CT 52

EGYPT AND THE PRE-HOMERIC GREEKS.

HOMER has been called by a very late Greek poet of the Anthology, 'the second sun of the life of Hellas.' In the warm light of his poem a world of men is alive, a world that we know from no other source. The sunshine of Homer breaks for a moment through the darkness of time, and the Achaeans and Danaans, when that light is withdrawn, fade back again into the obscurity that shrouded them before, like Children of the Mist. Of their history and of the development of their civilisation before the Homeric age, we have no authentic account, and of what befell them when the epics fail us, up to the moment when Greek literary records begin, we learn but vaguely from legend and tradition. Yet it is plain that a people so essentially civilised as the people amidst whom Homer sung, must have had a long training in experience of life, and in the knowledge of foreign culture. On the nature of that training and that early history, it has for some time been believed that light was cast by the Egyptian monuments. Within the last year, however, the 'History of Egypt,' by Dr. Brugsch, has been published and translated into English. The aim of some chapters in that learned work is to destroy the idea that the prehistoric Greeks had any connection with Egypt. The present article will be devoted to a consideration of the arguments for and against the opinions that the ancestors of Homer's Greeks were well acquainted with the empire on the Nile. It may be as well, in the first place, to sketch a picture of what that empire was like, in the distant years when the Achaeans and Danaans did not yet possess their sacred poet.

When we read Homer, we find ourselves in the morning of the world. Society has not yet fixed, by hard and fast limits, the special duties and conditions of human existence. The division of labour is still all but unknown. The king of one island may become the thrall, the swineherd, in another. The leader in war is a carpenter, a shipwright, a mason in time of peace. The merchant is a pirate on occasion, and the pirate a merchant. Each day brings variety and adventure to men who are ready for every vicissitude, and who still find in all experience, in war, storm, and shipwreck, in voyage of discovery, in the marvels of great towns, and in the peril of enchanted islands, something delightfully fresh and strange. The Homeric Greeks, in spite of the orderliness of their public and domestic life, are still like children, easily moved to wonder, easily adapting themselves to every change of fortune, and only impatient of dull drill, and of routine.

With Homer's men, we live in a young world; but on their very border, and within their knowledge, there existed a world already old, rich, artificial, and the slave of habit. The island of Crete was a part of heroic Greece; it owned Agamemnon as its over-lord, and from Crete he drew some of his bravest warriors. Within five days' sail of the island (if a ship had a fair north wind in her sails), were the mouths of 'the River of Egypt,' and the 'most fruitful fields of the Egyptian men' (Odyssey, xiv. 257). In Egypt, when Homer sung, civilisation had passed its noon, and was declining to its evening. Thus in 'Hundred-gated Thebes, where lies the greatest store of wealth in the houses' (Iliad, ix. 381; Odyssey, iv. 127), were already found the extremes of wealth and poverty, and the fixed divisions of society. Already the day-long and life-long labour which the Greeks detested deformed the bodies of the artisans.

> The weaver, within his four walls, is more wretched than a woman; his knees are lifted to the height of his heart, he never breathes the free air. . . . . The armourer has great toil and labour when he carries his wares into far-off countries. A heavy price he must pay for his beasts of burden when he sets out on his journey, and scarce has he returned to his home when again he must depart. . . . . Every worker in metals fares more hardly than the delvers in the fields. *His* fields are the wood he works on, his tools the metal wherewith he toils. In the night, when he should be free, he is labouring still, after all that his hands have wrought during the day. Yes, through the night he toils by the light of the burning torches. . . . . Thus all arts and trades are toilsome; but do thou, my son, love letters and cleave to them. Letters alone are no vain word in this world; he who betakes himself to them is honoured by all men, even from his childhood. He it is that goes forth on embassies and that knows not poverty.—(Maspéro, 'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient,' p. 127. Translation of Egyptian epistle.)

What a modern picture this is! How unlike anything that Homer has to draw, though he, too, pities the toil of the woman who lives by her loom, and of the woman grinding at the mill! The letter from which this sketch of Egyptian life is quoted was written by a certain scribe under the Nineteenth Dynasty, some fourteen hundred years before the birth of Christ. It was written, probably, at the very time when the children of Israel were suffering from cruel taskmasters, who 'made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and brick, and all manner of service in the field; all their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour.' To that Egypt, where the Hebrews were bond-slaves, the ancestors of Homer's Greeks may have come as pirates, or as hostile settlers, and may have remained as mercenary soldiers, or as labourers. Thus when Odysseus tells a feigned tale about his adventures in Egypt, he declares that he invaded the country, that his men were defeated, 'and some the Egyptians slew, and some they led away alive, to toil for them perforce' (Odyssey, xiv. 272). The monuments of an age much earlier than that of Homer, of an age between the dates of Joseph and of the Exodus, have been generally interpreted in the same sense as the story of Odysseus. They have been supposed to prove that, while the Israelites were yet in Egypt, or had but recently left it, the prehistoric Greeks fought there, were defeated, and became the mercenaries of the Pharaohs. There can scarcely be a more interesting or romantic moment in history than this was, if the usual reading of the monuments is correct. The early Greeks are learning a sense of their own national unity, and are gaining their first sight of an advanced civilisation, on the same soil as that where the Hebrews learned the same lessons. The romantic interest of this theory must not, however, lead us to neglect the arguments urged against it by Dr. Brugsch. Let us examine, then, the foreign relations of Egypt at this period, and the evidence as to Homer's knowledge of one of the peoples who have bequeathed to us our art, our politics, science, philosophy, and our religion.

The Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twentieth Dynasties of Egypt bore sway, widely speaking, during the centuries which passed between 1700 B.C. and 1100 B.C. In these ages the Egyptian empire reached the summit of her wealth and power. Her arms were carried victoriously northward, into Asia Minor, southwards down the Nile valley, and the Arabian Gulf, and across the 'great sea' to Cyprus. On the walls of her temples may still be seen the painted procession of captive or tributary races. These races are mentioned by names which it is not always possible to attach, with certainty, to known peoples, but the pictures themselves often afford the clearest evidence as to types of race. The Egyptians, broadly speaking, knew four races. These were the black men, negroes, whose type is unchanged; the hook-nosed Semitic peoples, whose features survive in the Jews; the Egyptians themselves, painted in a conventional victorious red, and lastly, the white non-Asiatic races of northern Africa, and of the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean. It was chiefly with the thick-lipped and curly-haired blacks of the interior, or with the Phoenicians and other Semitic races, that the Egyptians of the sixteenth century before Christ had to do. From the Hittites of the Orontes valley and other Asiatic tribes, conquered in the great battle of Megiddo, Thothmes III. took as tribute all those marvels of Sidonian art that Homer is never weary of extolling. The representations of the gold and silver vases on the monuments prove that Homer did not exaggerate the merit of the Phoenician craftsmen. Thothmes III. boasts how he took 'many golden dishes, and a large jug with a double handle, a Phoenician work.' He also acquired 'chairs with the foot-stools to them of ivory and cedar wood' (Brugsch, i. 327). We are reminded of Homer's description of the chair which Icmalius 'wrought with ivory and silver, and joined thereto a footstool that was part of the chair itself' (Odyssey, xix. 57). The horses of the Asiatic enemy also fell into the hands of Thothmes with the golden-studded chariots which had been framed in the isle of Cyprus, 'the land of the Asebi,' the very country where Homer places his most skilful artificers. It was thus that the Pharaohs dealt with their Semitic enemies, while from the negroes they took, as tribute, leopards and apes, incense and fragrant woods, and slaves, and tusks of ivory.

Such were the relations of the Egyptians with two out of the four races into which they divided the dwellers in the world. From the white-skinned peoples of Northern Africa, and from their allies, also white, who came from the isles and coasts of the great sea, Egypt took little by way of tribute. They rather came to seek her; it was not she who wished to attack them. As early as the reign of Thothmes III., the victor over the Asiatics at Megiddo, the monuments speak of the *Tamahu*, the 'people of the North,' and of the 'tribes of the islands.' Among these the most conspicuous at first were called *Tahennu*, the 'white men' of Northern Africa. Early in the reign of Ramses II. (about 1450 B.C.) the monarch boasts of conquests over 'the barbarians of the north, and the Libyans, and the warriors of the great sea' (Chabas, 'Études,' p. 184). It is among these 'warriors of the great sea' that we seem to recognise those indubitably powerful Mediterranean peoples, the ruins of whose vast Cyclopean cities, built before the dawn of history, crown many an isolated rocky height, and command many a harbour and creek, on the shores of Greece, Italy, and the islands. These warriors, in short, were in all probability the ancestors of Homer's more than half-mythical heroes.

