

in larger proportions, extending from the Thracian coast to Ethiopia, from Cyrene to the border of India. The eastern provinces speedily returned to the Syrian rule, and Ptolemy was content with a moderate accession of territory on that side. He, however, retained his Greek conquests and pushed far south in Abyssinia. Euergetes was not merely a warlike king. He cared for literature, and more than his predecessors laboured to please the Egyptians. He is the first Ptolemy whose Egyptian structures are worthy of the wealth of the country. Art had lost its ancient delicacy, yet the sumptuous architecture of this age merits admiration as showing a new though somewhat false development of the ancient style. His reform of the native calendar, as recorded in the Decree of Canopus, is another mark of his wise interest in Egypt. He was fortunate in his marriage with Berenice II., who as queen of Cyrene is the first Egyptian queen who has the same regal style as her husband. Having reigned twenty-five years he left his kingdom to his son.

Ptolemy Philopator, who began to reign B.C. 222, immediately on his accession put his mother Berenice and others of his nearest kindred to death, and, leaving the management of the state to Sosibius, abandoned himself to luxury. Antiochus III., king of Syria, seized the opportunity to wrest from Egypt all the eastern provinces. Ptolemy at length took the field himself in defence of Egypt, and defeated Antiochus at Raphia, where his success was greatly due to the courage of Arsinoë III., his sister and wife (B.C. 217). By this victory Coele-Syria and Phœnicia were recovered. Ptolemy returned to his former life, and Arsinoë was put to death. He left his kingdom, greatly weakened by bad administration and growing disaffection, to a child, Ptolemy Epiphanes. The other two Macedonian kings, Philip V. and Antiochus III., now allied themselves to despoil Egypt of the provinces. Everything but Cyprus and Cyrene was taken, and the Egyptian ministers only saved the country by having called in the aid of Rome. The Republic had long been friendly to the Ptolemies, and nothing suited her policy better than a protectorate of Egypt. Accordingly M. Æmilius Lepidus was sent as regent to Alexandria, and Antiochus was commanded to restore what he had conquered. It was finally settled that Ptolemy should marry Cleopatra, daughter of the Syrian king, and that she should take back Coele-Syria and Phœnicia. From this time Rome ruled Egypt with reference to her own eastern policy. The kingdom of the Ptolemies was not allowed to fall, but it was kept within the most moderate limits. Consequently the weak kings were supported and the strong kings thwarted in every way. Egypt could not rid herself of a bad ruler or enjoy the full advantage of a good one. The rest of the minority of Ptolemy was marked by a serious revolt in Lower Egypt, put down with great difficulty. In B.C. 196, when but thirteen or fourteen years old, the young king was crowned at Memphis, when the decree of the Rosetta Stone was issued. The place of coronation and the terms of the decree show a policy of conciliation towards the Egyptians which the revolt probably rendered especially necessary. The marriage of Ptolemy and Cleopatra I. took place B.C. 193-2, but the dowry was not handed over. Ptolemy continued true to the Romans in their war with Antiochus, but was not allowed to act as their ally, and gained nothing in the subsequent treaty. Another revolt broke out in Lower Egypt, and was cruelly suppressed, B.C. 185. Ptolemy perished by poison in B.C. 181, leaving two sons surnamed Philometor and Euergetes, who ruled Egypt in succession. Epiphanes inherited the weakness and cruelty of his father, and with him Egypt lost for a time her influence in the affairs of the world.

Cleopatra I., who like Berenice II. was queen as heiress,

now became regent for Ptolemy Philometor, and ruled well until her death, about B.C. 174. The ministers then made war on Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes) for the disputed provinces. The Egyptian forces were defeated, Egypt invaded, and Ptolemy seized (B.C. 170). His younger brother, Euergetes II., with an audacious courage that marks his whole career, declared himself king at Alexandria, where Antiochus besieged him in vain, and Roman ambassadors interfered for his protection. Antiochus retired, leaving Philometor as king at Memphis. The two brothers now made terms, agreeing to a joint rule. Antiochus again invaded Egypt, and marched to Alexandria, but was forced to retire by the resolution of a Roman ambassador, M. Popilius Lænas (B.C. 168). From this time Egypt was more than ever in the hands of the Romans, and in consequence of the manner in which Philometor had yielded to Antiochus while Euergetes had resisted his pretensions and depended on their support, we find them constantly aiding Euergetes, whose abilities, if equal to those of Philometor, were weighted by a perfidious and cruel disposition. It was not long before Euergetes succeeded in driving Philometor from Alexandria. The fugitive went to Rome B.C. 164, and the senate agreed to reinstate him. Euergetes was spared by his brother, and the Roman deputies obtained for him the kingdom of Cyrene, where he occupied himself in ceaseless plots to obtain Cyprus, assisted by the active support of Demetrius I. of Syria and the unjust diplomatic aid of the Roman senate. Philometor had the courage to oppose his brother, who invaded Cyprus with Roman ambassadors ordered to settle him in the government of the island. Philometor defeated and took him prisoner, but again spared his life, and left him the kingdom of Cyrene (B.C. 154). The Romans did not interfere with this settlement.

The part Demetrius I. had played in the war in Cyprus led Philometor to take the side of the usurper Alexander I. (Balas), to whom he gave his daughter Cleopatra to wife (B.C. 150). When Demetrius II. endeavoured to recover his father's kingdom Ptolemy advanced to the support of Alexander, but thinking him treacherous, he turned his arms to the aid of the legitimate king. Rapidly subduing the country, Ptolemy entered Antioch and was hailed king of Syria, to the crown of which he had a claim as descended maternally from the Seleucid line; but he admitted the higher right of Demetrius, whom he aided in resisting an invasion by Alexander. In a decisive victory Ptolemy was thrown by his horse and mortally injured (B.C. 146).

It was in the reign of Philometor that Onias founded the temple at Onion in Egypt, which tended to increase the importance of the Jewish colonies and to separate the Alexandrian from the Palestinian school.

With this king the power of Egypt finally fell. He was the last Ptolemy who had the capacity to rule amidst the growing difficulties of the time. In his wars he showed courage and generalship, in his dealings with Rome caution and decision, in his rejection of the Seleucid diadem moderation and justice, in his treatment of his brother and his subjects an extraordinary clemency and humanity.

Cleopatra II., the sister and widow of Philometor, put their son on the throne.¹ Euergetes at once marched from Cyrene to Alexandria. The Romans as usual took his part, and stopped the war on the condition that Euergetes should marry his brother's widow. The young king was instantly put to death. Ptolemy reigned as he had begun: Alexandria was depopulated by his cruelties, though the rest of Egypt seems to have fared better in consequence of his want of ambition. He divorced Cleopatra II. to

¹ There is difficulty as to his name. In Egyptian documents Eupator precedes or follows Philometor. Lepsius, *Berl. Akad.* 1852, 464, *segg.*, but in a Greek inscription in Cyprus the latter place is stated. Hogg, *J.*, "Inscr. from Cyprus," *R. S. L.*, 2 ser., vii. 387, *segg.*

marry her daughter, his niece, Cleopatra III. In B.C. 130 he was driven out of Egypt by a revolt, and Cleopatra II. became queen. In revenge he put to death their son. Cleopatra having asked the aid of Demetrius II., Ptolemy was recalled, B.C. 127, and for the rest of his reign adopted a more conciliatory policy. He engaged in war against Demetrius II., and supported the usurper Alexander II., against whom he subsequently turned, apparently with reason. The reconciliation with the Seleucids led to the recall of Cleopatra II., with whom Ptolemy now reigned. He died B.C. 117, in the fifty-fourth year from his first accession. This king, the worst of the Ptolemies, as Philometor was the best, is significantly known by the nickname Physcon, or Fat-paunch, but he was also called by his subjects the Ill-doer, Kakergetes, instead of the Well-doer, Euergetes. Some of his latest coins present, instead of the idealized head of Ptolemy, the founder of the line, bloated and cruel features which can only be those of Physcon. His one good quality was a hereditary love of letters.

