been carried on by Brugsch, who, in a paper read before the Oriental Congress, has identified the principal geographical names of the narrative of the oppression and of the Exodus (Brugsch, *L'Exode*). In particular, Ramesses is shown to have been another name of Tanis. The occurrence of this name in Genesis and Exodus is most important as bearing on the date of the Exodus, for it is almost certain that it was given by Ramesses II., who rebuilt the great temple of the town. Another cardinal piece of evidence is the mention of the 'Aperiu, or 'Apariu, as engaged in public works under Ramesses II. and later kings, but not after Dynasty XX. In this name that of the Hebrews has been recognized. If the identification were certain we should have much reason for dating the oppression under Ramesses II., which would accord with the Exodus under Menptah.

The difficulties of this theory are not slight. On the chronological side Manetho's date is only dependent on a tradition, and we cannot fix the chronology of the dynasty, B.C. 1300 for Menptah being about the middle point in a doubtful two centuries. The evidence of the Hebrew genealogies therefore is not conclusive for a date identical with that of Menptah, which we cannot yet say is irreconcilable with the chronology founded on the interval of 480 years from the Exodus to the building of Solomon's Temple. If, however, the genealogies are to be taken as a guide for the chronology up to the Exodus, Egyptologists prefer for the period of the sojourn the longer intervals stated in the Hebrew text to the very short ones that would result from the genealogical method. Still greater difficulties arise when we give a critical examination to Manetho's story. It reads like a perverted narrative of the calamities which closed Dynasty XIX., for we cannot suppose two conquests by Asiatics and two expulsions, one by Menptah and Setee II., the other by Set-nekht, who subdued the Syrian, nor resort to the violent hypothesis that the Papyrus of Ramesses III. attributes to Set-nekht that which Setee II. achieved. The name of Amenophis is suspicious, the two names of his son Sethos, "who is Ramesses," still more so; the recall of the Shepherds from Jerusalem, and the easy conquest of Egypt without a battle, all read like a legend founded on a fusion of the two periods of Eastern occupation. There is, moreover, another suspicious circumstance in the occurrence of the name of Bocchoris in two versions of the story. This would either point to Bocchoris of Dynasty XXIV., in whose time it is quite possible that there was a large number of Israelite fugitives in Egypt, or to some other king of the same or a similar name; we do not, however, know of any earlier Bocchoris. It may be reasonably asked whether this story has anything to do with the Exodus. Those who hold that it has yet, in common with all Egyptologists, argue, when they examine the Biblical data, on the ground of the minute accuracy of many of these data. If, then, the two narratives, that of Manetho and that of the Papyrus of Ramesses III., relate to the Exodus, it may reasonably be inferred that the Manethonian is a faulty and distorted one. It is, however, quite possible that Manetho may have known when the Exodus happened, and yet may have confused it with an event of the same period. The argument from the Biblical data that Ramesses II. ruled during the oppression of the Israelites is very strong, though it may be conjectured that a redactor has substituted the later name Ramesses for the earlier Zoan.

The name of the 'Aperiu, if certainly that of the Hebrews, would be decisive, but it is not a proper Egyptian equivalent, and so exact are the transcriptions of Semitic geographical names into Egyptian, that upon them mainly depends the theory of the sounds of the Egyptian alphabet developed by M. de Rougé and adopted by Dr Brugsch. Here, again, the evidence is inconclusive.

The arguments which would place the Exodus in any other period of Egyptian history are but slight. There is indeed the remarkable occurrence of a name similar to that of Jacob, or identical with it, in a record of the conquests of Thothmes III.¹ This may only be a reminiscence of Jacob, as M. de Rougé suggests, but it would be more natural to take it to indicate that the Exodus was anterior to the time of Thothmes, and there are other names in the list which may possibly point to the same conclusion.² Yet the preponderance of evidence is at present greatly in favour of the occurrence of the Exodus towards the close of Dynasty XIX. It is not, however, necessary to accept the date of Prof. Lepsius, in our present state of uncertainty as to the chronology of Dynasty XIX. It is also not a necessary consequence of accepting this historical synchronism, that we should take Manetho's narrative of the Exodus as more than his identification with it of an event of the same period. These may seem but unsatisfactory results of the great erudition which has been bestowed on this question. We refrain from speaking more positively when a discovery may at any moment render speculation needless.