For more than two centuries Egypt was exposed to the attacks and invasions of these northern peoples. Her wealth, her rich soil, her soft climate, and the beginnings of her decrepitude, attracted the maritime tribes, and the races of the Lybian mainland. As we read the accounts of these invasions in the inscriptions, we are irresistibly reminded of the similar excursions of the Northmen 'on viking.' The very language of the monuments reads like the language of the English chroniclers who went in fear of Danish pirates. The first recorded inroad on a large scale by the confederated forces of Libya and the maritime powers was made in the time of Ramses II. This king began his reign by an exploit which brought him into collision, according to some authorities, with the tribes which later succoured Ilion. In the battle of Kadesh he checked the power of the Khita or Hittites, with their allies, the Leku, the Dardani, the warriors of Carchemish, 'all the peoples from the extremest end of the sea, to the land of the Khita.' In the Khita some authorities see the otherwise mysterious Keteians who were led to fight for Troy by Eurypylus the son of Telephus (Odyssey, xi. 519). In the Dardani they remark the familiar Dardanians of Homer, and in the 'Leku' the no less familiar Lycians. Dr. Brugsch, the determined opponent of views so easy and so pleasing, is not content with these identifications. He thinks that the Leku are not the Lycians, but a much less powerful and important tribe, 'the Legyes mentioned by Herodotus as a people of Asia Minor' (Herodotus, vii. 72). Now the Greeks called all the wide-spread Ligurians of the north Mediterranean coast 'Legyes,' so it is not easy to see why, if 'Leku' is 'Legyes,' the allies of the Khita may not have come from Trieste or from the shores under the Maritime Alps. The Dardanians again are not, so Dr. Brugsch holds, the Dardanians with whom we are all familiar, but a sept named once by Herodotus (i. 189). Yet even the Dardanians of Herodotus were next neighbours of the Paphlagonians, who, in their turn, are numbered by Homer among the allies of Priam. Thus, even on the showing of Dr. Brugsch, the Asiatic enemies of Agamemnon, and the Asiatic enemies of Ramses II. drew their allies from the same districts. But why should we look for an obscure sept of Dardani on the Tigris, people only casually alluded to by Herodotus, writing a thousand years later? We might as plausibly identify the Dardani who fought against Ramses II. with the Dardani who, according to Strabo, lived in dens excavated under dunghills in Illyria, but possessed an unaffected taste for music.

When he attacked the Leku, Khita, and Dardani, Ramses II. was aided by some foreign mercenaries, called the Shardana 'of the sea.' These men are called 'the King's prisoners,' and it is probable that they had first been made captives in some war with North Africa, and afterwards trained to bear arms with the native Egyptian soldiery. The name of the Shardana, with that of other maritime peoples, was soon to be terrible to the Egyptians. The reign of Ramses II. lasted very long—no less than sixty-eight years—and it is possible that the government of Egypt shared the weakness of the king's old age. However that may be, Ramses II. had not long lain within his strangely humble tomb when the Libyans, with the peoples of the Mediterranean, invaded the empire. The story of the invasion is told by reliefs and inscriptions on the walls of a little court to the south of the precinct of the chief temple at Carnac. The inscriptions are described by Champollion, who partly deciphered them (1828), but did not identify the names of the races mentioned as hostile to Egypt. As read by the late Vicomte de Rougé, and (with occasional variations) by M. Chabas and Dr. Brugsch, they describe the war between the Libyan king and his allies on the one part, and Meneptah, son of Ramses II. (the Pharaoh of Exodus), on the other. The names of the allied powers are thus written by Dr. Brugsch: 'The A-qa-ua-sha, the Tulisha, or Turisha, the Liku, the Shair-dan, the Sha-ka-li-sha, peoples of the north which came hither out of all countries.' (Brugsch, ii. 116.) The Vicomte de Rougé spelled the names, 'Akaiusa, Tuir'sa, Leku, Shairdina, S'akalesha.' ('Mémoire sur les Attaques,' etc., p. 11.) Both authorities agree that the Rebu (Libyans) and Mashuasha (Maxyes, an African people who, in Herodotus' time, claimed Trojan ancestry) were among the invaders. All authorities agree in saying that these allies had for months pitched hostile camps in Egypt, did violence, 'plundered, loved death, and hated life.' In this inscription (translated also by Dr. Birch, 'Records of the Past,' vol. iv. p. 36), one seems to hear Gildas grumbling about the Saxons, or the English chroniclers denouncing the Danish pirates. Though Meneptah refused (on the pretence of a warning vision) to lead his troops into action, the charioteers of Egypt utterly routed the confederate hosts. Of the Libyans there fell over six thousand men, of the Shakalsha more than two hundred, many of the Shardana, whose kinsmen fought against them in the ranks of Egypt, and many of the Aqaiusha. The bloody trophies of victory, fragments and hands of the mutilated dead, were counted over before the king.