Cleopatra III., surnamed Cocce, widow of Euergetes and heiress of Philometor, succeeded, and, in deference to the popular will of the Alexandrians, associated with her Ptolemy Soter II., surnamed Lathyrus, or Lathurus, her elder son, instead of Ptolemy Alexander I., the younger, whom she preferred. They ruled together with little concord, and at length Cleopatra expelled her colleague, who had been the real sovereign, and recalled Alexander from Cyprus, where he had already ruled independently for seven years (B.C. 107). Cyrene was probably lost to Egypt about this time. Physcon had left this kingdom to his base son Ptolemy Apion, who is generally supposed to have at once succeeded. The coins, however, show that the latest Cyrenaic coinage of Physcon was continued by Lathyrus. Cleopatra III. now ruled with a stronger authority, but by degrees Alexander gained the upper hand, and ultimately dissensions arose which ended by his causing her death (B.C. 89): this occasioned troubles which lost him his throne, and brought about the recall of his brother (B.C. 89). During the interval Lathyrus had ruled in Cyprus, and both brothers had engaged on opposite sides in the wars of the Seleucid princes. As king of Egypt, Lathyrus had to subdue a native revolt, the first we know to have happened in Upper Egypt in the time of the Ptolemies. Thebes seems to have been its centre, and here the insurgents stood a siege of nearly three years, when the city was taken and reduced to the ruined state from which it has never since risen. Lathyrus died in B.C. 81. He appears to have been weak and cruel, with some qualities as a politician and general. He left one legitimate child, a daughter, Berenice III., who succeeded him. Her step-son, Alexander II., son of Alexander I., came from Rome as Sulla's candidate, and married her. The nuptials were almost immediately followed by the murder of the queen by her husband's order, and his deserved death in a popular tumult which was thus excited (B.C. 80). In default of legitimate issue, two base sons of Lathyrus now shared the Egyptian dominions, the elder, Ptolemy Neus Dionysus, surnamed Auletes, the Flute-player, taking Egypt, and his younger brother Ptolemy acquiring Cyprus. Auletes inherited the vices without the ability of Physcon, and having spent great sums in obtaining the recognition of the senate, who probably would not readily part with the claim based on the legacy which either Alexander I. or II. had made of his kingdom to the Romans, he wearied the patience of his subjects by heavy taxation, and was expelled by the Alexandrians B.C. 58. His wife Cleopatra V. and daughter Berenice IV. now reigned together, but, on the death of the elder, the younger became sole queen. Berenice was twice married, first to Seleucus, a pretended Seleucid,

whom she put to death, and then to Archelaus. With the support of Gabinius, proconsul of Syria, Auletes at length recovered Egypt, B.C. 55. He punished his daughter with death, and in B.C. 51 his troubled reign came to an end. At this time his family consisted of two sons and two daughters,—the famous Cleopatra and Arsinoë, all of whom in turn exercised regal power, three in Egypt.

Ptolemy, the elder son of Auletes, and Cleopatra VI., his elder daughter, succeeded in accordance with their father's will, which the Roman senate ratified. In B.C. 48 her brother expelled Cleopatra, who fled into Syria. Advancing to conquer Egypt by force of arms, she was met by her brother's forces near Pelusium. Here it was that Pompey, after the ruin of his cause, was assassinated by order of Ptolemy's ministers as he sought the king's protection. Cæsar, following Pompey, reached Alexandria. Here Cleopatra, giving up her ideas of war, made her way to Cæsar and secured his interest. After a struggle with the Egyptian ministers, who almost succeeded in overpowering Cæsar's small forces, and who ultimately had the support of young Ptolemy, who escaped from the Romans, the Egyptians were defeated and the king drowned (B.C. 47). Cleopatra now became queen, associated with a phantom king, the younger Ptolemy. In B.C. 45 she went to Rome with her brother and young Ptolemy Cæsar, her son by the dictator, wishing to be acknowledged Cæsar's wife, and that the boy should be made his heir. Next year Cæsar was murdered, but by his will his nephew Octavius became his heir, Cleopatra's son, his only surviving child, being necessarily set aside. The queen determined to secure for her son Egypt at least, and made away with her unfortunate brother. She next appears when, after the battle of Philippi, the triumvir Antony made his progress through Asia Minor. It was necessary that the queen of Egypt should conciliate the ruler of the Eastern world. Cleopatra resolved to govern him. As Cæsar seven years before, Antony now was instantly captivated by the Egyptian queen. She was past thirty, but if her beauty had waned her wit had grown. Her portrait on her coins is that of a woman of intellect and charm, not of beauty. A broad head with wavy hair, an aquiline nose, large deep-set eyes, and a full eloquent mouth, is supported by a long slender throat. To these personal qualities she added a mind singularly cultivated, ready discourse in several languages, and, what that so often lacks, as ready wit. She took Antony to Alexandria and governed the East for him. While her power waxed his waned. Asia Minor was overrun by Q. Labienus at the head of a Parthian army, and Palestine and Phœnicia by another led by Pacorus, the Parthian king's son. In Italy Antony's adherents were routed. He now resolved to attack Italy itself, and a great war was only averted by the armies, which forced the generals to conclude a peace (B.C. 40). Octavia, his rival's sister, was given in marriage to Antony, and for three years Cleopatra lost her power. In B.C. 36 Antony deserted Octavia and returned to Alexandria and the Egyptian queen. With the exception of an unsuccessful Parthian campaign and an inglorious Armenian one, Antony effected nothing. He was amused by the luxurious life of Alexandria; and, while Cleopatra maintained her Egyptian rights and ruled with Ptolemy Cæsar, she shared Antony's government of the East, appearing as queen with him as triumvir upon the coins of Antioch. In B.C. 32 Octavian declared war against Cleopatra, and Antony took his revenge by divorcing Octavia. Then followed the conflict in the Adriatic for the world's empire, in which Antony's old military skill failed him, and Cleopatra, leaving the battle, perhaps through a woman's fear, drew him away also (B.C. 31). Arrived at Alexandria, Cleopatra showed more energy than Antony, and, when Octavian reached

Egypt, more policy. Antony, on the false news of the queen's death, stabbed himself; and Cleopatra, finding Octavian resolved to make her walk in his triumph, perished by her own hands in some unknown way. Thus Egypt became a Roman province, B.C. 30. The young Ptolemy Caesar, in spite of his double claim, perished by the command of Octavian, but the beautiful Cleopatra, Antony's daughter by the queen, was generously taken by his divorced wife Octavia, brought up with her own children, and married to a king, Juba II. of Mauretania. With their son Ptolemy, whom Caligula put to death A.D. 40, this great line came to an end. Its genius ended with Cleopatra. The dislike of the Romans for her has tended to give the moderns too low an estimate of her abilities. When we see what Egypt was under Auletes and under her we are astonished to perceive how much she accomplished by her management of Caesar and of Antony. After all the other independent states had been absorbed by Rome, Egypt was raised from a mere protected province to be once more a kingdom, and at last Alexandria became again a seat of empire. But the task Cleopatra set herself was beyond accomplishment; the more she turned Antony into an imperial ruler the less could he control the Roman armies by which he governed. Thus the fabric she had raised was rotten at the base, and with her fall it disappeared.

The history of Egypt under the Romans being that of a province, and the most interesting events matters of ecclesiastical history, may here be told very briefly. Worn out by the cruelty and avarice of a succession of bad rulers, the country must have welcomed the Romans almost as it had welcomed Alexander, and so soon as it was known that the native religion would be protected, all discontent must have vanished. The temples were still the care of the rulers. Art had indeed fallen very low, yet it continued to produce buildings with a certain rich grandeur, that did not begin to give place to Greco-Roman structures till the time of Hadrian and the Antonines.

Elius Gallus, prefect of Egypt under Augustus, was ambitious to enlarge the province by foreign conquest. He failed in an expedition into Arabia Felix, but repelled an Ethiopian invasion, and in return penetrated as far as Napata, the capital of Queen Candace, which he captured. In later reigns the chief events were troubles connected with the Jewish population. In the time of Vespasian, the temple Onias had founded was closed, and a great Jewish revolt in the reign of Trajan, which was not easily suppressed, cost the Jews the privileges which, in common with the Greek population, they had enjoyed above the native inhabitants. Hadrian twice visited Egypt (A.D. 130, 134). He renewed the old privileges and granted new ones. The foundation of Antinoë shows how low the nation had then fallen. Under Antoninus Pius, a Sothiac Cycle began (A.D. 139). In the next reign, Avidius Cassius, prefect of Egypt, having suppressed a serious revolt, usurped the purple, and was acknowledged by the armies of Syria and Egypt. On the approach of Marcus Aurelius, the adherents of Cassius slew him, and the clemency of the emperor restored peace. After the downfall of the house of the Antonines, Pescennius Niger, who commanded the forces in Egypt, was proclaimed emperor on the death of Pertinax (A.D. 193). Severus overthrew his rival (A.D. 194), and the revolt having been a military one, did not punish the province, but gave great privileges to the Alexandrians. In his reign the Christians of Egypt suffered the first of their many persecutions. When Christianity was planted in the country we do not know, but it must very early have gained adherents among the learned Jews of Alexandria, whose school of thought was in some respects ready to welcome it. From them it rapidly passed to the Greeks. Ultimately, the new religion spread to the Egyptians; their own creed was worn out, and they found in Christianity a doctrine of the future life, for which their old belief had made them not unready; while the social teaching of Christianity came with special fitness to a subject race. The history of the Coptic Version has yet to be written. It presents some features of great antiquity, and, unlike all others, has the truly popular character of being written in the three dialects of the language. Side by side there grew up an Alexandrian Church, philosophic, disputative, ambitious, the very centre of Christian learning, and an Egyptian Church, ascetic, contemplative, mystical. The two at length influenced one another; still we can generally trace the philosophic teachers to a Greek origin, the mystics to an Egyptian.

