Egypt Exploration Society

Menes and Narâm-Sin

Author(s): W. F. Albright

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Apr., 1920), pp. 89-98

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853610>

Accessed: 24-10-2015 01:26 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Egypt Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

MENES AND NARÂM-SIN

BY DR W. F. ALBRIGHT

BEFORE proposing a synchronism between the first dynastic king of Egypt and the greatest of early Babylonian kings, one cannot but hesitate, fearful of seeming reckless. It may possibly be that we are dealing with a mere coincidence, extraordinary perhaps, but fallacious, and that the supporting indications will reveal themselves as conspirators against the truth. Yet the lines of evidence, geographical, historical, chronological and archaeological, converge so remarkably in the direction of our thesis that we ought not to shrink from the test—*o bere o affogare!*

Narâm-Sin, fifth monarch of the Dynasty of Akkad, says in a triumphal inscription on a statue found at Susa by the *Délégation en Perse*, that he defeated Mani of Magan: *Magān inār u Maniu[m] bél Magān* []¹, 'Magan he smote and Mani lord of Magan []'. In a Babylonian chronicle² we read (II, 10, 4): *ana Magāna illik-ma Mannu dannu šar Magān [qātsu ikšud]* = (II, 38, 17 f.) [*ana Ma]gāna illiku-ma Magāna ičbatu-ma* [] *šar Magāna qātsu ikšud[u]*, '(Narâm-Sin) who went to Magan, and vanquished (not 'captured') [Mannu, the mighty], king of Magan.' The fact that king Mannu is here called *dannu*, 'mighty,' is very important, as no other of the princes conquered by Narâm-Sin has this honorific title in his inscriptions except the latter himself, who, in common with the others of his dynasty, affixes *dan(n)u^m* to his name: *Narām-Sin dan(n)u^m šar kibrāti^m arba'i^m*, 'Narâm-Sin, the mighty, king of the four quarters.' The lord of Magan must have been a powerful ruler to receive so illustrious an appellative.

The forms *Maniu^m* and *Mannu* indicate a basic **Manni*; *u^m* is the nominative ending, affixed regularly, like Lat. *us*, to stems ending in *i* (cf. *Guti*, *Guti^m*; *Suti*, *Suti^m*) in Old Akkadian. The name **Manni* is, I believe, as exact an equivalent as attainable in cuneiform of the early pronunciation of *Mni* = *Μήνις*. The late translation of the name as *αἰδιος*, if approximately correct, shows that *Mni* is a qualitative from *mn*, 'be stable, remain³,' with the pronunciation *Mannei⁴*, and the meaning 'steadfast' (Ar. *Uatīq*), or the like.

Magan may now be identified beyond reasonable doubt with Egypt, despite the general

¹ THUREAU-DANGIN, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften*, p. 166, h, Col. 2.

² Published by KING, *Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonian Kings*.

³ Eg. *mn* corresponds to Ar. *banna*, 'remain,' by dissimilation for **manna*; cf. the many exact parallels given by RUŽIČKA, *Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen*, pp. 92—95. Ember now adopts this etymology in preference to Heb. *בטח*, 'be firm, secure,' which is probably Eg. *imn*, 'conceal,' as pointed out by Steinbach.

⁴ It is impossible in a note to give a clear idea of my work in the field of Egyptian vocalization, which has placed the phenomena of vocalic development from Proto-Semitic to Coptic on the same secure basis that the consonantal development now is (*pace* critics of some injudicious paragraphs in my "Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology"). I will only remark here that the two qualitative types *ꜥꜣꜥ* and *ꜣꜣꜣ* are to be derived from **ḥabsey* < **ḥabsej* and **mēney* < **māney* < **mannej* (like *ꜥꜣꜥ* < **rāsej* < *ra's* = Ar. *ra's*, Assyr. *rēšu*), respectively. Doubling was given up in Old Egyptian, as in modern English; Coptic doubling is secondary, as shown by Sethe, Steindorff, Spiegelberg, and Lacau.

impression to the contrary, shared by no less an authority than Eduard Meyer. This consensus of opinion is based partly upon erroneous data, and partly upon the sheer inertia of old preconceptions. In the Assyrian inscriptions of the seventh century, as is well known—Winckler's unfortunate theories are now forgotten, and his fame rests secure on Boghaz-keui, so no disrespect to his genius is intended—*Magan* and *Meluḫa* are employed as archaic terms for *Muṣr* and *Kûs* (pronounced *Kôš*), Egypt and Ethiopia, respectively, just as Esarhaddon calls Melid (Melitene) *Ḥanigalbat*, and Nabopolassar gives the name Subartu to Assyria. That this is not a mere display of inventive erudition on the part of Assyrian historiographers is certain from the Amarna letters, where *Meluḫa* appears repeatedly as a synonym of *Kaši* = later Eg. *Kôš*, Nubia¹. It is, therefore, only rational to suppose that *Magan* and *Meluḫa* refer to Egypt and Ethiopia, or contiguous lands, in the inscriptions of the preceding (third) millennium as well.