The all-important question must now be asked, who were these maritime nations, these enemies of Egypt? The spelling of their names by various interpreters does not vary so much, but that a ready answer rises to the lips. When the Vicomte de Rougé published his celebrated 'Mémoire' in 1866, he identified, as most people would be prone to do, the Aqaiusha with the Achaeans, who, in Homer's time, were the chief race in Greece. In the Shakalusha he saw the Sicilians, whom Homer frequently alludes to as slave merchants, and therefore, probably, as pirates. The Shardana were taken for the Sardinians and the Tuirsha for the Tyrrhenians or Etrurians; these famous seafarers, an identification favoured by the spelling of the Tyrsenian, or Tyrrhenian name in Oscan inscriptions. Even if these natural suggestions are adopted, it does not follow that the Tyrrhenian, Sardinian, Sicilian, and other tribes had as yet established themselves in Etruria, Sardinia, and Sicily. De Rougé's system was adopted by Maspéro, Chabas, Lenormant, and (provisionally) by Dr. Birch. It has been disturbed by the theory of Dr. Brugsch ('History of Egypt,' vol. ii. p. 124). According to Dr. Brugsch, the invaders were 'Colchio-Cretan tribes.' They came from the distant Caucasus, and from Crete, where, as Homer tells us, dwelt Achaeans, native Cretans, Cydonians, Dorians, and Pelasgians. (Odyssey, xix. 175.) Dr. Brugsch, however, says little about the Cretans among the invaders. It is from the spurs of the Caucasus and the coasts of the Black Sea that he brings the allies of the Libyans. Let us examine his reasons.

Dr. Brugsch's system is based, partly on a point of Egyptian verbal scholarship, in which no one agrees with him; secondly, on ethnological conjecture. He interprets the inscriptions about the Egyptian victory to mean that the dead Aqaiusha and Shakalsha, whose hands were cut off and brought to Meneptah, were circumcised men. No other translator, neither Dr. Birch, nor M. Chabas, nor De Rougé (and their combined opinion is of immense weight) has understood the inscription in this sense. Dr. Brugsch holds that the Libyans were despised by the Egyptians as an uncircumcised race, while the circumcised Aqaiusha and Shakalsha were comparatively respected. He argues that 'to identify *circumcised* tribes, as some have done, with the Achaeans, Sicilians, Sardinians, &c., is to introduce a serious error into the primitive history of the classical nations.' Here, then, is the negative argument; the Aqaiusha conformed to the Egyptian and the Jewish rite, therefore, they were not the Achaeans of Greece. Here two obvious answers suggest themselves; first, the translation on which Dr. Brugsch reposes is not, as yet, accepted by other scholars; second, we have no means of knowing whether the prehistoric ancestors of the Greeks did or did not practise a rite which is widely spread, especially among savage races. We only know that, in the age of Herodotus, a thousand years after this period, no tradition that the Greeks had ever practised the rite seems to have survived. It is perfectly possible that races with the Hellenic instinct for refinement at one time conformed to, but later, and long before the time of Herodotus, abandoned a custom which, in origin, seems essentially savage. In precisely the same way, the Phoenicians gave up this trait of manners when they became acquainted with the Greeks (Herodotus, ii. 104), and many Polynesian peoples are abandoning it in our own time. Again, it must be noted that Dr. Brugsch declares the Mashuasha (Maxyes) to have conformed to the Egyptian manners in this respect. Now, Herodotus, on whose evidence Dr. Brugsch elsewhere relies, omits to mention the Maxyes in his catalogue of circumcised races, while, in his account of the Maxyes, he says nothing about circumcision. Did Dr. Brugsch assume that the Maxyes conformed to the rite, *because* he found that their hands were cut off, after a battle, like the hands of the Aqaiusha? Singularly enough, the mutilation of a hand is the punishment now inflicted in Socotra, on persons who are *not* circumcised. Many other arguments derived from the practice of Polynesian races might here be adduced. It is enough to say that, even if Dr. Brugsch's translation is accepted, the authentic history of manners permits us to suppose that the Achaeans of the thirteenth century before our era may have conformed to the descriptions of the Aqaiusha in the Egyptian texts, as translated by Dr. Brugsch.

The learned German is dissatisfied with the old identification. What reasons lead him to put forward his new theory? At a first glance, it does seem very unlikely that the tribes of 'remotest Caucasus,' that 'wall of the world's end,' as the Greeks thought it, should ally themselves with Libya, and invade Egypt. No Greek tradition or legend speaks of such an alliance, while Greek legendary history starts from a supposed constant intercourse between Libya, Egypt, Sardinia, Sicily, and Greece. Herodotus however assures us, that, whether the Caucasian tribes came to Egypt or not, the Egyptians went to the Caucasus. This expedition was made, he says, under Sesostris, that is, Ramses II., the monarch on whose death the Caucasians (*teste* Brugsch) in their turn invaded Egypt! This was a singular turning of the tables. Herodotus thinks that the Colchian tribes learned Egyptian manners from the soldiers of Ramses II. Is it probable that the practice became at once so general that they could send a circumcised army to invade the realms of the son of Ramses? Here, at least, is the argument of Dr. Brugsch; the maritime invaders of Egypt conformed to the Egyptian rite, therefore, they were not the ancestors of the famous Achaeans. But the tribes of the Caucasus (a thousand years later), practised the rite, therefore it is proper to look among them for the invaders of Egypt. Yet even Dr. Brugsch has to come down to much later times for his facts. He wishes to find, among the Colchian and Caucasian mountaineers, names of tribes that correspond to the names of invaders on the monuments, and these names he finds, more than a thousand years later, in the pages of Strabo, a writer of the time of Augustus. As Dr. Brugsch goes to the Caucasus, and to Colchis, to find the invaders of Egypt, it may be as well to quote Herodotus's account of the Colchians, and of their apparent ethnological connections with the Egyptians.