If the Exodus took place towards the close of Dynasty XIX., when did the period of oppression and the government of Joseph fall? The reckoning by generations would place Joseph in the later part of Dynasty XVIII., and the oppression under Ramesses II. downwards. It is, however, very generally acknowledged that this method of computation is not consistent with the growth of the Israelites from a family to a nation during the sojourn in Egypt. Scholars are therefore disposed to choose a reckoning by years. Here the Biblical data give either 430 years exactly for the sojourn and 400 for the oppression, or else 215 years for the sojourn. The longer periods are those generally preferred. If we reckon by them, the government of Joseph would have fallen under the last Shepherd king, and the oppression would have probably begun under Aahmes, to be greatly increased in intensity under Ramesses II.

Set-nekht, a chief probably of the line of Ramesses II., overthrew the Syrian intruder and again restored the Egyptian monarchy. His short reign, which begins Dynasty XX.,² was probably entirely occupied in reorganizing the administration of Egypt. Ramesses III., whom his father had already made his colleague (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 262), succeeded to a united Egypt but a distracted Empire. Evidently in the time of anarchy every province and tributary state had fallen away. The new king was equal to the effort of repelling invasion at home and reconquering lost territory abroad. In his fifth year he defeated the Libyan tribes who had invaded the west of Lower Egypt.

¹ In this list Ikkab-aa is read by M. de Rougé as representing Jacob, a form like Nathaniel for Nathan (*Rev. Arch.*, n. s. iv., 370).

² The chronology of Dynasties XX. and XXI. is extremely obscure. We know that Ramesses III. reigned 32 years, and Ramesses XI. or XII. upwards of 32 years. The six successors of Ramesses III. probably had very short reigns, as all but the second and sixth were certainly sons of that king, and the sixth probably. The other kings are represented by few monuments. Her-har, however, may have had a longer reign, the sculptures of the temple of Khons at Thebes giving this impression. There does not seem, however, to be any ground for a duration of more than a century until the Tanites of Dynasty XXI. rose into power. The latest Theban kings probably held a local and constantly diminishing authority for part of the time of the Tanites, of whom the records are extremely scanty and the chronology consequently obscure. Two centuries is a probable measure of the whole interval.

In his eighth, he met another attack from the opposite quarter. The Taanau (Danai) and the Takkaru (Teucrians), who now first appear, forming with the Tuirsha (Tyrseni), Washasha (Oscans), Shakalasha (Sikels), Leka (Lycians), and Pelesta (Philistines), a great confederation, which attacked the east of Egypt by sea and land. Their army conquered and carried with it the Kheta and neighbouring tribes. Their fleet, manned by the Takkaru and Shardana, reached Egypt at the same time. The Egyptian army and fleet encountered and defeated them. This campaign, and particularly the sea-fight, form the subjects of interesting reliefs in the great sepulchral temple built by Ramesses III. in western Thebes. In his eleventh year a second invasion of the west of Egypt, by the Libyans, aided by the Tuirsha and the Leka, was equally unsuccessful. The eastern provinces and tributary states were recovered, and an expedition was sent to the Somálee country on the eastern coast of Africa or Arabia Felix. This last great conqueror finally preserved Egypt from the maritime nations. The course of their migrations seems to have been changed. All that remained of their invasions were the Philistine settlement in Palestine and one of the Mashusha, a Libyan tribe, in the Delta, from whose race the Egyptians drew mercenaries (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 266). The importance of these forces is evident in the Biblical notices of Egypt of the time of the Hebrew kings.

The historical value of the Egyptian notices of the primitive populations of the Mediterranean is being more and more perceived. It is at first perplexing that we find the nations afterwards settled in well-known seats either far to the east or in constant movement. Yet the key thus afforded to the earliest Greek colonization is most valuable, and it is significant of the historical character of the documents that new names appear, as we should expect, in such a manner as to explain the confusion of the Greek terms, which speak of Achæans and Danai, Dardans and Teucri, at the same time indifferently, whereas the Egyptian documents show that they are not interchangeable. Ramesses III., besides constructing the magnificent temple at Médeenet Haboo, enriched the temples of Egypt with splendid gifts, during a prosperous reign of thirty-two years. The later kings of the dynasty do not appear to have achieved anything remarkable. They maintained the Empire, but their authority at home waned, while that of the high-priests of Amen grew until, towards the close of the dynasty, Her-har, one of these high-priests, gained the royal power. Probably the close of the dynasty was occupied by a struggle between the last Ramesside kings and the high-priests, as well as by the additional distraction caused by the rise of another line, Dynasty XXI., of Tanite kings. Probably the Tanites ultimately gained the sole authority. The high-priests of Amen-ra, about this time, certainly not later than the rise of Dynasty XXII., retreated to Ethiopia, where they founded a kingdom, of which the capital was Napata. The Pharaoh whose daughter Solomon married was, if Manetho's numbers are correct, Psusennes II., Har-Psiunkha, last king of Dynasty XXI. He seems to have endeavoured to restore the military power of Egypt, for he made an expedition into Canaan and captured the town of Gezer, which he gave to his daughter, Solomon's queen.