The first scholar in recent times to advocate the identification of *Magan* and *Meluḫa* with Egypt and Ethiopia is Haupt, whose article on the subject appeared six years ago². While it is now, perhaps, necessary to modify a few of the contentions, in the light of available evidence, it is also possible to add a number of arguments to Haupt's list. In the vocabularies, compiled in the last part of the third millennium, *Magan* and *Meluḫa*, and their products appear quite frequently. The 'tree of *Magan*,' Old Sumerian *muš-magāna* = Assyrian *musukkannu*, Heb. *mesukkan*, has been identified convincingly by Haupt³ with the *Acacia Nilotica* or *Acacia seyāl*, the shittim-wood of the Old Testament. Haupt has also pointed out⁴ that the *ušû*-stone (NÀ-KALAG), which Gudea brought from *Magan*, is black diorite, presumably from the quarries in Wādî Ḥammâmât. Gudea, *Cyl. A*, 23, 1, states that it required a year to bring the stone from *Magan* to Babylonia. Similarly, the GI-ZI (= Assyrian *kîsu*) = *qan Makkan*, 'reed of *Magan*,' is, we may suppose, papyrus (Eg. *čûf* > Heb. *sûf*)⁵. The 'pig of *Magan*' (ŠĀĜ-MĀ-GAN = *šahû makkanû*; II R, 6 cd, 28), mentioned along with *šahû* and *tabû*, 'pig,' and *kurkizannu* (perhaps = Ar. *karkadann*, 'rhinoceros'; the ideogram may not have been ŠĀĜ-TUR = *sahturrû*, 'shoat,' but ŠĀĜ-BANDA, lit. 'very large hog'), is probably the hippopotamus (Haupt), called by the Egyptians *rrî*, 'pig,' and by the Arabs *hinzîru-l-mâ'i* 'water-hog.'

Being unquestionably more remote from Babylonia, the products of *Meluḫa* are rarely mentioned. The *sāmtu*-stone, which is said to come from *Meluḫa*, is certainly not porphyry⁶, or cornelian, but malachite⁷; the Egyptians drew most of their malachite from the mines of Sinai, probably included by the Babylonians under the term *Meluḫa*, referring, it would seem (see below), to the shores of the Red Sea, south of Palestine and Egypt; it is hardly a reasonable supposition that the Sumerians were acquainted with Nubia. Ships of *Magan*

¹ Cf. KNUDTZON-WEBER, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, pp. 1154 foll., 1578.

² *Orient. Literaturzeitung (OLZ)*, Vol. xvi, cols. 488—492.

³ See *OLZ*, Vol. xvi, col. 489; *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, Vol. xxxvi, pp. 145 foll.

⁴ *OLZ*, Vol. xvi, cols. 488 foll.

⁵ The ideogram means 'upright reed,' or the like. Papyrus may have grown sporadically in Babylonia, as in Palestine. From the report of ʿUen-Amôn we know that it was exported into Asia in the eleventh century; there is no reason to doubt that it was occasionally seen in Babylonia a thousand years before, as a curiosity of Egyptian origin.

⁶ This disposes of the objections of MEYER, *Geschichte des Altertums*, third ed., § 401.

⁷ Cf. *Am. Journ. of Sem. Lang. (AJSL)*, Vol. xxxiv, p. 230. The evidence might be considerably increased. I regret to have given to Kugler credit which really belonged to Jensen, *Zeit. für Assyriol.*, Vol. x, pp. 368 ff. Cf. also *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, col. 4808.

and Meluḥa are often mentioned along with ships of Tilmun = Baḥrein, in the southern part of the Persian Gulf, not only in the vocabularies, but also in the religious texts, as in the incantation IV R, 25, Col. 1. Most interesting is the early text published by LANGDON, *Sumerian Liturgical Texts*, No. 1, where (obv. Col. 2) Magan, Meluḥa, and Tilmun are mentioned together; cf. line 5 f.: [Mà]-gan^{ki}-na an-zaga ġé-en-lal [-mà]-gi-lum Me-luḡ-ġa^{ki}-a-ġè = 'May he reach [Ma]gan, on the horizon of heaven; [] the bamboo (?)¹ barks of Meluḥa.' A sufficient commentary is provided by line 8: [] kúr-kúr-ra Nibru^{ki}-šù ġé-na-ab-tum = '[The products] of foreign lands may he bring to Nippur.' Such passages make it clear that there was a more or less flourishing sea-traffic between Babylonia and the coasts of Arabia and Africa in the third millennium: the first important station was Tylos² in the Persian Gulf, the second Meluḥa; last came Magan, 'on the horizon of heaven,' a year's journey away. In actual distance by land route Magan was evidently nearer, as no king of Meluḥa is included among the conquests of the kings of Akkad. Ships bound for Magan presumably stopped at Ƙosêr, opposite Koptos, which, as is well known, was an important port in the earliest times.