> Thereafter he (Sesostris, Ramses II.) went all through the continent, even till he crossed out of Asia into Europe, where he overcame the Scythians and the Thracians. So far, and no further, methinks, came the Egyptian host, for in the land of these peoples are the memorial pillars set, and still to be seen, but beyond these they are no longer to be found. Thence he turned about, and went back, and when he came to the Phasis river, I have thereafter no clear story to tell, as to whether the King Sesostris himself sundered a portion of his army, and planted them there, or whether certain of the soldiers, being weary of wandering, chose to abide there about the River Phasis. For the Colchians seem to be of Egyptian race, and this I say as one that noted it myself, before I heard it from others. But when the thing came into my mind I made inquiry of both peoples, and the Colchians remember the Egyptians better than the Egyptians remember the Colchians. The Egyptians said they reckoned the Colchians to be in the host of Sesostris, but I guessed at the matter by this, that both Egyptians and Colchians are dark-skinned and curly haired. And this proves nothing, for other men so far resemble them; but by this I was more led to my guess, namely, that the Colchians, Aegyptians, and Aethiopians, *and they alone*, have always from the beginning practised circumcision. . . . . Come, now, I will mention other Colchian matters, to show how like they are to the Egyptians. They and the Egyptians are the only peoples that weave linen (in the same way), and all their manner of life, and the tongue they speak, resemble each other. And Colchian linen the Greeks call *Sardonikon*, but that which comes from Egypt they call Egyptian. (Herodotus, ii. 103, 104.)

So far Herodotus goes, and by aid of his evidence Dr. Brugsch recognises his circumcised *Shardana* in the Colchian makers of Sardonian linen (λίνον Σαρδονικὸν). The *Tursha* of the sea, Brugsch calls people from Mount Taurus, but it appears that philological reasoning ('if anyone is inclined to trust that,' as Herodotus would say) strongly favours De Rougé's identification of the Tuirsha with the Tyrseni, or Etruscans. The *Leku*, or *Luku*, as we have already seen, Dr. Brugsch believes to be, not Lycians, but Legyes. The *Aqaiusha* are Achaeans with Dr. Brugsch, as well as with De Rougé and Chabas, but then they are not the Achaeans of Greece or Crete, but the Achaeans of the Caucasus. This interesting tribe (the ancestors of 'the gallant Lazi') are mentioned by Strabo, some thirteen hundred years after their appearance on the monuments. According to Strabo, the Achaeans of the Caucasus were not unlike the modern buccaneers of Batoum. In his time, they dwelt near the rugged and harbourless coasts of the Black Sea. They lived somewhat inland, in the forests and glens, in which they dragged up the canoes (capable of holding about twenty-five men each), in which they made buccaneering expeditions. When an expedition was over, they returned to their fastnesses, and drank, and feasted till all was spent. It is in the ancestors of these semi-savage neighbours of the degraded 'lice-eaters,' that Dr. Brugsch recognises the allies of Libya, the men who shook the empire of Egypt. Few other students will be inclined to overlook the claims of the Achaean race, which was certainly, within four centuries, so powerful in the Levant, in favour of a remote and obscure set of savages, without history, traditions, or architectural remains. The remains of Mycenae, Orchomenos, and scores of other towns, attest the prehistoric homes of the dwellers in Greek coasts and isles. The legends of Libya, Sardinia, Sicily, Egypt, and Greece, as Pausanias shows, are all in undesigned coincidence with the Egyptian monuments, as read by De Rougé and Chabas. The contents of the oldest graves in Greek and in Sardinian soil, speak to a prehistoric intercourse with Egypt. The very sculptures on the sepulchral *stelae*, found in the Acropolis of Mycenae, are most easily explained as rude and debased imitations of the familiar Egyptian group, in which the king fights from his chariot. In face of all this tangible evidence which connects prehistoric Greece with Egypt, it seems superfluous to seek for casual similarities of name among the obscure tribes of the remote Caucasus.