During the later period of the Empire, partly through marriages of the Pharaohs, partly in consequence of the large employment of mercenaries, chiefly Libyans, great settlements of foreigners, Asiatic as well as African, were established in Egypt. So far from the Semites being then disliked, a multitude of Semitic words were introduced into Egyptian, and it even became the fashion to give a Semitic form to native words (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 337, 338). A Semite family, settled at Bubastis, or in the Bubastis

nome, succeeded by the command of mercenaries and by alliances with the Tanite family in establishing a new royal line, Dynasty XXII, which is remarkable for its foreign names. The royal names Sheshonk, Osorkon, Takelot are all either Assyrian or Babylonian. Still more striking is the name Nemrut, or Nimrod, borne by non-kingly members of the family. Probably it came from the further East.

Sheshonk I., the Shishak of the Bible, may have gained the royal power peaceably. His son Osorkon married the daughter of the last king of the Tanite Dynasty, to whom Sheshonk succeeded. He seems early to have entertained the design of restoring the Egyptian rule in the East, for he received Jeroboam when he fled from Solomon. The revolt of the Ten Tribes enabled him to carry out this project, and late in his reign he marched against Rehoboam, and returned with the treasures of the Temple and the palace. A remarkable sculpture at the temple of El-Karnak gives a list of 130 names of towns and peoples conquered by Shishak in this expedition. Long as is the list, it is not like the rolls of the conquerors of the Empire. The items are far less important, and the Hagarenes recur several times, as if to record the subjugation of a series of small Bedawee tribes. Cities of Judah and Israel appear in the list, but the towns in the kingdom of Jeroboam seem to be Levite and Canaanite, and it is probable that the Israelite king was not averse to their overthrow. With this occurrence we gain the first good chronological footing in Egyptian history. The Hebrew chronology is indeed not as yet fixed. The Assyrian monuments seem to indicate a reduction of at least twenty-three years in the ordinary dates. The invasion of Shishak is ordinarily dated B.C. 971, but may thus have to be lowered to about B.C. 948; and as it probably took place in about the twentieth year of the Egyptian king's reign, his accession may be dated approximately B.C. 967.

The government of Egypt under the kings of Dynasty XXII underwent an important change. They made the high-priesthood of Amen-ra an office of a prince of the family, usually the eldest son, and gave high governments to other princes. Thus the power of the Pharaoh ultimately became merely nominal, and Egypt resolved itself into an aggregate of principalities. A further cause of decay was the importance of the Libyan mercenaries which each of the princes commanded. Under a new dynasty, XXIII, said to be of Tanites, but probably kindred to the Bubastites, Egypt was, for a time at least, reunited under a single rule, but towards its close the process of disintegration had already again set in, and the country was divided among nearly twenty princes, at least four of whom took the royal insignia (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 378 seq.).

Among these small princes but one was capable of attempting to reunite Egypt under his rule. This was Tafnekht, Tnephachthos, prince of Sais, who reduced great part of the country, and would probably have achieved complete success, had not the yet unconquered princes called in the priest-king of Napata, Piankhi Meriamen. While Egypt had declined, Ethiopia had constantly risen, and at this time part of the Thebais owed it allegiance. Piankhi, the descendant of the priest-kings of Thebes, was not unwilling to recover his ancient dominions. In one brilliant campaign he defeated Tafnekht and his allies, captured their strongholds, and obtained the sovereignty of Egypt, leaving the small princes to rule as his vassals. The ancient Empire was thus in part restored, but as it was ruled from Ethiopia, and the little princes constantly strove for independence, it had no real durability. Piankhi was succeeded by Kashta, who was probably an Ethiopian, owing his throne to his intermarriage with a princess of the Theban line.

Bokenranf, or Bocchoris, son and successor of Tafnekht, no doubt seizing this occasion, was able to carry out the pro-

ject of his father and make himself king of Egypt. After a short reign marked by energy and prudence he perished in a fresh Ethiopian invasion. Shabak, or Sabakon, conquered Egypt, and having taken Bokenranf in his capital, Sais, put him to a cruel death. It was no longer an Egyptian prince who ruled at Napata; all the circumstances we know of Shabak and his dynasty indicate an Ethiopian line, governing Egypt as a conquered country, not as their ancient territory. Still Shabak's connection with the priestly line was not forgotten. His sister, Queen Ameniritis, governed Thebes, and the power of the local rulers was limited, not destroyed. Hoshea, king of Israel, sent presents to Shabak,¹ who was subsequently drawn into a confederacy of Syrian and other princes against Sargon king of Assyria, but, as in all these wars, the Ethiopian king was a tardy ally. His capital lay too far south, and in crossing the eastern border of Egypt he left the ill-affected princes of the Delta in the line of his communications. He therefore came into the field too late, and it was but little east of Egypt that he met the Assyrians and experienced a disastrous defeat at Raphia. He lost great part of Egypt, in which the small princes again established themselves, now as vassals of Assyria, Shabak only retaining Ethiopia and part of Upper Egypt.