Carsacalla, in revenge for an affront, massacred the population of Alexandria. Under Decius the Christians again suffered from persecution. When the Empire broke up in the weak reign of Gallienus, Emilianus was made emperor by the troops at Alexandria;

but, after a short and vigorous reign, was conquered by the forces of Gallienus. Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, after an unsuccessful invasion, on a second attempt conquered Egypt, which she added to her empire, but lost it when Aurelian made war upon her (A.D. 272). The province was, however, unsettled, and the conquest of Palmyra was followed in the same year by the suppression of a revolt in Egypt (A.D. 273). Probus, who had governed Egypt for Aurelian and Tacitus, was subsequently chosen by the troops to succeed Tacitus, and is the first governor of this province who obtained the whole of the Empire. The country, however, was still disturbed, and under the reign of Diocletian, in A.D. 292, a formidable revolt had broken out, led by Achilleus, who as emperor took the name Domitius Domitianus. Diocletian, finding his troops unable to determine the struggle, came to Egypt and reduced the strongholds of the country. After he had left, Domitianus again raised his standard and captured Alexandria, but Diocletian returning to Egypt took the city and put his rival to death (A.D. 297). This revolt has very distinctly the character of a native rising, for it was not localized in Alexandria, but spread over the country.

The reign of Diocletian is the turning-point in the history of the Egyptian Church. The edict of A.D. 303 against the Christians, and those which succeeded it, were rigorously carried out in Egypt, where Paganism was still strong, and face to face with a strong and united church. Galerius, who succeeded Diocletian in the government of the East, implacably pursued his policy, and this great persecution did not end until the persecutor, perishing, it is said, of the dire malady of Herod and Philip II. of Spain, sent out an edict of toleration (A.D. 311). The Copts date from the accession of Diocletian (A.D. 284), which they call the Era of Diocletian or of the Martyrs.

By the Edict of Milan (A.D. 313), Constantine, with the agreement of his colleague Licinius, acknowledged Christianity as having at least equal rights with other religions, and when he gained sole power he wrote to all his subjects advising them, like him, to become Christians (A.D. 324). The Egyptian Church, hitherto free from schism, was now divided by a fierce controversy, in which we see two Greek parties, rather than a Greek and an Egyptian, in conflict. The Council of Nicea was called together (A.D. 325) to determine between the orthodox and the party of the Alexandrian presbyter Arius. At that council the native Egyptian bishops were chiefly remarkable for their manly protest against enforcing celibacy on the clergy. The most conspicuous controversialist on the orthodox side was the young Alexandrian deacon, Athanasius, who returned home to be made archbishop of Alexandria (A.D. 326). For the long period during which he presided over the Church of Egypt, his history is that of the struggle of the two parties. Four times expelled by the Arians, and once by the emperor Julian, he employed each banishment for work in the cause to which he was devoted, and on each restoration he used his success with a moderation in marked contrast to the persecuting policy of his enemies. His name and person were at last known to the whole empire, which unconsciously recognized in him an ecclesiastical ruler of Christendom, rather than the chief prelate of a province. He was more a man of action than of thought, more an administrator than a student, but his intrepid patience, his moderation, and his indomitable energy, all directed to the welfare of the church and to no personal ends, gave him an influence never afterwards obtained without the support of a vast ecclesiastical machinery. His is the latest character which was formed upon the model of St Paul's, and the most remarkable of his age. He died A.D. 373, at the moment when an Arian persecution began. The reign of Theodosius I. witnessed the overthrow of Arianism, which was followed by the suppression of Paganism, against which a final edict was promulgated A.D. 390. In Egypt, the year before, the temple of Sarapis at Alexandria had been destroyed, and to the same period we must assign the beginning of a partial destruction of those Egyptian temples which had escaped the Persian conquerors. Generally the Coptic Christians were content to build their churches within the ancient temples, plastering over or effacing the sculptures which were nearest to the ground and in the way of the worshippers. They do not seem to have been very zealous in the work of destruction. The native religion was already dead and they had no fear of it. The prosperity of the church was the sign of its decay, and before long we find persecution and injustice disgracing the seat of Athanasius. Cyril the patriarch of Alexandria expelled the Jews from the capital with the aid of the mob, and by the murder of the beautiful philosopher Hypatia marked the lowest depth to which ignorant fanaticism could descend. A schism now produced lengthened civil war, and alienated Egypt from the empire. The Monophysites, after a struggle of two centuries and a half, became utterly hostile to the Greek rule. It was in these circumstances that a country which, remote from the great conflicts that destroyed the Western Empire and threatened the existence of the Eastern, had enjoyed uninterrupted freedom from an invader since its conquest by Zenobia, and had known no rebellion since that of Achilleus, fell without a

conflict when attacked by Chosroës (A.D. 616). The success of Heraclius restored Egypt to the Empire and for a time it again received a Greek governor. The Monophysites, who had taken advantage of the Persian occupation, were persecuted and their patriarch expelled. The Arab conquest was welcomed by the native Christians, but with it they ceased to be the Egyptian nation. Their language is still used in their churches, but it is no longer spoken, and its literature, which is wholly ecclesiastical, has been long unproductive.

The decline of Egypt was due to the purely military government of the Romans, and their subsequent alliance with the Greek party of Alexandria which never represented the country. Under weak emperors, the rest of Egypt was exposed to the inroads of savages, and left to fall into a condition of barbarism. Ecclesiastical disputes tended to alienate both the native population and the Alexandrians. Thus at last the country was merely held by armed force, and the authority of the governor was little recognized beyond Alexandria, except where garrisons were stationed. There was no military spirit in a population unused to arms, nor any disinclination to be relieved from an arbitrary and persecuting rule. Thus the Muslim conquest was easy.

[In the year 639 of our Era, or the eighteenth of the Flight,¹ Egypt was invaded by the Muslims, under the celebrated 'Amr Ibn-El-As (or El-Asce). Entering the country from Syria, at the head of only 4000 men, he besieged Pelusium, and took it after thirty days. This town was considered the key of Egypt on the Syrian frontier, and its capture was, therefore, an important advantage, which opened the country southwards to the Arab general. He marched thence to 'Eyn-Shems, the ancient Heliopolis, where he found the Greeks collected in force, and commanded by John Mukowkis, or rather John the Mukowkis, or Gurey the Mukowkis,² the governor of Memphis, a native Egyptian. They offered a vigorous defence, but were put to the rout, and 'Amr advanced to the banks of the Nile and laid siege to Egyptian Babylon, a fortress of great strength, and garrisoned by a Roman legion. Here he received two reinforcements of 4000 Muslims each, and after a protracted siege of seven months he took the place by assault. In an enemy's country, and far from all supplies, the small army of the Arabs was still in a critical position and unable to push on against the capital, Alexandria, when the enmity of rival Christians and the perfidy of Mukowkis decided the balance in their favour. The persecutions which the Copts had suffered had greatly embittered them against the Greeks, and, as Gibbon observes, had "converted a sect into a nation, and alienated Egypt from their religion and government." Mukowkis, who governed Memphis, was in heart a Monophysite, and had also withheld the tribute due at Constantinople; and both he and his Coptic brethren, after the first resistance, hailed the new invaders as their deliverers from the Greek yoke. On the fall of Babylon they entered into

¹ The years of the Muslim era, the Hijrah, or Flight of Mohammed from Mecca, are generally used in this portion of the history, as they are more convenient to Oriental scholars. The principal dates are, however, given according to both methods of computation.