In the so-called Epic of Paradise, published by Langdon, the god *Nin-dûl-la* is appointed lord of Magan (rev. 3, 44); he is otherwise unknown³, but his name means 'Lord of wells,' associated paronomastically in our text with *utul*, 'flock.' Nindulla is apparently brought into connection with Egypt because of that country's wide reputation for fertility and abundance of potable water. It is even possible that the cult of Osiris as lord of water spread into Syria and Mesopotamia in the third millennium, just as Ba'alat of Byblos was worshipped in Egypt about the same period as *Hthr* of *Kpn*.

There can be little doubt that Hommel was correct in combining Magan with Ma'ân⁴, though this need not imply a connection with the Minaeans, who first come into the light of history more than two thousand years after Narâm-Sin. The place-name *Ma'ân* (> Heb. *Ma'ôn*) or *Ma'in* is very common, being derived from *ʿaïn*, 'spring,' and meaning, accordingly, 'well-watered region, oasis'; cf. Eth. *teʿānt*, 'encampment,' properly '(camp) by a spring⁵.' *Ma'ân* has the same basic meaning as the name *Damascus*, which means, as Haupt has made probable⁶, 'settlement in a well-watered region' (*Dār-mašqî*). Since the name *Ma'ûr* (> Heb. *Ma'ôr*, and, by vocalic assimilation, Assyr. *Muṣur*, combined by popular etymology with *miṣru*, 'boundary,' whence the form *Miṣr*) means 'fortification,' and has

¹ Sum. *gi-lum* means lit. 'flourishing' or 'flowering reed.' Bamboo is the most natural rendering, as it is the only suitable reed for making barks.

² For the identification of Tilmun with Tylos and Baḥrein, already proposed by other scholars, cf. my article "The Mouth of the Rivers" in *Am. Journ. Sem. Lang.*, Vol. xxxv, p. 183.

³ Contrast LANGDON, *Sum. Epic of Paradise*, p. 83, n. 3.

⁴ Cf. his *Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients*, p. 132. The *g* represents the ʿ, which did not exist in Sumerian. While the Sum. *ġ* appears to have been pronounced like Ar. ڭ, it is curious that, if Hommel's combination of *ganam*, 'ewe,' with Ar. *ġanam*, 'sheep,' is not a mere coincidence, *g*, not *ġ*, should be employed to reproduce the Arabic sound. However, linguistic science abounds with such apparent anomalies, due often in reality to slight phonetic differences, which make a strange impression upon a foreigner, not used to quite the same nuances of pronunciation. Another case of Sum. *g* for ʿ may be the *Gubi* or *Gubin* of Gudea, situated in the west, which I would identify with the *Ubi* of the Amarna letters, representing probably the plain of Damascus (see KNUDTZON-WEBER, *op. cit.*, pp. 1110 f.). Haupt, *OLZ*, Vol. xix, pp. 45 foll., suggests that *Ubi* may be etymologically identical with Heb. *ʿāb*, 'thicket.' Possibly *Ubi* is the same word as Heb. **ʿubî*, 'thickness,' which may have meant also 'luxuriance,' as the same stem still does in Arabic.

⁵ *OLZ*, Vol. xii, col. 69, n. 14.

⁶ *Zeit. der Deutsch. Morg. Ges.*, Vol. lxix, pp. 168 foll.

therefore been referred with great reason to the Wall of the Princes (Heb. *Šár*), *Maśān* may very plausibly be explained as the West-Semitic name of Egypt before the construction of this wall; Lower Egypt seemed like a terrestrial paradise to the tribes of the desert (Gen. xiii, 10).

The name *Meluha* is more elusive; the combinations made hitherto with Meroë, Amalek, etc., are quite impossible. *Meluha* may represent the oldest form of *Μαλαω* (*Periplus of the Erythraean*, 8), modern Berbera on the Somali coast, opposite Aden, still the principal seaport of the country (FABRICIUS, *Periplus*, p. 124). At all events, the term *Meluha* probably included Eg. *Punt*, the Somaliland. It is interesting to note that malachite, one of the products of *Meluha*, appears among the precious freight brought to Ḥatšepsôuet by the expedition to *Punt*.