Shabatok, or Sebichus, was the son and successor of Shabak. He made himself supreme king in Egypt, but appears to have lost Ethiopia to Tahraka. Towards the close of his reign the Egyptian dynasts joined in an alliance against Sennacherib, who had recently succeeded Sargon. The confederates were defeated, or made their submission one by one. The Egyptian princes lost a battle in southern Palestine, in the territory of their ally Hezekiah, who was the last in the East to submit. But the Egyptians again advanced, encouraged by Tahraka, king of Ethiopia, who marched to their support. No battle was fought. The Assyrians moved against the Egyptians, but in one night the invading army perished, and Sennacherib fled to Nineveh. The tradition of the Egyptians agrees with Biblical history in relating the destruction of the Assyrians as miraculous; and it should be noted that for the rest of his reign Sennacherib never ventured again to invade Palestine. During this interval of respite Tahraka entered Egypt, slew Shabatok, and made himself master of the whole country (B.C. 692).

After twenty years of what seems to have been a peaceful reign, the Assyrian war began afresh, Esarhaddon, son and successor of Sennacherib, resolving on the subjugation of Egypt. Tahraka was vanquished and fled to Napata, and Memphis and Thebes were taken. The country was divided between twenty princes, with Neku I. of Sais as their chief. The fortresses were garrisoned with Assyrian troops (B.C. 672). In a few years, however, Tahraka returned, defeated the Assyrians, and captured Memphis. In commemoration of the earlier subjugation or of this one, the Ethiopian king puts the name of Egypt among those of conquered nations not only at Napata but also at Thebes (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 427; Brugsch, *Hist.*, 1 ed., 244, 245). Soon after Esarhaddon abdicated in favour of his son Asshur-bani-pal, who speedily invaded and reconquered Egypt, driving out Tahraka and restoring the tributary princes. As soon, however, as he had left, a conspiracy broke out, and these chiefs sent emissaries to Tahraka. They were overcome by the Assyrians, and Neku and two others sent in chains to Nineveh, before Tahraka could come to their aid. But he again reconquered Thebes and Memphis. Asshur-bani-pal now made a politic use of the Egyptian party, treated Neku with honour, and sent him back to Egypt as ruler of Sais, giving a second principality to his son Psametik. Neku returned to find that Tahraka

¹ With this transaction Shabak's record at El-Karnak of the tribute of Syria has been connected (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 390).

had left Egypt (B.C. 666). Urdamen, Tahraka's son-in-law and successor, held Upper Egypt, and at once attacked the Assyrians, captured Memphis from them, and took Neku, whom he put to death, while Psametik fled into Syria. Asshur-bani-pal now invaded Egypt, defeated Urdamen, and sacked Thebes, carrying the whole population captive. The twenty principalities were again set up, but Psametik was not the chief.

After a time the Egyptian princes became independent of Assyria, but they had once more to submit to an Ethiopian invader, Nouat-Meiamen, who reconquered the country without much difficulty, but does not seem to have long held it. The Saite prince Psametik, whose ambition excited the jealousy of the other dynasts, at last achieved the object for which his predecessors had pertinaciously fought. By the aid of Carian and Ionian mercenaries he put down his rivals, and by a marriage with the niece of Shabak rendered his line legitimate. This alliance with a princess only a generation younger than the first Ethiopian king brings into striking relief the vicissitudes which Egypt underwent during the Assyrian wars. Calamities were crowded into those years which usually occupy centuries. Yet under the new king, who was the real founder of Dynasty XXVI, Egypt rapidly recovered, and during the rule of his successors it was for the first time since the Empire strong and united, enjoying a true national existence. Public works of all kinds were carried on with energy. Art, which had fallen under the Bubastites and their followers, now suddenly revived, and with its recovery the ideas of the primitive dynasties came into fashion. The style of the age may be best compared with that of Dynasties IV. and V. It is, however, wanting in vigour, using elongated forms and abundant details. Still it has an elegance and a mastery of material which show that Egypt had not lost the true feeling of its art, in spite of the disastrous wars which had threatened the overthrow of all the institutions of the country.