The next mention of the people of the Mediterranean coasts and islands is found in the monument of Ramses III. (1200–1166 B.C.) On the walls of Medinet Habou in Western Thebes are depicted the chief events in the history of an invasion of Egypt, in the eighth year of Ramses. The inscriptions declare that 'the people quivered with desire of battle in all their limbs, they came up leaping from their coasts and islands, and spread themselves all at once over the lands.' (Brugsch, vol. ii. p. 147.) They were moved by the irresistible attraction of the south, by the force that draws the Slavonic races towards India and the Mediterranean, the force that led the Northmen to Byzantium and the Goths to Rome. 'It came to pass,' says another inscription, 'that the people of the northern regions, who reside in their islands and on their coasts, shuddered [with eagerness for battle] in their bodies. They entered into the lakes of the mouths of the Nile. Their nostrils snuffed up the wind, *their desire was to breathe a soft air.*' (Brugsch, vol. ii. p. 149.) From the reliefs and inscriptions we learn that the invasion was attempted both by land and sea. Some of the Northerners landed on the coast of Canaan, defeated the Khita, the people of Kadi (Galilee), and of Karchemish, and so advanced on Egypt. Others sailed round to the mouths of the Nile. By the rapidity of his movements Ramses III. discomfited the double attack. In the reliefs of Medinet Habou, we see the king distributing arms, we accompany the army on the march, and behold the destruction of the islanders and men of the Mediterranean coasts. A fourth picture represents the return march of the Egyptians to encounter the hostile navy, and the fifth shows us the earliest extant view of a naval battle. Ramses had formed a *cordon* of ships and boats to protect the great water-gate of Egypt. 'A defence was built on the water, like a strong wall, of ships of war, of merchantmen, of boats and skiffs. They, who had reached the boundary of my country never more reaped harvest. . . . Their ships and all their possessions lay strewn on the mirror of the waters.' (Brugsch, vol. ii. p. 148.)

Who were the islanders and coastmen who thus failed to make good their enterprise? The inscriptions give their names, the bas-reliefs present pictures of their ships, costumes, and weapons. First let us examine the names. They are read thus by Dr. Brugsch: 'Their home was in the land of the Purosatha, the Zakkar, the Shalkalsha, the Daanau, and the Uashuash.' ('The Tuirsha of the sea,' Brugsch's Taurians, and the Tyrrhenians of De Rougé, were also engaged.) For Purosatha, M. Chabas, with almost all other scholars, reads Pelesta, vaguely identified with Pelasgians, or Philistines. For Zakkar, it is usual to read Tekkri, or Tekkariu, supposed to be the classical Teucri. There is a general agreement as to the *spelling* of Shakalsha or Shalkulsha, Taanau or Daanau, and Uashuash, though not about the peoples mentioned under these names. Now here the method of Dr. Brugsch is well worth attending to; it is so extraordinary as to be almost incredible. He protests that the Shakalsha are not Sicilians, but the people of Zagylis (vol. ii. p. 124). Now what was Zagylis? It was 'a village in the time of the Romans.' There 'the last remnant of the Shakalsha still remained.' Obviously this tells us nothing. The Shakalsha are the people of Zagylis, and the people of Zagylis (some fourteen hundred years later), are—the remnant of the Shakalsha! Take another example: the Shardana are 'the Chartani,' and the Chartani are—the remains of the Shardana. Here, however, we have at least some clue as to who the Shardana were: they were not the Sardinians, but Colchians, linen-manufacturing people, inferred to exist from the term 'Sardonian linen,' in Herodotus. Let us try the Daanau; these are the classic Danai, or the Daunians, according to other students. Dr. Brugsch says they are the people of Taineia, mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy. And who are the people of Taineia? They are the remains of the Daanau. Finally, the Zakkar are identified with the Zygritae (vol. ii. p. 151), and when we ask who the Zygritae were, we find that they were a small tribe, who perpetuated the name of the Zakkar. Surely it is not a very scientific process to identify a powerful ancient race with a small one first heard of a thousand years later, and then to explain that the weak tribe is the descendant of the strong one. We think it is sufficiently obvious that Dr. Brugsch's theory is no satisfactory substitute for the older system, which recognised powerful and historical peoples of the Levant in powerful prehistoric races of almost identical names, only slightly altered by Egyptian orthography.

Let us now turn from the record of names in his inscriptions to the record of facts in the bas-reliefs. In these representations preserved to us through three thousand years, we may admire, with absolute confidence, the lively pictures of the old masters of the Mediterranean. From the representations of the battle on land, it is plain that the Tekkri and Pelesta were in the same social conditions as the Cimbri who were defeated by Marius, and the Tartars who invaded Russia in the thirteenth century. Like the Tartars, they came to conquer and settle; they brought their wives and children with them in huge wains of wicker work, with solid wheels, each wain being drawn by four oxen. The descriptions of the Russian annalist might serve for an account of these inroads of the Tekkri. The Egyptians, like the Slavs, must have been dismayed by 'the grinding of the wheels of the wooden chariots, the bellowings of the buffaloes, the howling of the barbarians.' While the warriors of the Tekkri and Pelesta were fighting in open chariots like those of the Egyptians and Greeks, the wains with the women and children were drawn up in the rear. The van of the foreign army was routed, and in the pictures of Medinet Habou we see the Egyptians falling on the waggons, and slaying the children whom the women in vain endeavour to rescue. It is a singular fact that the Tekkri who took the lead of the land-forces also supplied many mariners to the confederate navy. In the sea-piece which preserves the events of the naval battle, we recognise the Tekkri by their peculiar head-piece, which is not absolutely unlike a rude form of the later Greek helmet. This head-piece is also worn by Pelesta, Daanau, and Uashuash.