Historically, an invasion of Egypt by Narâm-Sin is very probable. Sargon I, founder of the Dynasty (ca. 3000; see below), extended his conquests on the north-west to the Mediterranean, including in their scope the Silver Mountains (Taurus¹) and the Cedar Forest (Lebanon). An inscription of his enumerates three western lands subdued by his arms, Mari, Īarmûti, and Ibla. Mari is the country on the Middle Euphrates, about the mouth of the Ḥâbûr². Poebel's effort to identify Īarmûti, the Īarimûta of the Amarna texts, with the plain of Antioch (*op. cit.*, pp. 225 ff.) is untenable in the light of the Amarna correspondence; see the discussion of the problem by Niebuhr³, who identified it with the Delta, and especially by Weber⁴. It is certain that Īarimûta was a district on the sea-coast between Egypt and Byblos, and that it was a great grain-producing land, devoid of timber, under the watchful eye of the Pharaoh, who rules it through his viceroy or *râbiç*, a man with the Semitic name ĩanḥamu (*i.e.* ĩanḥam = יִנְחָם), whose authority extended from Simyra in Phoenicia to the extreme south of Palestine. The only available identification is with the Plain of Sharon, described in the inscription of Ešmûnʿazar of Sidon as a 'splendid grain land (אֶרֶץ רֵגֶן הָאֲדָרֶת)', with the principal towns of Dor and Joppa, forty-five kilometres apart. Īarimûta seems, therefore, to correspond to the Palestinian *Šefēlā*, stretching from Carmel to Gaza, a distance of a hundred kilometres. The name has survived in the Biblical *Īarmûṭ* (LXX, *Ιεριμουθ*), expressly located in the *Šefēlā* (Jos. xv, 33, 35), probably modern Ḥirbet Īarmûk (or *Īarmûṭ*), some thirty kilometres south-east of Joppa; *Īarmûṭ* means 'fertility,' precisely like *Šarôn*⁵.

Ibla has not yet been identified⁶; I would consider it as a Sumerian corruption of *Gibla*, the proper pronunciation (*cf.* Heb. gent. *Giblā*, and Gr. *βίβλος*, 'papyrus') of the name *Byblos*, which appears in the Amarna letters as *Gubla*, the *u* being due to the labial, as often, especially in Assyrian. Byblos was the most important city in Phoenicia in early times, and the only one mentioned in hieroglyphic texts of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, where it appears as *Kpn*, *Kbn*⁷. Gudea brought from Ursu in the mountains of Ibla (*i.e.* the

¹ See POEBEL, *Historical Texts*, p. 224.

² *Cf.* CLAY, *Empire of the Amorites*, pp. 103 foll.

³ *Mitt. der Vord. Ges.*, Vol. I, pp. 32—36.

⁴ KNUDTZON-WEBER, *op. cit.*, pp. 1153, 1169—1172.

⁵ *Šarôn* is derived from the stem שָׂרָה, Ar. *tārā*, Assy. *šērā*, 'swell, be fertile, luxuriant'; *cf.* *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 147. *Īar(i)mûṭ* is a specifically West-Semitic abstract formation, like Heb. *yalḏāt*, 'youth,' and is derived from an adjective **ārīm*, 'luxuriant.' The stem *urm*, from the root *rm*, 'be high,' is preserved in Ar. *urīma*, 'swell, become fat, luxuriant (of a plant),' as well as in Eg. *urm*, 'Nile inundation,' *urmiṭ*, 'swelling,' and Coptic ωλμ, 'swell, rise' (LORET, *Recueil*, Vol. XI, p. 121, n. 4).

⁶ Jensen's combination with Pieria (*ZA* 111, Vol. x, pp. 360 f.) is out of the question.

⁷ See GARDINER, *Recueil*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 21 foll., and SETHE, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Sprache*, Vol. XLV, pp. 10 foll.

Lebanon) beams of various woods, *zabalu*^m (note the Semitic names), *tulubu*^m, 'sycamore, and *ašûhu*^m, 'fir'.

The conquests of Sargon were exceeded in all directions by Narâm-Sin, who, after a prosperous reign of half a century, was deified in memory of his extraordinary achievements. In his inscriptions Narâm-Sin claims to have visited lands never before reached by his predecessors². In the north he subdued Armanu^m, presumably the Armina of the Achaemenian inscriptions two thousand years later, and in Mount Tibar in Armanu^m set up his royal stele. Tibar cannot be separated from the *Τιβάρηνοι*³ of Strabo, XII, 28 foll., later occupying the hinterland of Pharnakia and Trapezos, east of the Iris and north of the Antitaurus, the region called Kizyadna in the second millennium. As Strabo also places the Chaldaeans (Chaldians) in the same part of the country, there had evidently been a displacement from the south-east; Mount Tibar refers perhaps to part of the Antitaurus, about a hundred miles north of Pir-Husseïn near Diarbekr, where a relief of Narâm-Sin has been found *in situ*.

The *chef-d'œuvre*⁴ of Narâm-Sin's reign, however, was the invasion of Magan, to the south-west. As Magan was accessible both by land and sea, and lay beyond Palestine, Egypt is the only available identification. Moreover, Egypt was the only country at that time which was the peer of Babylonia in civilization, and whose king, therefore, might reasonably be considered by the haughty Narâm-Sin as his equal (*dannu*^m). The cuneiform records do not necessarily imply a conquest of Egypt; Mesopotamian rulers were not always more veracious than their Pharaonic contemporaries.