Psametik I., or Psammetichus, employed his long reign in strengthening Egypt and in restoring the temples and making additional monuments. He recovered from Ethiopia a part of Lower Nubia, and made a successful expedition into Philistia. His designs of conquest were, however, frustrated by a wholesale desertion of Egyptian troops, caused by jealousy of the Ionian and Carian mercenaries to whom Psametik owed his throne. The mutineers, whose number Herodotus puts at 240,000 men, were too strong to be resisted, and deaf to the king's intreaties marched to Ethiopia and received lands from the king of that country. All that the Egyptian sovereign could do was to form a new army and build a fleet. He thus missed the opportunity afforded by the decline of Nineveh of winning back the influence Egypt had long lost in the East. An interesting memorial of his reign is the Greek inscription on one of the colossi of Aboosimbel, in Nubia, recording the visit of mercenary and Egyptian troops.

Neku II., B.C. 611, son and successor of Psametik, inherited his father's energy but not his prudence. He attempted to complete an enterprise of the Empire and connect the Red Sea with the Nile, and so with the Mediterranean, by a canal. Under his orders Phoenician seamen circumnavigated Africa. Less fortunate was his attempt to recover the eastern rule of Egypt. He marched against Megiddo, still the key to the route to the Euphrates. Here he was met by the forces of Josiah, king of Judah, with whom he unwillingly fought. Josiah was slain, and the king of Egypt advanced to Carchemish on the Euphrates. Thus the Egyptian Empire was for a moment restored. There was no great eastern rival to contest its supremacy. Assyria had fallen, Babylon was not yet firmly established. After about three years Nabopolassar, the king of Babylon,

sent his son Nebuchadnezzar against the Egyptians. At Carchemish the armies met. Neku was defeated, and the Egyptian rule in the East finally destroyed. Soon after the king of Egypt died, leaving his throne to his son Psametik II., B.C. 595, whose short reign was only marked by an expedition against the king of Ethiopia. The next king, Psametik's son, Uahabra, or Apries, the Pharaoh Hophra of Scripture, B.C. 590, inherited the energy and ambition of the Saite house. His accession was the signal for a general confederation of Palestine and Phoenicia against the king of Babylon. The war was speedily ended by the capture of Jerusalem, which Uahabra in vain endeavoured to prevent. He was, however, successful at sea. His Greek ships beat the Phoenician fleet of Nebuchadnezzar, and for a time he held the Phoenician coast, and aided Tyre in a resistance of thirteen years against the Babylonian besiegers. A great disaster lost Uahabra his throne. He engaged in a war with the Greeks of Cyrene. His Egyptian troops were defeated. The native soldiers believed that he had planned their destruction that he might put mercenaries in their place. They revolted and chose Aahmes, or Amasis, king. Amasis defeated the mercenary troops of Uahabra and dethroned him, B.C. 571. It is to this time that the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar is assigned by Josephus. The silence of Herodotus and the other Greek historians, and the prosperity of Egypt under Amasis, have induced modern scholars to suppose that Josephus based his statement on the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. If, however, we read between the lines of the story of Herodotus, we need some other cause than the disaffection of the Egyptian troops to account for the sudden success of Amasis, and especially for his easy defeat of the mercenaries with a discouraged native force. Again, the conquests of Egypt by the Assyrians, though predicted by Isaiah and noticed as past by Nahum, are unrecorded by Herodotus and the Greeks. The prosperity of the country in the reign of Amasis might as easily follow a Babylonian conquest as that under Psametik I. followed the terrible Assyrian wars. The scantiness of the native records of Nebuchadnezzar's reign leaves us without Babylonian evidence.

Amasis took to wife a grand-daughter of Psametik I. and his heiress-queen Shapentap, thus legitimatizing his pretensions. He greatly embellished the temples of Egypt. It may be that, as in the time of Psametik I., they needed restoration. His foreign policy was marked by energy and caution. He transferred the Ionian and Carian mercenaries to Memphis itself as a force of guards. He granted the Greeks the free use of Naukratis as a Hellenic settlement and trading port. He conquered Cyprus, and kept up the influence of Egypt in Phoenicia. He had friendly relations with the Greek states, and instead of conducting an expedition against the Babylonians during their Empire or against the rapidly rising power of the Persians, he joined in an alliance of which Croesus, king of Lydia, was the head, and agreed to furnish him with an Egyptian contingent in his war with Cyrus. After the fall of Croesus other wars kept Cyrus from any designs on Egypt, and it was not until the accession of his son Cambyses that the Persians could attempt its reduction. Meanwhile Amasis died, leaving the crown to his son Psametik III., the Psammenitus of Herodotus, who, after a single well-fought battle near Pelusium, and the capture of Pelusium and Memphis, lost his kingdom, B.C. 525.