The picture of the sea-fight throws a great deal of light on the civilisation of the predecessors (we dare not say 'ancestors') of Agamemnon. The artist has been most careful to mark the difference between the ships of the Shalkalsha, Shardana, and Daanau, and those of his own countrymen. The Egyptian vessels are low at prow and stern, either extremity is tipped by a carved lion's head, and it is easy for a warrior to have one foot on deck, and the other on the figure head of his ship. The bulwarks are slightly raised at each extremity, and the ships must have been half-decked. The confederates on the other hand fight in barques which are lofty in prow and stern. Either extremity is finished off with a bird's beak, which rises high out of the water. The reader of Homer at once recognises the *νηυσὶ κορωνίσι*, the ships with beaks at either end, the *νέας ἀμφιελίσσας*, vessels curved at prow and stern (*recurvatae*) of the poet. The later barques of the Greeks, as we see them painted on vases of the sixth century, were quite unlike these. The prow was by that time constructed for ramming purposes, for which these high birds' beaks of the early Mediterranean vessels were not at all adapted. That the people of the Mediterranean did use such vessels as those which they man in the Egyptian pictures, is proved by a very old Cyprian vase in the Cesnola collections (Cesnola's 'Cyprus,' pl. xlv.). On this vase is painted a ship with the arrangement of mast and sail common to the barques of the Egyptians and their enemies.

The prow and stern, however, are built high out of the water, and protected, as in the reliefs, by lofty bulwarks. This is good evidence to the accuracy of the Egyptian draughtsmen, who were careful to mark all these distinctions, as they were engaged in compiling historical records, rather than in producing mere works of art.

In the sea-fight the Egyptians are, of course, having the best of the battle. The masts of the Tuirsha, Tekkri, and Shakalsha are going by the board; the Egyptians shower in their arrows with deadly effect; the Tekkri, with drawn swords, in vain attempt to drive back the boarders. The face of the sea is covered with the bodies of men who have fallen from the decks, and the Egyptians, with the clemency which was peculiar to them, help the wounded to reach the shore, or take them on board their own vessels. In some of the ships of the allied invaders are soldiers who wear a peculiar helmet. It so far resembles the helmets of the Shardana, that it has a curved horn on each side, but, unlike them, it has no spike and ball in the centre. A horned helmet of the same sort (but probably much later) has been found in an Italian grave, and may be seen in the British Museum. In other ships of the allies appear the Tekkri, with their crested bonnets, mingled with allies who wear the conical cap of the Greek and Etruscan sailors, the cap, or fez, which, in Greek art, is worn by Odysseus. The wearers of these caps are, probably with justice, recognised as the Tuirsha, whom Dr. Brugsch calls the Taurians, but whom we prefer to call Etrurians or Tyrrhenians. The striped tunics worn by these two last classes of allies are the same as those in which the Shardana were still dressed, even after they had become allies of the Egyptians.

We have now caught a glimpse of the races in whom it seems not unreasonable to recognise Mediterranean peoples, the ancestors of Homer's heroes. We may say, then, with some confidence, that for centuries before the period dealt with in the Homeric poems, the dwellers on the borders of the midland sea, the Tuirsha, Shakalsha, Aqaiusha, Tekkri, and the rest, were adventurous warriors, capable of forming such large confederacies as those which took part in the siege of Troy. About the Tekkri, we may say with certainty that they had not passed the period of great national migrations. Unless a whole people had moved, or had at least sent out a *ver sacrum*, they would not have led with them women and children, in the wains drawn by oxen. About the sea-faring Aqaiusha, Shakalsha, and Shardana, we cannot speak so certainly. 'They desired to breathe a soft air,' they were eager to plunder the Egyptians, but it does not seem that they brought their women with them, or definitely meant to settle. When we turn from the monuments to Homer, we certainly find in him a picture of an established society contented with secure habitations. The Achaeans and Argives of the poems are deeply attached to home; their thoughts always go back from the leaguer under Troy to wives, children, and aged fathers, who now and again send them news of their welfare, from Phthia, Crete, or Argos. Homer knows nothing of combined Achaean invasions of Egypt. The more recent feuds of the eastern and western shores of the Aegean have put any such adventures out of memory. Only here and there the roaming spirit of the older pirates survives in such men as Odysseus feigned himself to be, in the story told to Eumaeus (Odyssey, xiv. 240–300). When he there describes himself as a Cretan pirate who ventured to make a raid on Egypt, he also declares that such adventurous persons are now rare. His joy, he says, is in all that other men hold in horror.