Thanks to the discovery of the Cairo fragment of the Palermo-stone (see below), it is reasonably certain that Menes is to be combined with Horus Naʿrmer, who completed the conquest of Lower Egypt begun by his predecessors, especially the so-called 'Scorpion.' Naʿrmer also fought with the Libyans, while his successor, ʿAḥa, had conflicts also with the Libyans and Nubians. It is likely enough that both monarchs extended their sphere of influence into Palestine, a fact in itself calculated to incur the hostility of the warlike Akkadian. There is no more difficulty in assuming a conflict between Menes and Narâm-Sin than in the case of Sennacherib and Tirhakah. At all events the two former were certainly more energetic than the two latter. In this connection it may be added that we need not assume so much exaggeration in the numbers of persons and animals which Naʿrmer claims to have captured as Meyer supposes⁵. Naʿrmer boasts of capturing 120,000 prisoners; we must remember that this refers to men, women, and children, and that Tiglathpileser IV, for example, carried away 135,000 from Chaldaea, and 60,000 from the north-east, while Sennacherib removed 208,000 persons from Chaldaea. The number of 400,000 oxen and

¹ For *ašûhu*, see MEISSNER, *Mitt. der Vord. Ges.*, Vols. XVIII, 6, p. 35, and for its Aramaic derivative אֲשׁוּחָ, Löw, *Pflanzennamen*, p. 60. According to Rashi, the אֲשׁוּחָ is the female cedar, which the ideogram shows to be impossible. The *Sidrâ Rabbâ* says that the אֲשׁוּחָ grows in Lebanon. From these statements and the ideogram *ʾiṣ-ku-gal-gal*, 'very great ṣ-ku' (cf. Assy. *ašûhâ šihâti*, 'lofty *ašûhê*'), it is evident that the *ašûhu* was a very lofty conifer, perhaps the Cilician fir (Eg. ʿš, Loret [cf. *Journ. of Eg. Arch.*, Vol. IV, p. 272], also procured from Lebanon). It is hardly probable that Eg. ʿš is a corruption of a West-Semitic *ašûh*.

² Cf. POEBEL, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

³ In this case Tabal-Tubal is a foreign corruption of the name Tibar which remained the native pronunciation for three thousand years. It is certain that Tabal is the same as Tibar; Her. VII, 78, joins the Moschi and Tibareni, just as the O.T. and the Assyrian monuments associate Mušk(i) and Tabal-Tubal.

⁴ Cf. MEYER, *op. cit.*, § 401.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 208.

1,422,000 goats (and sheep) is evidently overestimated, but *cf.* the 80,000 cattle and 800,000 sheep which Sennacherib carried away as booty from Chaldaea.

It may not be irrelevant to note that native Egyptian traditions ascribe a catastrophe to the close of Menes' reign. The folkloristic legend that Menes was slain by a hippopotamus may even be the garbled reminiscence of his death in battle with a foreign army; Naḥmer's tomb has yet to be found. Similarly, Egyptian legend transformed the pestilence which attacked the army of Sennacherib into an army of mice.

The foregoing combinations are, of course, misleading if the chronology proves recalcitrant. In the last edition of his *Geschichte des Altertums* (1914) Meyer places Menes at 3315, Narām-Sin at 2700, a divergence of over six centuries. Archaeology, however, has not been stationary, and the material published since 1914 completely alters the situation. In fact, the argument from chronology is no less favourable than that from geography and history.

Thanks to the recent discovery of the annals of Larsa, we know that the Dynasty of Isin terminated in the thirty-first year of Rīm-Sin of Larsa, which corresponds to the first of Ḫammu-raḫiḫ, who reigned, as we are assured by astronomical testimony, 2123—2080. It is therefore possible to fix the beginning of the Dynasty of Ūr at 2465 (Meyer, 2469), a date whose substantial exactness is shown by a mass of collateral evidence. The king-lists published by Père Scheil and Arno Poebel give 348 years from the accession of Sargon I to the expulsion of the Gutī by Utu-ḡegal of Erech. From the latter to Ur-Engur, head of the Dynasty of Ūr, there is a lacuna of uncertain length, occupied by a Dynasty of Erech, in the period of whose decline falls Gudea I of Lagaš, subject apparently of Lugal-kisalsi II, and a Dynasty of Adab, represented by at least one great conqueror, Lugal-anna-mundu¹. To the same period belong at least ten other patesis of Lagaš beside Gudea, including Ur-Bau, the predecessor of the latter. All these were autonomous princes, employing their own dating, contrary to the custom during the Dynasties of Akkad and Ūr, and handing down the rule by inheritance, like the Egyptian monarchs of the last part of the third millennium. The length of the lacuna cannot well be less than a century, and may easily have been two or three; 150—200 years is a moderate estimate. We may thus tentatively assign Sargon I to 3000 B.C., and Narām-Sin to 2920, as he ascended the throne 80 or 90 years later; the absolute minimum date for the latter is *cir.* 2800.