Cambyses, as we learn from the narrative of the Egyptian priest Uta-har-sun of Sais, at first adopted the style of a Pharaoh, and was initiated into the mysteries of Neith at Sais. It was not until the failure of an expedition against the Oasis of Ammon, and of another directed by himself against the Ethiopian kingdom of Napata, that Cambyses, probably aware of the satisfaction the Egyptians must have

felt at these reverses, changed his policy, and vented his rage upon the monuments and objects of worship in Egypt. The Saites priest, in general terms, describes this as a time of calamity such as had never before befallen his country. Cambyses left Egypt, which was so completely crushed that the subsequent usurpation of the Magian was marked by no revolt. One of the first cares of Darius I. was to charge Utahar-sun with the restoration of the disordered country. In a visit to Egypt at the moment when a revolt had broken out, he pacified the people by supporting their religion, in the most marked contrast to Cambyses. For the rest of his reign he endeavoured to promote the commercial welfare of Egypt, in particular opening the canal from the Nile to the Red Sea. In the Great Oasis he built a temple to Ammon. It was not until the very close of his reign that the Egyptians rose against his rule, and expelled the Persians, choosing as king Khabbash, whose name has been discovered in the Sarapeum. The revolt lasted but three years, and Xerxes I. suppressed it with severity. Achæmenes, the brother of Xerxes, was made satrap. Egypt did not again rise until the troubles which marked the accession of Artaxerxes I. The insurrection was led by Inaros, prince of Marea, who immediately concluded an alliance with the Athenians. Supported by 200 Athenian triremes, he defeated and slew the satrap Achæmenes, and besieged in the citadel of Memphis the remnant of the Persian army, which, though it included Egyptian soldiers, held out until the attacking force was drawn off by a fresh Persian army. The Egyptians and their allies were now driven to the island of Prosopitis, and there besieged for eighteen months. At last Inaros was taken and put to death; Amyrteus, an Egyptian who reigned with him, fled to the marshes, where he long maintained himself. Artaxerxes, after this serious revolt of six years, modified the administration of Egypt, recognizing Thannyras, son of Inaros, and Pausiris, of Amyrteus, as vassal kings. The government was, however, held by a Persian satrap; these were merely local princes.

An Amyrteus, probably son of Pausiris (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, 562), revolted, and on the death of Darius II., B.C. 404, made Egypt virtually independent. He is the one king of Dynasty XXVIII., Saites. His successor, Naifaaurut I., founded Dynasty XXIX. of Mendesiens, B.C. 399. With him the monuments, silent since the rising of Khabbash, again give us information, and under the next dynasty show that the Saites art still lived in spite of the misfortunes the country had undergone. The Mendesiens Naifaaurut and Hakor are chiefly known for the part they took in aiding the enemies of Persia. Hakor was followed by Naifaaurut II., and then the sovereignty passed to Dynasty XXX. of Mendesiens, the last native Egyptian line. The first of these kings, Nekht-har-heb, or Nectanebes I., came to the throne when a Persian invasion was imminent, B.C. 378. Hakor had already formed a powerful army, largely composed of Greek mercenaries. This army Nekht-har-heb intrusted to the Athenian Chabrias. The Persians, however, succeeded in causing his recall and in gaining the services of his fellow-countryman Iphicrates. The invading army consisted of 200,000 barbarians under Pharnabazus and 20,000 Greeks under Iphicrates. After the Egyptians had experienced a reverse, Iphicrates counselled an immediate advance on Memphis. His advice was not followed by Pharnabazus; the Egyptian king collected his forces and won a pitched battle near Mendes. Pharnabazus retreated, and Egypt was free.

Nekht-har-heb was succeeded by Tachos or Teos, whose short reign was occupied by a war with Persia, in which the king of Egypt secured the services of a body of Greek mercenaries under the Spartan king Agesilaus and a fleet under the Athenian general Chabrias. He entered

Phœnicia with every prospect of success but having offended Agesilaus, he was dethroned in a military revolt which gave the crown to Nekht-nebf, or Nectanebes II., the last native king of Egypt. At this moment a revolt broke out. The prince of Mendes almost succeeded in overthrowing the new king. Agesilaus defeated the rival pretender, and left Nekht-nebf established on the throne. But the opportunity of a decisive blow against Persia was lost. The new king, Artaxerxes III. Ochus, determined to reduce Egypt. A first expedition was defeated by the Greek mercenaries of Nekht-nebf, but a second, commanded by Ochus himself, subdued Egypt with no further resistance than that of the Greek garrison of Pelusium. Nekht-nebf, instead of endeavouring to relieve them, retreated to Memphis and fled thence to Ethiopia, B.C. 340? Thus miserably fell the monarchy of the Pharaohs after an unexampled duration of nearly 3000 years, or as some think far longer. More than 2000 years have since passed, and though Egypt has from time to time been independent, not one native prince has sat on the throne of the Pharaohs. "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt" (Ezek. xxx. 13) was prophesied in the days of Apries as the final state of the land.