The authorities upon which this sketch of the history of Egypt under Muslim rule is based are these:—Eutychius, *Annales*; the *Kāmil* of Ibn-el-Atheer (ed. Tornberg); Abu-l-Fidā, *Annales Muslimi* (ed. Reiske); El-Makreeze's *Khitat*; El-Ishākie (MS.); Ab-ul-Mahāsin; Ibn-Khalikān's *Biogr. Dict.* (tra. De Slane); Es-Suyootee's *Kitāb Husn el-Mohādarah* (MS.) and *Ta-reekh El-Khulafā*; El-Makreeze's *Kitāb-es-Sulook* (tra. Quatremère); Bahā-ed-Deen's *Vita Saladini* (ed. Schultens); El-Gabartee's *Annals* (MS.); Wüstenfeld's *Die Statthalter von Aegypten zur Zeit der Chalifen* (1876); Weil's *Geschichte der Chalifen*; Quatremère's *Vie de Moazz-li-din-Allah*, and *Mémoires géogr. et hist. sur l'Égypte*; Michaud's *Hist. des Croisades*; Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis*; Marcel; Mengin's *Hist. de l'Égypte*; Sir R. Wilson's *History of the British Expedition*; Lane's *Modern Egyptians*; Mrs Poole's *Englishwoman in Egypt*; M'Coan's *Egypt as it is*; &c.

² Mukowkis, meaning a kind of ring-dove, seems (according to the *Kāmoos*) to have been the symbol of the governor of Egypt under the Greeks, just as the hawk was the symbol of the Pharaohs. Gurey may also be written Jurey, but the former, representing the Egyptian pronunciation of the letter *jeem*, is preferred in this article in this and similar instances.

a treaty with the Arabs, engaging to pay to them a poll-tax of two deenars on every adult male, and agreeing to furnish them with supplies and assistance while completing the subjugation of the country. Having concluded this treaty, and founded the city of El-Fustāt on the site of his first encampment on the banks of the Nile, with the mosque known by his name, 'Amr marched against Alexandria; and after overcoming many obstacles, and disputing the whole way with the Greeks, who conducted their retreat, in the face of a victorious army, with great ability, in twenty-two days he appeared before it. Fresh warriors continued to arrive from Syria to strengthen the besieging force; but the defence was as obstinate as the attacks of the Muslims were brilliant, and was protracted for fourteen months. At length, on the 10th December 641, the metropolis of Egypt, the first city of the East, capitulated; but it is said that this conquest was only achieved with the sacrifice of 25,000 Muslims. Abu-l-Farag relates that 'Amr, wishing, at the earnest request of John the Grammarian, to spare the famous Library, wrote to the caliph (khaleefeh) Omar, asking his instructions respecting it, and that he answered: "As to the books you have mentioned, if they contain what is agreeable with the book of God, in the book of God is sufficient without them; and if they contain what is contrary to the book of God, there is no need of them; so give orders for their destruction." The historian adds, that they were burnt in the public baths of the city, and in the space of six months were consumed.³ The conquest of the rest of Egypt was soon effected, and the various strongholds successively fell into the hands of the invaders.

'Amr governed the country with much wisdom for four years, but was dismissed by 'Othmān, who appointed in his place 'Abd-Allah Ibn-Saad Ibn-Abes-Sarh. The latter reduced Alexandria, which had been retaken by the emperor Constans II., and pushed his conquests beyond Africa Proper. He died at Ascalon, in the year 36, having governed eleven years. His successor's rule was short, and the next viceroy, Mohammad, son of the caliph Abou-Bekr, on assuming the reins of government acted with such tyranny towards the followers of 'Othmān, that Mu'āwiyeh was compelled to dispatch 'Amr to Egypt with a force from Syria, and a great battle was fought in A.H. 38 between the two armies of Muslims, in which 'Amr was again victorious. As a reward for this service, he was a second time appointed governor of Egypt, and he died there at the age of ninety years, in A.H. 43.

From this time to A.D. 868, or for rather more than two centuries, Egypt was governed by a succession of viceroys, appointed by the caliphs of Damascus and Baghdād. Their period was distinguished by intestine troubles and a constant change of rulers, resulting from the caprice of the caliphs or the vicissitudes of their fortunes. Here we may mention, that shortly after the overthrow of the Amawee ("Ommiade") Dynasty of Damascus, and the accession of the house of 'Abbās, which ruled at Baghdād, the city of El-'Askar, immediately to the north-east of El-Fustāt, was founded, and the seat of government removed thither. The site is without the walls of modern Cairo, and is marked by extensive mounds of rubbish.

In A.D. 868 (A.H. 254) Ahmad, the son of Tooloon, a Turkish slave who held a high office at Baghdād, was appointed governor of the province of Misr by the caliph El-Moatezz, and two years after that of Alexandria also, by his successor El-Muhtedee. His temporal allegiance to the caliph soon became merely nominal, and he was virtually sovereign of Egypt; but at the same time he endeavoured to avoid a complete rupture by continuing the prayer for the Prince of the Faithful in the mosques, and the mention of his name on the coins which he struck. Later in his reign, however, he forbade the mention of the next caliph's brother and colleague El-Muwaffik in the prayers and state-documents of Egypt, and El-Moateamid, who was a weak prince, was prevailed on to denounce

³ This tradition is, we believe, only mentioned fully by Abu-l-Farag, but he was a Christian, and Muslim writers would consider it an occurrence of no importance. Abd-el-Lateef merely says, "Here was the library which 'Amr Ibn-El-As burned by permission of Omar;" and El-Makreeze, speaking of Pompey's Pillar, says, "It is said that this pillar is one of those which stood in the portico of Aristotle, who there taught philosophy, and that his academy contained a library which 'Amr Ibn-El-As burned by direction of Omar." See *Englishwoman in Egypt*, vol. i. 40, seqq.

him publicly as a traitor from the pulpits throughout his dominions. Yet that he secretly favoured him is proved by his vain attempt to escape to Egypt from the tyranny of his warlike brother. Ahmad founded the dynasty of the Bence-Tooloon, which lasted for a period of 37 years. He built the royal city of El-Katás, between El-'Askar and Mount Mukattam, enriched it with splendid buildings, and constituted it the seat of his government. Its site is now covered with ruins, only his great mosque remaining a proud example of his wealth and magnificence, still the largest mosque of Cairo, and, as presenting the earliest specimens of the pointed arch, noteworthy in the history of architecture. The reign of this vigorous and wise prince was remarkable for prosperity at home and conquests abroad. He took Barkah, and in Syria in 264 captured Damascus, Hims (Emessa), Hamáh, and Aleppo; after which he proceeded to Antioch, and the governor refusing to surrender, he took that city by storm. He then advanced towards Tarsus, but his supplies failing he was compelled to retire. About five years later, Lu-lu, his deputy and governor of Aleppo and other towns in Syria and in Mesopotamia, revolted and entered into a league with El-Muwaffik. It was apparently after an expedition against this rebel that Ahmad died, in the year 270 (A.D. 884). During the latter years of his reign, he had abandoned that simplicity of life which had distinguished his youth, and had given himself up to boundless luxury. At his death, there was found in his treasury ten millions of denárs, and his establishment was discovered to consist of 7000 mounted memlooks, 300 picked horses for his own use, a body-guard of 24,000 slaves, besides 6000 asses and mules, 10,000 camels, and 100 wherries. By what oppression the revenue necessary to maintain such a household was raised some idea may be formed, when it is stated that at the time of his death 18,000 persons were confined in Ibn-Tooloon's prisons.

Khumáraweyh, on the death of his father, was appointed his successor by the army, he being then twenty years old, and he inherited a kingdom extending from the Euphrates to Nubia. He fought a battle with the forces of the caliph, commanded by a son of El-Muwaffik (afterwards the caliph El-Moatadid), between Damascus and Ramlah; in which his army gained the victory, although he himself, never having seen a battle before, fled the scene of action in a panic, drawing a large part of his troops after him. But he soon reversed the independent policy of his father, and making peace with the caliph in 273 he not only put the latter's name with that of his brother El-Muwaffik in the public prayers, but entirely omitted his own; though it must be allowed he did not pursue the same servile course in his coinage. On the accession of El-Moatadid in 279, Khumáraweyh continued his conciliatory policy and offered his daughter Katr-en-Nedá (Dewdrop) in marriage to the caliph's son. In 282 he made an incursion into the Greek territory, and died at Damascus. It is said that he was fearful of assassination; to avoid which he had trained a lion to guard him while he slept on his bed of quicksilver. His fears were justified; for he was put to death by his women, or according to some by his eunuchs.