The Egyptological situation may seem hopeless at first thought; the chronology of Meyer and Breasted places Menes in the 34th century B.C., but this figure must be reduced considerably, in the light of the most recent discoveries. The discovery of the Cairo fragment of the Palermo-stone puts the chronology of this document on a much firmer basis. By far the most probable reconstruction which I have seen is that offered in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1917, pp. 107—115, by Seymour de Ricci, as it agrees with the length of reign assigned in the Turin Papyrus to Šepseskaf, Ḳeserkaf, and Saḫurēḫ. On the basis of the reverse, this scholar would then allow about 362 years for the first four registers of dynastic kings on the obverse, a number which can hardly be far from correct. The interval from Menes to the accession of Snefru can thus be hardly over 400 years, and may even be half a century less. A few corrections in the scheme should be made: the king whose name appears in the third register of the obverse of the Cairo piece is not Qebḫu (Qaḥsen), but Semerḫêt (PETRIE, *Anc. Eg.*, 1916, p. 183), while the Neḫeren (*Ntr-n*) who appears on the Palermo fragment in the fourth register is the third rather than

¹ See POEBEL, *Historical and Geographical Texts*, No. 75, a copy of an important inscription of this king.

the fifth king of the Second Dynasty; the length of the remaining reigns in the Dynasty must be reduced. As, according to this scheme, the first two Dynasties, from Menes to Nebkarêç, ruled about three centuries, the First Dynasty, covering the second and third register, may be given approximately 160 years, the Second about 140. The following interval, from the Third to the Fifth Dynasties inclusive, may be fixed at about 350 years, as shown by Meyer, following the data furnished by the Turin Papyrus, confirmed by the Palermo-stone and the monuments.

It is very instructive to observe how the figures of Manetho crumple up under the test. Dynasties III—V lasted 716 years, according to Africanus, or 739 if we add up the regnal years actually given, but the Turin Papyrus allows only half as great a duration. The last three kings preceding Nebkarêç receive 47 years on the Papyrus, but 103 in Manetho, more than twice as much. Semerhêt gets 9 years on the Palermo-stone, but 18 in Manetho, just double. In the light of these reductions, 300 years for the Thinite period, instead of Manetho's 565, must be considered a liberal allotment. Naturally the assignment of three reigns to a century, frequently advocated, following the example of Herodotos, is extravagantly high¹. Let us compare the contemporaneous situation in Babylonia, where we have accurate data. Fourteen kings of the dynasties of Upi and Kiš receive 205 years (3200—3000), an average of 15 years to a reign; the following 18 kings of Erech and Agade reign 248 years (3000—2750), an average of 14 years; the sixteen kings of Guti and Ūr rule 242 years, or 15 years apiece; sixteen kings of Isin rule 225½ years, 14 years each. Fourteen rulers of Larsa reign 265 years, or 19 years each. It is hardly accidental that the Babylonian average we have found, 15 years, if multiplied by 43, the number of kings in the first five dynasties, according to Manetho, will give 645 years, in perfect accord with the available data from the monuments.

On the basis of the 955 years apparently counted in the Turin Papyrus for the period from Menes to the end of the Eighth Dynasty, Meyer has assigned 420 years to the first two. Even if the number 955 does refer to this interval, which is not certain, though probable, we can hardly take it too seriously, being the computation of a Nineteenth Dynasty scribe. In view of the tendency of Egyptian chronologers to exaggerate the antiquity of their country, we may safely discount it; the reduction by fourteen per cent. which would be required if our results are correct is, *a priori*, very reasonable. Even Babylonian scribes, despite their praiseworthy respect for accuracy, seldom found in Egypt, show a marked tendency to swell their numbers in the process of time: *e.g.* Berossos ascribes a duration of over 34,000 years to the period from the flood to the First Dynasty of Babylon, 2000 more than is allowed by the lists from the latter Dynasty; Nabonidos places Narâm-Sin 3200 years before his time, an excess of 800 years²; king-list A gives Ḫammurabi (Cammu-raḫiḫ) 55 years, a number presumably secured by the mechanical addition of the 12 years assigned

¹ Even if all the kings stood in a lineal genealogical relation to one another, which is far from being the case, three reigns to a century is too high. In ancient Babylonia we have two genealogical series, without interruption, five kings of Ūr, who ruled 117 years, or 23 each, and five kings of Isin, who reigned 94 years, an average of 19 years. In late Assyrian times we have two series of five, reigning 99 and 100 years respectively, or 20 years to each king, probably a good average for all such computations. There is one exception, in early Babylonia, where ten monarchs of the First Dynasty of Babylon, each son of the preceding, rule 285 years, or 28 apiece. The reigns in this Dynasty are extraordinarily high, and are, moreover, absolutely certain.

² Elsewhere I shall prove that this is not a mere guess of the great archaeologist king, but was a *bona fide* computation, on the basis of the available lists.

him as king of Larsa in the Larsa list to the 43 years given him correctly by the Babylonian annals¹.