The causes of the downfall of Egypt are sufficiently evident in the previous history. The weakness of the later Thebans fostered divisions. The Bubastites aided the natural tendency of the country to break up into small principalities. The Ethiopians, while they brought a new force to resist the Assyrians, increased the divisions of Egypt, which had to choose to which of two foreign empires it would submit. The Saites restored nationality, but they maintained it at the cost of alienating the native troops, and thus could not effectually resist Persia. Although their gallant struggles brought out the fighting qualities of the Egyptians, these Pharaohs could never venture on a great war without Greek mercenaries. Hence constant discontent and an inharmonious military system. At length the native energy was worn out.

The barbarian Ochus used his success mercilessly, rivalling the worst acts of Cambyses. Under him and his successors Egypt made no movement, and when Alexander entered the country as the conqueror of Persia he was welcomed as a deliverer. The Persian governor had not forces enough to oppose him, and he experienced nowhere even the show of resistance. He visited Memphis, founded Alexandria, and went on pilgrimage to the oracle of Jupiter Ammon. He then organized the government under two officers, who from their names appear to have been a Greek and an Egyptian. He left the Egyptians satisfied with his reverence for their religion, and for the rest of his reign the country remained a peaceful province of his great empire. With Alexander, the Macedonian dominion began. It lasted for 302 years, after the Empire the brightest period of Egyptian history, during the whole of which no general native revolt broke out. From this time the Egyptian local princes, who for five centuries, except only during the rule of Psametik and his house, had caused all the divisions of Egypt, disappear from the scene. This final settlement was probably due to the policy of Alexander, under whose successors we see the real government of the country, with its centre in the Greek city he had founded, and the control of the army and navy, intrusted to Greeks; whereas the native religion was protected, but wholly left to the Egyptian priests, except so far as the king himself acted as one of the priesthood. Thus the foreigners had all the true power, while the natives were satisfied with a semblance of it, and the local importance this semblance gave to their functionaries. Routes of trade were actively pushed, and works of public benefit carried out, and the Egyptians grew more and more

wealthy in Egyptian towns, where a Greek was rarely seen, and the king only appeared in the character of a Pharaoh to show respect to the religion of the country. The learned men of both races drew nearer together, and Greek speculation had its effect on Egyptian thought. The less cultivated settlers were attracted by the native superstitions, and at last the Alexandrian was far more an Egyptian, than even a Macedonian.

On the division of Alexander's dominions, Egypt fell to the share of Ptolemy, son of Lagus and Arsinoë, a concubine of Philip's, whose son he was supposed to have been. Of all Alexander's generals he was the most far-sighted. Instead of aiming at the rule of the empire, he secured the least exposed province and employed its resources rather for defence than offence. One of his first acts was to divert the burial of Alexander from Macedon to Egypt. The body was taken to Memphis, but under Ptolemy's successor it was removed to Alexandria, so that the conqueror rested in the city he had founded. His first conquest was the Cyrenaica (B.C. 322), a valuable province outside the field of the contests of his rivals, yet greatly useful for naval enterprises against them. Yet he did not declare himself independent; as a subject of the phantom kings Philip Aridæus and Alexander Ægus, he inscribed their names in his restorations of Egyptian temples, and alone of all the generals struck money in the name of Ægus so long as that last heir of Alexander lived. He was not long left in undisturbed occupation of his government. The regent Perdicas, finding that Ptolemy was engaged in a league against his authority, marched into Egypt, B.C. 321; but the resistance of Ptolemy and a mutiny in the invader's army, which resulted in his death, delivered Egypt from this danger. The succeeding years were occupied in attempts to add Coele-Syria and Phœnicia to the Egyptian dominions, which can scarcely be considered rash when we remember the importance of these provinces to the security of Egypt against invasion, and for winning of the maritime supremacy of the eastern Mediterranean. During this time Cyprus was made a dependency, and the Cyrenaica, which had revolted, was finally reduced by Ptolemy's step-son Magas. A great calamity now arrested the growing power of Egypt, when Demetrius, son of Antigonus, defeated Ptolemy in a sea-fight off Salamis of Cyprus (B.C. 306). Antigonus then assumed the royal diadem, and Ptolemy followed his example. Antigonus and Demetrius immediately attacked Egypt, but without success; and Ptolemy, rapidly recovering his strength, aided the Rhodians when besieged by Demetrius (B.C. 305-4). It is related that when the siege was raised the Rhodians gave Ptolemy, as their "preserver," the title of Σωτήρ. This appears in his hieroglyphic inscriptions as his distinctive title, and upon the coins of his successors struck in his name in Phœnicia. After this Ptolemy again attempted without success the conquest of Coele-Syria and Phœnicia, but ultimately seized and held Cyprus, B.C. 295, which thus became a part of the Egyptian monarchy for nearly its whole duration. His later years were passed in consolidating his power. Seleucus was master of a Syrian empire, too firmly ruled to be attacked with any chance of success, and stretching too far eastwards to make its master aggressive on the Egyptian border. The government of Egypt was assured by the care taken to maintain and increase the Greek element in the country. Alexandria was made a seat of Hellenic culture, and if it is not absolutely certain that Ptolemy founded the Library and the Museum, he undoubtedly gathered the necessary intellectual materials. The great Greek colony of Ptolemæis, in the Thebais, was established. Thus the native and foreign elements were kept apart, conflicts avoided, and strong Hellenic centres secured. The