His eldest son, Geysah Abu-l-'Askir, not yet fourteen years old, succeeded him. This prince was killed in less than eight months: his youth, which rendered him unfit to govern, occasioned his fall; for he had discarded from his society those who were in favour with his father, and associated with none but worthless men. He was succeeded in 283 by his brother Hároon, the principal events of whose rule were a great tempest and earthquake in Egypt in 286, and a treaty which he concluded with the caliph, by which the provinces of Awásim and Kinnesreen were ceded to him and the annual tribute from Egypt was fixed at 450,000 denárs. He reigned upwards of eight years, but gave himself up to pleasure, and, as some say, was put to death in 292 by his uncles Sheybán and Adeé, sons of the founder of the dynasty, the former of whom succeeded to the government. In the meantime, at the instigation of the generals of Hároon, Mohammad Ibn-Suleymán, a scribe of Lu-lu, advanced against Egypt with a numerous and heavily equipped army. Sheybán went forth to meet him with all the forces he could muster, but numbers of his troops deserted to the invader, and he was soon compelled to surrender. Mohammad Ibn-Suleymán burned El-Katás, and sacked El-Fustát, reducing the women to slavery, committing many atrocities, and exiling the family of Ahmad Ibn-Tooloon, with all their adherents (A.H. 292, A.D. 905).

Having thus completed his conquest, and restored the province of Egypt to the house of 'Abbás, Ibn-Suleymán yielded the government to 'Esa En-Nósharee, appointed by El-Muktefee. He died in 297, and was followed by Tekeen El-Gezere, under whose rule Egypt was invaded by the forces of 'Obeyd-Allah El-Mahdee, first prince of the dynasty of the Fátimées, which had succeeded the Bence-l-Aghlab in the dominion of Northern Africa. His general Hubáshah, having taken Barkah, advanced (in 302), with an army of 100,000 men, to Alexandria, which he found deserted, and thence marched to the Feiyoom, where Tekeen, reinforced with troops from El-Irák, gave battle, and defeated the enemy in a sanguinary conflict. In the following year, he was succeeded by Abu-l-Hasan Zekeen Er-Roomce, in whose time El-Mahdee again attempted the conquest

of Egypt with an army under the command of his son, Abu-l-Kásim; Alexandria fell into his hands in 307; its inhabitants fled, and Zekeen entrenched himself in El-Gezeah, on the western bank of the Nile, and shortly afterwards died. In this emergency Tekeen was reinstated in his office; and a fleet of twenty-five sail was sent from Tarsus by the caliph, which meeting with the flotilla of the enemy off Resheed almost annihilated it. Tekeen, meanwhile, had defeated the Africans, but without decisive effect. At length, being twice reinforced from Baghdád, he drove Abu-Kásim back to Barkah. After rendering this important service Tekeen was again recalled. Three other governors were then successively appointed; but the troops revolting, and much sedition and rapine ensuing, Tekeen was once more despatched to Egypt, where he remained until his death in the year 321 (A.D. 933).

He was followed by Aboo-bekr Mohammad El-Ikhsheed Ibn-Tághah, afterwards the founder of the dynasty of the Ikhsheedees, who was almost immediately superseded by another governor; and for one year more Egypt continued to be a province of the caliphs of Baghdád. In the year 323, El-Ikhsheed again succeeded to the government. About this time little remained to the caliph of his once broad empire beyond the province of Baghdád, and even there his power was but nominal. Khurasán, Fars, Karman, Rei, Ispahán, Mosul, and the provinces of Mesopotamia, were either in a state of revolt, or nearly or wholly lost to him. Spain was governed by the Dynasty of Umsiyeih, and Africa by that of El-Mahdee; and we have seen the distracted state of Egypt since the fall of the Bence-Tooloon. El-Ikhsheed availed himself of these circumstances to make himself the independent sovereign of Egypt and Syria, continuing, however, to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the caliph. Shortly after, he defeated the forces of El-Mahdee, who had again made an inroad into the country; and in 327 he was decorated by Er-Rádee with the title of El-Ikhsheed, a name borne by the rulers of the province of Ferghánah in Transoxania, from whom he was descended. In the following year Ibn-Ráik subdued a great part of Syria, and having taken Damascus advanced to the frontier of Egypt, where after a very severe engagement he was utterly routed and pursued by the troops of El-Ikhsheed as far as Damascus. There, however, the fortune of war turned against El-Ikhsheed, and for a time he was deprived of the province of Syria, though he subsequently regained possession of it. During his reign, the caliphs of Baghdád were daily losing power, and in the year 333, El-Muktefee wrote to him lamenting his miserable state; whereupon El-Ikhsheed immediately repaired to him at Rakkah with valuable presents and offered him assistance and an asylum in Egypt, of which the caliph was too timid to avail himself. About this time, also, he conducted a war with various success against Seyf-ed-Dowleh the Hamdánee, who had attacked Syria. He died at Damascus in 334 (A.D. 946), in the 66th year of his age, and was buried, as were his sons, in the mosque of Omar at Jerusalem.

Of El-Ikhsheed's two sons and successors, Abu-l-Kásim Oongoor (who died in 349), and Abu-l-Hasan 'Alee, little is known, their vizir Káfoor, a black eunuch, being the actual ruler. In the reign of the former, in the year 343, a great fire occurred in El-Fustát, which destroyed 1700 houses and much merchandise. Káfoor succeeded to the throne in 355, and was acknowledged throughout Egypt, Syria, and the Higáz. He ruled with great ability, and was a patron of literature; his name is celebrated by the poet El-Mutanebbe, who was his boon-companion, and whom, as well as other learned men, he rewarded with magnificent presents. On his death in 357, internal dissensions respecting the succession of Abu-l-Fuwáris, a son of 'Alee, presented a favourable opportunity to the Fátimée caliph to renew the often-repeated invasions of Egypt.

Hitherto, with few exceptions, the most notable of which are the reigns of Ibn-Tooloon, Khumáraweyh, El-Ikhsheed, and Káfoor, the Muslim rulers of Egypt had not much benefited the country, or rescued it from the anarchy and troubles in which it had become involved under the Lower Empire. But the incidents of the time are so little known that they have been deemed worthy of more mention in this article than perhaps their importance would otherwise warrant. From the period at which we have now arrived, however, the annals of Egypt contain much important matter, and are so closely interwoven with the events of the Crusades as to render them deeply interesting to the student of European history. The rise of the schismatic caliphs of Africa is a remarkable episode in the early days of El-Islám, and most of the princes of that dynasty were not unworthy of their successors, the renowned Saladin and his family, and the Memlook sultans.

In the year 358 (A.D. 969) El-Mo'izz li-deeni-lláh, the fourth Fátimée caliph, equipped a large and well-armed force, with a formidable body of cavalry, the whole under the command of Abu-l-Hoseyn Góhar el-Káid, a native of Greece, and a slave of his father El-Mansoor. This general, on his arrival near Alexandria, received a deputation from the inhabitants of El-Fustát, charged to negotiate a treaty. Their overtures were favourably entertained, and the conquest of the country seemed probable without bloodshed.

But, while the conditions were being ratified, the Ikhsheedees prevailed on the people to revoke their offer, and the ambassadors on their return were themselves compelled to seek safety in flight. Góhar lost no time in pushing forward. Before El-Gezeah a partial combat took place; several days were passed in skirmishes, and at length he forced the passage of the Nile a few miles south of that town, at the head of his troops. Here the Ikhsheedees offered a brave resistance, the greater part were left dead on the field, and the remainder, taking what valuables they could carry off, fled from El-Fustát. The former mediators were now brought to intercede for the inhabitants and the women of the fallen dynasty, and to the honour of the African general it is related that they were pardoned and the city was peaceably occupied. The submission of the rest of Egypt was secured by this victory; and all the Higáz, including the holy cities, and the Yemen, speedily acknowledged the authority of the Fátimée El-Mo'izz. In the year 359 Syria was also added to his dominions, but shortly after was overrun by the Karmateses (Carmathians), the troops of El-Mo'izz met with several reverses, Damascus was taken, and those lawless freebooters, joined by the Ikhsheedees, advanced to 'Eyn-Shems. In the meantime, Góhar had fortified El-Káhíreh, or Cairo (the new capital which he had found immediately north of El-Fustát), and taken every precaution to repel the invaders; a bloody battle was fought on Friday, the 1st of Rabee' el-Owwal, in the year 361, before the city walls, without any decisive result. On the following Sunday, however, Góhar obtained a great victory over the enemy, who experienced a reverse more complete than any before suffered, and the camp and baggage fell into the hands of the conqueror.