Meyer allows 400 years for the dark period between the close of the Sixth Dynasty and the rise of the Twelfth, a duration agreeing closely with Eusebius' figures, and more than half as large as the extravagant allotment of Africanus, who assigns six centuries to the Herakleopolitan kings alone. Since some dynastic contemporaneity at this time is certain, it is impossible to escape the conviction that the Manethonian numbers are grossly excessive, just as in the next dark period, from the Thirteenth to the Seventeenth inclusive, where the most cogent astronomical and monumental evidence requires the reduction of the length of 1590 years given by Africanus to little over two centuries². Accordingly, I shall propose the reduction of the interval in question from 783 years (Africanus) to about 160 (see below), fixing the rise of the Sixth Dynasty at *cir.* 2300 B.C. The material curtailment of the duration of the period is also required by the succession of nomarchs³, as well as by the intimate relationship of the cultures of the Sixth and Twelfth Dynasties. Moreover, the quarry dates (*cf.* MEYER, *Chronologie*, pp. 178 ff.) point to the same conclusion. Nebtaurêc Mentuhotep IV worked at Hammâmât two to three calendar months after Pepi I, which would place the latter 240—360 years earlier; our estimate from other considerations is 250. Una relates that in the reign of Merenrêc I he had great difficulty, owing to the low Nile, in bringing a stone table of offerings to Sakḳâreh in a ship which had been built during seventeen days of Epiphi. For a heavy-laden vessel navigation would be very hard after the first of March; if we allow several weeks for loading and transportation, Epiphi will coincide with January, in accord with our chronology.

There is every reason to suppose that the Egyptian Empire became greatly weakened during the long inactivity of Pepi II's ninety-year reign; it is certain that the following nine rulers, assigned by the Turin Papyrus to the Sixth and Eighth Dynasties, were ephemeral, as the five lengths of reigns preserved total ten years, two years each, an average no higher than in the Thirteenth Dynasty. The Tablet of Abydos gives 17 kings after Merenrêc II, a fuller list than that of the Papyrus, which omitted a few names. The penultimate king, Neferkeuhôr, who apparently reigned two years, was still able to publish his decrees at Koptos, so it is evident that the Herakleopolitans had not yet declared their independence. The Turin Papyrus shows that the Memphite kingdom did not last more than forty years after the demise of the aged Pepi II.

The two Herakleopolitan Dynasties (Nine and Ten) fall between the close of the Eighth and the triumph of Mentuhotep III, the exact date of which is not known, but lies between 2050 and 2020. After the clarification by WEILL, *op. cit.*, of the processes involved in the swelling of the length of the Hyksos period, involving especially the reduplication of dynasties and numbers, we can hardly doubt that the Ninth Dynasty, with 19 kings and 409 (100) years, and the Tenth, with 19 kings and 185 years, are simple doublets, an impression confirmed by the Turin Papyrus, which gives here 18 kings for the whole

¹ This may afford a hint as to one of the causes of the exaggeration of Egyptian dates; the scribes and historiographers were not liars, though they must have been very careless. When divergent numbers came into their hands, they showed due respect for the sacredness of the records by adopting both! It can easily be imagined how rapidly the chronology would swell, under such treatment.

² The best study of the chronological situation, with a serious attempt to explain the origin of the Manethonian numbers, is found in Weill's monograph, *La période comprise entre la XIIIe et la XVIIIe dynastie*, in *Journ. As., onzième série*, Tome VI (1915), pp. 1—150.

³ *Cf.* LIEBLEIN, *Recherches*, pp. 68—71.

Herakleopolitan rule. The Hyksos parallel, and the situation in the Eighth and Thirteenth Dynasties suggest that we may safely adopt the least number given, a century, and regard that as probably too large!

The only approximately correct number for the whole period is the duration of 160 years for the Eleventh Dynasty, which we owe to the Turin Papyrus. The rulers of this Dynasty fall into three sections (*cf.* WINLOCK, *Am. Journ. of Sem. Lan.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 1 ff.): nomarchs of Thebes, rulers of Upper Egypt only, and kings of all Egypt. The rulers of the second series were engaged in conflict with the Herakleopolitans for the hegemony; after a long war Nebhepetrê^c Mentuhotep III (II) won the victory, and reunited the land under one sceptre. About a generation later, the Eleventh Dynasty was replaced by the Twelfth (B.C. 2000). While it is difficult to say just when the Theban rulers became autonomous, this may well have occurred immediately after the death of Pepi II, when the decay of Memphite power was evident to all. This assumption leaves ample space for the Herakleopolitans: 160 - (40 [Memphite] + 30 [Theban]) gives 90 years for the Ninth—Tenth Dynasty, which, as has been pointed out above, is a very reasonable estimate. In Babylonia there is an interesting parallel to this situation. The decline of the empire of Ūr set in with the end of Dungi's reign of 58 years; thirty-two years later Larsa declared its independence, followed by Isin, whose first king, Išbi-Urra of Mari (see above), finally conquered Ūr nine years after the beginning of the Larsa Dynasty. While the latter began first, the Dynasty of Isin was considered legitimate.