Egyptians were flattered by the arrival of the image of Sarapis from Sinope and the spread over Egypt, under the king's influence, of a Hellenic form of their religion. The king's portrait on his coins shows us him in old age, and is distinguished by resolution, keenness, and craft.

Having ruled thirty-eight years, the old king abdicated in favour of his young son Philadelphus, chosen to the prejudice of his elder brothers (B.C. 285), and died two years later (B.C. 283).

Ptolemy Philadelphus ruled for thirty-eight years of almost untroubled peace. His half-brother Magas, probably soon after the death of Ptolemy Soter, declared himself king in Cyrenaica, and attempted to invade Egypt. Ptolemy remained on the defensive, and at last a treaty was signed by which Ptolemy, heir of the Egyptian crown, and Berenice, heiress of Cyrenaica, were betrothed, Magas retaining the power if not the name of king. Philadelphus was also fortunate in recovering Phœnicia and Coele-Syria. This probably took place not much before B.C. 266, for that is the earliest date in the series of coins struck at Tyre during his reign. He secured the friendship of the Phœnician and Palestinian coast-towns, by granting them a degree of autonomy, for their coins, though dated in his reign, were struck at each town, and bear not his name but that of his father. In Egypt he paid great attention to the extension of commerce. He reopened the canal of the Red Sea and established a desert route from Coptos to Berenice on the coast which he had founded. He made war in Ethiopia, but according to his custom he was content to be on friendly terms with the Ethiopian king Ergamenes. His Ethiopian expedition led to his establishing a station for the purpose of securing a supply of elephants for war. An ambassador was sent to India. Thus the trade of Ethiopia, Arabia, and India was secured for Egypt, and continued to enrich it for eighteen centuries. Not less wisely Philadelphus made Alexandria, with the Museum and Library, the heart of the learning of Greece. Many cities were founded by him, or like Ptolemæis in Galilee, refounded. In his long reign there was little expenditure but such as was calculated to enrich his empire. At his death his dominions equalled those of his father. He held Cyprus, much of the coast of Asia Minor, the Cyclades, and part of Ethiopia and Arabia. The Cyrenaica was only to be separated for the life of Magas. He twice married. His second wife was Arsinoë II., his full sister, whom he married in accordance with Egyptian rather than Greek notions. She was a woman of great beauty and force of character, and much loved by her husband. The character of Philadelphus is marked by the craft rather than the force of his father's; but he inherited to the full his love of literature and his love of pleasure, both undisturbed by warlike ambition. He is the last representative of the old Greek "tyrannos," whom Pindar has made known to us, rather than one of the restless "diadochoi."

Ptolemy Euergetes, son of Philadelphus and Arsinoë I., by his accession, B.C. 247, reunited the Cyrenaica to the Egyptian empire. A quarrel between Egypt and Syria immediately broke out. The Syrian king Antiochus II. had married a daughter of Philadelphus. She was now put away, and, as well as Antiochus, murdered by her rival, his first wife Laodice, who set up her son Seleucus II. Ptolemy invaded Syria, which he speedily subdued, and then following the traditions of Egyptian conquest, he passed the Euphrates and reduced the whole of the eastern dominions of Seleucus. He returned to Egypt with vast treasures, including the statues of the gods which Cambyses had carried away, and which he restored to the temples. At sea he was equally fortunate, and the maritime territories of Egypt in the eastern Mediterranean were greatly enlarged. For a moment the old Egyptian Empire was again revived