At the earnest solicitations of his lieutenant, who had ruled Egypt both ably and justly, with almost absolute authority, El-Mo'izz at length determined to remove his court to his new kingdom. In Ramadán 362, he entered El-Káhíreh, bringing with him the bodies of his three predecessors and vast treasure. El-Mo'izz reigned about two years in Egypt, dying in the year 365. He is described as a warlike and ambitious prince, but, notwithstanding, he was especially distinguished for justice and was fond of learning. He showed great favour to the Christians, especially to Severus, bishop of El-Ashmounayn, and the patriarch Ephrem; and under his orders, and with his assistance, the church of the Mu'allakah, in Old Misr, was rebuilt. He executed many useful works, (among others rendering navigable the Tanitic branch of the Nile, which is still called the canal of El-Mo'izz), and occupied himself in embellishing El-Káhíreh. Góhar, when he founded that city built the great mosque named El-Azhar, the university of Egypt, which to this day is crowded with students from all parts of the Muslim world. The principal event of his reign in Egypt was the second irruption of Hasan the Karmatee. The enemy, as on the former occasion, reached 'Eyn-Shems; but now he gained more advantage over the African troops. Although he was twice defeated in different parts of Egypt, and constantly harassed in his advance, the capital was closely besieged by him, and its defenders were driven across the fosse. Thus straitened, El-Mo'izz had recourse to stratagem, and succeeded in bribing Hasan Ibn-El-Garráh (who, with a body of the tribe of Tei, fought with the Karmateses) to desert them in the heat of the next battle. The result of this plan was successful, and again Hasan was defeated and compelled to flee. This event, which occurred in the year 363, relieved Egypt of another invader, an ally of Hasan, by name Abd-Allah Ibn-'Obeyd-Allah (formerly governor of Syria under Káfoor), and obtained for the arms of El-Mo'izz various successes in Syria.

El-'Azeez Aboo-Mansoor Nizár, on coming to the throne of his father, immediately despatched an expedition against the Turkish chief El-Eftekeen, who had taken Damascus a short time previously. Góhar again commanded the army, and pressed the siege of that city so vigorously that the enemy called to their aid the Karmateses. Before this united army he retired by little and little to Ascalon, where he prepared to stand a siege; but being reduced to great straits, he purchased his liberty with a large sum of money. On his return from this disastrous campaign, El-'Azeez took the command in person, and meeting the enemy at Ramlah, was victorious after a bloody battle; while El-Eftekeen, being betrayed into his hands, was with Arab magnanimity received with honour and confidence, and ended his days in Egypt in affluence. El-'Azeez followed his father's example of liberality. It is even said that he appointed a Jew his vizir in Syria, and a Christian to the same post in Egypt. These acts, however, nearly cost him his life, and a popular tumult obliged him to disgrace both these officers. After a reign of twenty-one years of great internal prosperity he died (A.H. 383) in a bath at Bilbeys, while preparing an expedition against the Greeks who were ravaging his possessions in Syria.

¹ The modern Cairo was originally called El-Mansoorceyeh; El-Mo'izz, however, changed its name to that of El-Káhíreh, by reason of an omen at its foundation. For details respecting this and the other capitals of Egypt under the Muslims, see the sketch in the *Englishwoman in Egypt*, vol. i. 124, seqq. in which the author has availed herself of the valuable MS. notes of Mr Lane.

El-'Azeez was distinguished for moderation and mildness, but his son and successor rendered himself notorious for very opposite qualities. El-Hákim bi-amri-lláh Aboo-'Alee Mansoor began his reign, according to Muslim historians, with much wisdom, but afterwards acquired a character for impiety, cruelty, and unreasoning extravagance, by which he has been rendered odious to posterity. He is described as possessing at once "courage and boldness and cowardice and timorousness, a love for learning and vindictiveness towards the learned, an inclination to righteousness and a disposition to slay the righteous;" and this character is fully borne out by his many extravagances. Of his cruelty numerous anecdotes are told us, especially in the discharge of his functions as Mohtesib, or "regulator of the markets and of the weights and measures," an office which he assumed, and in which he became the terror of the inhabitants. But his cruelty was surpassed by his impiety. He arrogated to himself divinity, and commanded his subjects to rise at the mention of his name in the congregational prayers, an edict which was obeyed even in the holy cities, Mecca and Medinah. He is most famous in connection with the Druses, a sect which he founded and which still holds him in veneration and believes in his future return to the earth. He had made himself obnoxious to all classes of his subjects, when, in the year 397, he nearly lost his throne by foreign invasion. Hishám, surnamed Aboo-Rekweh, a descendant of the house of Umeiyeih in Spain, took the province of Barkah with a considerable force and subdued Upper Egypt. The caliph, aware of his danger, immediately collected his troops from every quarter of the kingdom, and marched against the invader, whom, after severe fighting, he defeated and put to flight. Hishám himself was taken prisoner, paraded in Cairo with every aggravation of cruelty, and put to death. El-Hákim having thus by vigorous measures averted this danger, Egypt continued to groan under his tyranny until the year 411, when he fell by domestic treachery. His sister Seyyidet-el-Mulook had, in common with the rest of his subjects, incurred his displeasure; and being fearful for her life, she secretly and by night concerted measures with the emeer Seyf-ed-Dowleh, chief of the guard, who very readily agreed to her plans. Ten slaves, bribed by 500 denárs each, having received their instructions, went forth on the appointed day to the desert tract southward of Cairo, where El-Hákim, unattended, was in the habit of riding, and waylaid him near the village of Hulwán, where they put him to death.

He was succeeded by his son, Edh-Dháhir (commonly pronounced Ez-Zahir) bi-lláh Abu-l-Hasan 'Alee, who ruled with justice and moderation for nearly sixteen years. In 414 Aleppo was taken by Sálh Ibn-Mardás; and although he was defeated and slain by an Egyptian force sent against him, a son, Shibl-ed-Dowleh, yet retained possession of that city. At this time also Hasan, of the tribe of Tei, before mentioned, had made himself master of Ramlah; and indeed from this caliph's reign we may date the decline of the Fátimée power, especially in Syria.

In the year 427, El-Mustansir bi-lláh Aboo-Temeem Ma'add came to the throne at the age of seven years. His reign occupied a long period, rendered remarkable by the unparalleled troubles which befell Egypt. It commenced prosperously with the defeat and death of Shibl-ed-Dowleh. Aleppo was taken, and the submission of the rest of Syria followed; and the general who had conducted the expedition against that province assumed its government. On his death, Mo'izz-ed-Dowleh, a brother of Shibl-ed-Dowleh, retook Aleppo in 433; but the various fortunes of this prince and his nephew Mahmood, from this time and during the calamities of Egypt, are too complicated and subordinate to claim a place here. In the western provinces, the rebel El-Mo'izz (the third successor of Yoosuf Ibn-Zeyree, who was appointed governor on the conquest of Egypt), was punished by an irruption of wild Arab tribes in the pay of El-Mustansir.

In the year 450 (A.D. 1058), the Fátimée caliph was publicly prayed for in Baghdád,—a remarkable event, of which the immediate cause was briefly as follows. El-Besseere, a powerful Turkish chief exercising unbounded authority in that city, had fallen into disgrace, and received supplies of men and money from the caliph of Egypt; and while the Seljooke sultan Tughril-Beg espoused the cause of the 'Abbás caliph, his brother Ibraheem Eynál revolted, joined El-Besseere, and defeated Tughril-Beg. El-Besseere entered Baghdád, in which the combat continued to rage; and the unfortunate city was devastated by massacre and pillage. El-Mustansir was solemnly declared Prince of the Faithful, and the insignia of the legitimate caliph was sent to El-Káhíreh. The success of El-Besseere, however, was but transient; Tughril-Beg had, in the meantime, defeated and killed his brother Ibraheem; he then entered Baghdád in Dhu-l-Kaadah 451, and despatched a force against El-Besseere, who fell in a battle near El-Koofeh.