Adding the data thus obtained, the accession of Menes will fall about 2950; the absolute minimum is 2850. Menes seems to have ruled about forty years, to infer from the Palermo-stone; as Narâm-Sin reigned 44 (or 54) years, there is some scope for overlapping.

If Menes flourished in the thirtieth century, instead of the thirty-fourth, or thirty-ninth, it is difficult, though not impossible, to place the date of the introduction of the calendar so early as 4240; one would hardly feel justified in assuming so great a degree of civilization at so remote a predynastic period. On the other hand, it is quite reasonable to suppose that the definite fixing of the calendar took place at the commencement of the next Sothic cycle, in 2780, shortly after the beginning of the Second Dynasty, according to our chronology. It is interesting to note that Kechoos, second king of this Dynasty, is said to have introduced the cult of Apis, an event which the Sothis Book refers to Aseth, last of the Hyksos kings, connecting it with his introduction of the five epagomenae and establishment of the vague year (*cf.* MEYER, *Chronologie*, p. 39). As the worship of Apis is much older than the Hyksos period, it is not impossible that both acts were transferred erroneously from Kechoos to Aseth, and that the Egyptians had a tradition that the calendar was fixed during the reign of the former, whose accession would fall about 2780, according to our dates. However, this suggestion is as precarious as the sources upon which it is based.

Following is a synchronistic table of the early chronology of Egypt and Babylonia, to illustrate our conclusions:

EGYPT	BABYLONIA
3000 The 'Scorpion'	3000 Dynasty of Akkad, Sargon I
2950 First Dynasty, Menes	—
—	2925 Narâm-Sin
—	—
2780? Introduction of Calendar	2775 Irruption of the Guti
—	—
—	—

EGYPT	BABYLONIA
2650 Third Dynasty, Nebkarê ^c	2650 Utu-ġegal expels the Guti
—	—
—	—
2550 Fourth Dynasty, Ĥufu	—
—	2500 Gudea I
—	—
2450 Fifth Dynasty, Ueserkaf	2465 Dynasty of Ur, Ur-Engur
—	—
—	—
—	2348 Dynasty of Isin, Išbi-Urra
2300 Sixth Dynasty, Teti	—
—	—
—	2225 Dynasty of Babylon, Sumuabum
—	—
2160 Eleventh Dynasty, Theban	2153 Elamite conquest of Larsa
2120 Dynasty of Herakleopolis (Ninth--Tenth)	2123 Fall of Isin; accession of Ĥammurabi
—	—
2030 Fall of Herakleopolis	—
2000 Twelfth Dynasty	—
	—
	1925 Fall of First Dynasty of Babylon

In conclusion, it must be emphasized that our results, if correct, will not depress the antiquity of Egyptian civilization unduly in favour of Mesopotamia. So far as appears on the surface, the age of Menes in Egypt was no less cultured than the epoch of Narâm-Sin in Babylonia. The Egyptians wrote on perishable papyrus¹, the Babylonians on indestructible clay; it is the misfortune of the former to have employed the more perfect, but more fragile writing material. If a papyrus cache from the Thinite period ever comes to light, we shall get a different impression of the civilization of the age in Egypt. During the long centuries of the kingdoms of Upper and Lower Egypt before Menes, writing must have been cultivated to an extent not varying much from the scope of cuneiform in the centuries before Sargon the Elder. Both Egypt and Babylonia began to date by annual events at about the same time; the earliest known Babylonian dates of this type come from the reign of Šargališarri, Narâm-Sin's successor. Architecturally, the Egyptians of the Thinite period were probably not behind the contemporaneous Babylonians; in the Memphite age they completely outdistanced the latter, whose *ziggurâti* never reached the perfection of the pyramids. In sculpture the two peoples kept pace more closely, if we may judge from the statues of Gudea and Ĥafrê^c, whose similarity in technique has often been noticed, though the latter is superior in execution; according to our chronology, the two works are coëval. The same parallelism may be observed in the external civilization. In the 26th century Snefru controlled the lands adjacent to Egypt on all sides, sending his fleets on the Mediterranean and the Red Sea; a few decades later Gudea was able to send his peaceful missions to Syria and Egypt, by land and by sea. The last great period of the Old Empire, from Saĥurê^c to Pepi II (2450—2200), is parallel in civilization and achievements to the Babylonian Empire, from Dungi to the decline of the Dynasty of Isin with Bûr-Sin (2247—2206). Very many additional comparisons might be adduced, but the foregoing is surely enough to show the reasonableness of the reconstruction of ancient chronology defended in this paper.

¹ Papyrus must have been used for writing purposes in pre-dynastic times, as follows from the use of ink to write hieroglyphs on clay.