A persecution of the Christians of Alexandria occurred about this time; and in 454 commenced a desolating struggle between the blacks and the Turks, both of whom had become numerous in Egypt. The former were succoured by the mother of El-Mustansir,

herself a negress, while the command of the latter was taken by Násir-ed-Dowleh Ibn-Hamdán, a general of El-Mustansir, more than once governor of Damascus, and at this period governor of Lower Egypt. To this man's unscrupulous ambition was due much of the trouble which ensued. After many battles the Turks succeeded in destroying the power of their adversaries, and their leader assumed almost absolute authority, while they not only extorted from the caliph immense sums of money and treasure, but even rifled the tombs of his predecessors for the valuables which they contained. At the same time the bulk of the valuable library of the Fátimées was dispersed by these brigands. But the very power of Násir-ed-Dowleh threatened his overthrow. His sense of security in his position rendered him regardless of the support of the Turks; and when at length his schemes for the deposition of El-Mustansir brought matters to a crisis, a large portion of the army declared against him. Defeated and driven from the metropolis, he succeeded in possessing himself of Lower Egypt, and a terrible civil war raged between the contending parties. But an even heavier calamity afflicted Egypt. For seven successive years the inundation of the Nile failed, and with it almost the entire subsistence of the country, while the rebels intercepted supplies of grain from the north. El-Makreezee informs us that El-Askar and El-Katás were depopulated, and that half the inhabitants of El-Fustát perished, while in El-Káhíreh itself the people were reduced to the direst straits. Bread was sold for 14 dirhems the 1 lb loaf; and all provision being exhausted, the worst horrors of famine followed. The wretched people resorted to cannibalism, and organized bands kidnapped the unwary passenger in the desolate streets by means of ropes furnished with hooks and let down from the latticed windows. In the year 462 the famine reached its height. It was followed by a pestilence; and in the midst of these horrors, Násir-ed-Dowleh advanced on El-Káhíreh at the head of an enormous army; he was induced to withdraw by the promise of large concessions, only to repeat the attack, and finally to make himself master of the city, after having inflicted a signal defeat on the caliph, who became only the nominal ruler of Egypt, a condition which lasted until the assassination of this powerful rebel in the year 465.

While these events were occurring in Egypt, Syria was in a continual state of anarchy and war. A distinguished general, the emeer El-Guyooch Bedr-ed-Deen El-Gemálee, held the government of Damascus during these times; and now El-Mustansir wrote, recalling him to assume the office of vizir of Egypt. On the condition of being allowed to bring with him a veteran force, he, happily for the country, obeyed the summons, and to his talents was owing the restoration of order and even prosperity which followed. By a massacre of emeers at a grand banquet shortly after his arrival, and by numerous executions, he subdued all opposition in the capital; and in a series of brilliant victories he annihilated the savage hordes who infested the country throughout its whole extent, having either been called to the aid of the contending parties, or voluntarily taken advantage of the universal confusion to commit their lawless ravages.

In concluding this necessarily extended notice of the reign of El-Mustansir, the invasion of Aksees with an army of Turkumáns, Kurds, and Arabs, in the year 469, must be mentioned. Spreading devastation around them, they encamped near El-Káhíreh; and in the first engagement defeated the forces of El-Gemálee; but fortune favouring him in a second battle, the enemy was totally routed with immense carnage.

El-Mustansir reigned 60 years, and died in the year 487. He was a weak prince, solely given up to pleasure. El-Gemálee had governed with almost absolute authority and great ability for a period of 20 years, dying only a few days before the caliph. While admiring El-Gemálee's talents, we cannot but condemn his severity. He built the mosque which gives its name to the mountain immediately S. E. of the citadel of El-Káhíreh (Gebel-El-Guyooches), and the second wall of the city, with its three principal gates, Báb-Zuwayleh, Báb-en-Nasr, and Báb-el-Futooh. These gates, which are very fine specimens of architecture, are said to be the work of three Greek brothers.

El-Mustaalee bi-lláh Abu-l-Kásim Ahmad succeeded his father; but a son of El-Gemálee, El-Afdal, had the principal management of the affairs of the kingdom. This caliph's reign is memorable for the First Crusade. El-Afdal had taken Jerusalem from the Turks in the year 491 (A. D. 1098); and a few months later it yielded to the Crusaders, after a siege of 40 days. El-Afdal arrived shortly after its fall with a reinforcement of 20,000 men, but he was defeated in the battle of Ascalon. Later, an Egyptian army, commanded by Saad-ed-Dowleh, was worsted by Baldwin, count of Edessa, and the general was killed in the action. From this period, with the exception of some efforts made in the next reign, to the time of Saláh-ed-deen ("Saladin"), Egypt was too much occupied with intestine troubles to equip expeditions against the various parties who now struggled for the possession of Syria. El-Mustaalee died in the year 495. He is stated to have been a Sunnee; a strange anomaly in a dynasty of Shiya'ees.

His son El-A'mir bi-ahkámí-lláh Aboo-Alee Mansoor came to the throne at the age of five years, and until his arrival at manhood the government was conducted by El-Afdal. The first act of the caliph, however, on taking it into his own hands, was to put his minister to death, and appoint in his stead a man whose wickedness obliged him to imprison him and afterwards condemn him to death. The rule of El-A'mir was chiefly remarkable for his impiety and tyranny, and for the successes of the Crusaders, who, having reduced many of the principal coast-towns in Syria, meditated the conquest of Egypt, and crossed the frontier, but were deterred from the prosecution of their enterprise by the illness of Baldwin, whose death took place at El-Areesh, on his way back to Jerusalem. El-A'mir was put to death in 524, at the town of El-Geezeh, it is said by partisans of El-Afdal, whose son then usurped the entire government, setting up, as caliph, El-Háfíh li-deeni-lláh Abd-El-Megeed, a grandson of El-Mustansir (El-Amir having left no male issue), but without the usual ceremonies of installation. This vizir, Aboo-Alee Ahmad, even forbade the mention of El-Háfíh in the public prayers, and inserted his own name in his stead. He perished in a popular tumult, roused by his extortions and arbitrary rule, and El-Háfíh was duly declared caliph and received the oaths of allegiance. After the death of Ahmad, he successively appointed three other vizirs; but these proving equally refractory, he at length dispensed with that office altogether. He reigned nearly 20 years. The licentiousness of his son and successor, Edh-Dháfir bi-aadái-lláh Aboo-Mansoor Isma'eel, occasioned his death in four years and seven months at the hand of his vizir El-Abbás.

El-Fáz bi-lláh Abu-l-Kásim 'Eesa Ibn-Alee was, on his accession in 549, only five years of age, and the history of his times presents merely the contentions of rival vizirs, of whom the chief were El-Melik Es-Sálih Tatás Ibn-Ruzzezyk, and his competitor El-Abbás, before named. The latter, finding his power failing, gathered together the wealth he had amassed and fled to Syria, where he fell into the hands of the Crusaders, who stripped him of all that he had and detained him a prisoner. Eventually he was given up to Tatás and crucified over the gates of the palace.

El-Fáz died in the year 555, and El-Ádid li-deeni-lláh Aboo-Mohammad Abd-Allah, a grandson of El-Háfíh, and the last of the Fátimée caliphs, was raised to what was then but the shadow of a throne, the entire power being in the hands of Tatás, who by his oppression and cruelty well-nigh rendered El-Ádid, by nature benevolent and wise, as tyrannical as himself. He was assassinated after a year by the secret orders of the caliph, and the latter to conceal his agency in this act installed his son El-Ádil in his place. At this time the well-known Sháwir was governor of the Sa'eed (or Upper Egypt), a post next in importance to that of prime minister. During the last three reigns the vizirs had been rapidly increasing in power; and the annals of the period are entirely occupied with the rise and fall of potent grandees, all eager for a post which conferred on its possessor the supreme authority. At length, in the reign of this unfortunate prince, they consummated the ruin of the dynasty and overwhelmed themselves in its fall. In 558 El-Ádil dispossessed Sháwir of his government, and the latter had immediate recourse to arms, marched against his enemy, and succeeded in putting him to death. He then constituted himself vizir, but in his turn was compelled to flee from a more powerful rival, Ed-Dirghám. Noor-ed-Deen (Noureddin), the sultan of Damascus, received the fugitive with favour; and in the course of the next year (559) despatched an army to Egypt, under the command of Saad-ed-Deen Sheerkooch, to reinstate him. In the meantime Ed-Dirghám had been busy putting to death the great men of the empire; and having thus weakened his power, he offered but a feeble resistance, was overthrown in a battle near the tomb of the Seyyideh Nefeseeh, on the S. of El-Káhíreh, and Sháwir was restored. No sooner, however, was this effected, than he forgot the engagements into which he had entered with Noureddin, and threw off his allegiance to him. Sheerkooch retired to the Sharkeyeh, and occupied the town of Bilbeys, and thence threatened Sháwir. In this position of affairs the latter had recourse to the Crusaders, who willingly responded to his call, and Amaury, king of Jerusalem, arrived with a considerable force. With these allies, Sháwir besieged his former protector in Bilbeys, until, hearing of Noureddin's successes over the Franks in Syria, they negotiated a peace, and permitted Sheerkooch to withdraw from Egypt. About two years later, Noureddin, determined on punishing the treachery of Sháwir, again sent Sheerkooch into Egypt with a great army, and accompanied by his nephew, the famous Saladin. Sháwir again sought to strengthen himself by an alliance with Amaury, from whom he received the first intelligence of the meditated invasion. Apprised of this knowledge of his movements, Sheerkooch changed his course from Bilbeys, entered the valley of the Nile at some distance above Cairo, and crossing the river marched northwards to El-Geezeh. Here he endeavoured to raise the people against Sháwir and his Frank confederates; and had in some measure succeeded when the superior forces of the enemy

compelled him to retreat southwards as far as El-Bábyen, near Ashmooneyn, where he risked an engagement, and gained a complete victory. This success opened to the invaders the greater part of Egypt, and Alexandria itself fell into their hands. Saladin was placed in that city with a numerous garrison, and his uncle departed to subdue the rest of Egypt. The Crusaders, however, at once closely invested Alexandria, and so pressed the siege for three months, as to oblige Sheerkooch to come to its relief. An honourable compromise was effected, by which the Syrians agreed to resign their conquests and evacuate Egypt. But fresh troubles were in store for this unfortunate country. Amaury, irritated at the result of a campaign in which he had only lost, determined on an expedition against his recent ally; and, entering Egypt, took Bilbeys, putting its inhabitants to the sword, and laid siege to El-Káhíreh, his course being marked by the most dreadful barbarities. On his approach, the ancient city of El-Fustát was set on fire by order of the vizir, to prevent it falling into the enemy's hands, and it continued burning somewhat more than fifty days. El-Ádid now earnestly sought the aid of Noureddin; and that monarch, actuated by religious zeal against the Franks, who had already felt his power in Syria, and by the desire of conquest, once more despatched Sheerkooch. In the meantime negotiations had been opened with Amaury to raise the siege of El-Káhíreh, on payment of an enormous sum of money; while, however, the conditions were yet unfulfilled, the approach of the Syrian army induced him to retreat in all haste. Sheerkooch and Saladin entered the capital in great state, were received with honour by the caliph and with obsequiousness by the perfidious Sháwir, who was contriving a plot which was fortunately discovered and for which he paid with his head. Sheerkooch was then appointed vizir by El-Ádid, but dying very shortly, he was succeeded in that dignity by Saladin 564 (A. D. 1169).

For the short period which elapsed before Saladin's assumption of the title of sultan a few words will suffice. One of his first acts was to put to death the chief of the eunuchs, and a revolt of the blacks resulted; a combat took place in El-Káhíreh in the street called Beyn-el-Kasreyn; and the malcontents being worsted, the disturbances were quelled. Bahá-ed-Deen Karákoosh, a white eunuch, who afterwards played a prominent part in the reign of Saladin, was appointed to the vacant post. This gave the vizir great influence in the palace, of which he judiciously availed himself. In 565 we hear of Amaury with Greek allies unsuccessfully besieging Damietta; and in the following year, Saladin conducted an expedition against the Franks to Ascalon and Ramleh. In 567, by order of Noureddin, he suppressed the name of El-Ádid in the congregational prayers, and substituted that of the 'Abbásee caliph, a masterly stroke of policy to secure the adhesion of the orthodox Muslims. The last of the Fátimées was lying dangerously ill, and his relations concealed from him his degradation. He died without the knowledge of it, and with him perished an illustrious but unfortunate dynasty.

Saladin was thus relieved of the most serious obstacle on his way to the throne; yet he dared not throw off his allegiance to the sultan of Damascus, but prudently waited for a favourable opportunity. Noureddin's suspicion was already aroused, and he died (in 569) while secretly preparing to proceed in person to Egypt. Saladin almost immediately proclaimed himself sultan of Egypt, and inaugurated his reign with a series of brilliant successes. With the conquest of El-Mo'izz, Egypt again took an important place among the nations; and by the wars of Saladin it became the nucleus of a great empire. But military glory was not the sole aim of this prince and his successors. The patronage they continued to extend to letters and the arts had the most beneficial effect upon the civilization of the country.

Saladin, whose full appellation was El-Melik En-Násir Saláh-ed-deen Yoosuf Ibn-Eiyooob, acquired his greatest renown by his campaigns against the Crusaders in Syria. As these belong, however, more properly to the history of those wars than to that of Egypt, they will be more briefly noticed in this place than would otherwise be necessary. The youth of El-Melik Es-Sálih Isma'eel, the son and successor of Noureddin, and the consequent confusion which prevailed in his dominions, gave Saladin a fair pretext to occupy Damascus, as the guardian of the young prince, and enabled him to wrest from him his kingdom. He thus considerably enlarged his territory, made himself master of a great portion of Syria, and continued to consolidate his power in those parts until the year 572 (A. D. 1178), when

Philip, count of Flanders, laid siege to Antioch, and Saladin entered Palestine. Having encamped before Ascalon, the Egyptian troops ravaged the neighbouring country, and set fire to Joppa, until at length Baldwin the Leper, king of Jerusalem, issued from Ascalon and gave them battle. The result was disastrous to Saladin: his army was totally routed, and he himself fled alone on a dromedary. After this, however, he gained some partial advantages over the Christians, till a terrible famine induced him two years later to conclude a truce with the king of Jerusalem; and to retire to Egypt.

In the year 576 he again entered Syria and made war on Kiliç-Arslán, the Seljookee sultan of Anatolia, and on Leon, king of Armenia, the Cilicio-Armenian kingdom, both of whom he forced to make terms of peace. Not long after his return, Saladin departed from Egypt (A. H. 578) to prosecute a war with the Crusaders in which neither side desired peace. Their hostility was aggravated by the following circumstances. A vessel bearing 1500 pilgrims had been wrecked near Damietta, and its passengers captured; and to the remonstrances of the king of Jerusalem the sultan replied by complaining of the constant inroads made by Renaud de Chátillon. At this time the latter turbulent chief undertook an expedition against Eyleh, and for this purpose constructed boats at Karak and conveyed them on camels to the sea; but this flotilla was repulsed, and the siege raised by a fleet sent thither by El-Ádil ("Saphedin"), the brother of Saladin, and then his viceroy; and a second attempt was still more unfortunate, the Christian captives on that occasion were sacrificed in the valley of Mina. Having threatened Karak, Saladin encamped at Tiberias, and ravaged the territory of the Franks; he then besieged Beyroot, but in vain; and thence turned his arms against Mesopotamia and subdued the country, but the city of Mosul successfully resisted him. In the meanwhile, the Crusaders contented themselves with miserable forays across the enemy's borders, and made no serious preparations for the return of their redoubtable antagonist. The latter, having been almost everywhere successful in Mesopotamia, took Tell-Khálid and 'Eyn-Táb in Syria and obtained possession of Aleppo; he again besieged Karak, ravaged the territory of Samaria, and later received the fealty of the lord of Mosul, but not the keys of the city.

In the year 582 (1186 of our era) war again broke out between Saladin and the Crusaders. The sultan had respected a truce into which he had entered with Baldwin the Leper, and Renaud, before named, was the first to break it. The capture by the latter of a rich caravan enraged Saladin, who despatched orders to all his lieutenants and vassals, summoning them to assist in the "Holy War." He marched (A. D. 1187) from Damascus to Karak, and there laid close siege to Renaud; at the same time a large body of cavalry under the command of his son, El-Afdal, advanced on Nazareth; and here a body of 130 Knights Hospitallers and Templars, seconded by a few hundred foot soldiers, and encouraged by the heroic Jacques de Maillé, marshal of the Temple, by their devotion immortalized their memory. Only the Grand Master of the Temple and two of his knights escaped from the unequal struggle. Soon after, Saladin approached in person at the head of an army of 80,000 men; and the Christians with their whole force encountered him on the shore of the Lake of Tiberias. The result of the battle which ensued was the heaviest blow which had yet fallen on the Crusaders. Weakened by thirst, shaken by the flight of a part of their troops on the second day of combat, and overwhelmed by numbers, the knights fought with desperate courage, but at length were forced to the hills of Hitteem. A multitude fell in this bloody fight, and among the prisoners were Guy