Though Homer knows nothing of confederated invasions of Egypt, his acquaintance with the manners of the country is tolerably exact. He knows Thebes as the richest city in the world, full of stored wealth, of chariots, and horses. Mr. Gladstone and others have tried to show that this description could only apply to Thebes in the days of its imperial prosperity. We cannot possibly say, however, how long the memory of Thebes as the 'mickle-garth' of the world might survive its actual decline. It is unnecessary to discuss Dr. Lauth's bold attempt to find Ramses III., 'the old man of the sea,' in the Proteus of the fourth book of the Odyssey. Proteus is merely the Homeric form of the *märchen* which in Scotland becomes the ballad of *Tamlane*.

Setting aside these far-fetched conjectures, it is certain that Homer knows 'the River Aegyptus,' which in Hesiod has already become 'the Nile.' He knows Thebes and its wealth; he knows the island Pharos. He is familiar with the clemency of the Egyptians. The king, in the story of Odysseus, conveys the pirate chief safely away in his own chariot, just as the sailors, on the monuments, rescue their drowning enemies. Homer is also aware that the Egyptians had friendly relations with Cyprus and Phoenicia (Odyssey, xvii. 440). He knows the Egyptian reputation for skill in medicine. 'There each man is a physician skilled beyond all others, for they are of the race of Paeaeon.' (Od. iv. 211, 213.) To be brief, Egypt is to Homer a land within the limits of the real world; it is beyond Libya that the enchanted isles and shores come into the ken of his wandering hero.

We have tried to show reason for maintaining the opinion that the Egyptian monuments reveal to us a moment in the national education of the early Greeks. Egypt probably gave them their first glimpse of a settled and luxurious civilisation, first taught them to take delight in other things than 'swords, shafts, and spears, and ships with long oars.' What manner of life would Greek prisoners or mercenaries see in Egypt? There they would find towns wealthier than the fabled city of the Phaeacians. Thebes alone they knew of as a dim rich city that rose on the borders of the world, as did Byzantium on the horizon of the Danes. In Thebes and the other cities of Egypt they beheld 'the fields full of good things, the canals rich in fish, the lakes swarming with wild fowl, the meadows green with herbs. There are lentils in endless abundance, and melons honey-sweet grow in the well-watered fields. The barns are full of wheat, and reach as high as heaven; the vine, the almond, and the fig-tree grow in the gardens. Sweet is their wine, and with honey do they mingle it. The youths are clad always in festive array, the fine oil is poured upon their curled locks.' It is thus that an Egyptian scribe depicts one of the towns of his country. The picture is precisely that which Homer draws of ideal luxury and comfort. Even in trifling details the Homeric domestic life is like that of Egypt. In Phaeacia, as in the monuments, kings' daughters drive chariots. In Ithaca, as in Thebes, kings and queens are fond of geese, of all birds! In the tribute brought to Thutmes III. from the Phoenician land are 'two geese. These were dearer to the king than anything else' (Brugsch, i. 334). Compare Penelope's story of her dream: 'Twenty geese have I in the house that eat wheat out of the water-trough, and it gladdens me to look on them.' (Odyssey, xix. 540.) In the Egyptians' 'Garden of Flowers' the northern mercenaries may have seen the strange tamed beasts, and have undergone (as some romances in the papyri show us) the magic wiles of Circe. (See 'Records of the Past,' vi. 152, iv. 129; where there are ancient Egyptian stories in the style of the 'Arabian Nights.') If the stranger passed through the temple precincts he saw the walls covered with signs, which perhaps were deciphered for him. He then listened to chants like those which the minstrels of his own lands were soon to recite. There are some curious, though probably accidental resemblances, in the style of Egyptian and Greek epic poetry. The similes are often identical. Thus the slaughtered Khita, under the walls of Kadesh, are said by the Egyptian poet to lie kicking in heaps, like fishes on the ground. Compare the slain wooers in the Odyssey (xxii. 384): 'He found all the host of them fallen in their blood, in the dust, like fishes that the fishermen have drawn forth in the net, into a hollow of the beach, from out of the grey sea . . . . and the sun shines forth and takes their life away.' In the account of the battles with the invaders, the Egyptian warriors 'come down like lions of the hills, like hawks stooping upon birds.' The Khita, before Ramses II., are 'like the foals of mares, which tremble before the grim lions.' But the Egyptian poet most closely resembles Homer when he dilates on the valour and piety of Ramses II., when cut off from his army at Kadesh. The religious sentiment, the relations between Amon and Ramses, are precisely like those between Odysseus and Athene. Ramses, with his charioteer, is alone in the crowd of foes. Then he calls to Amon, as Aias calls to Zeus, or Odysseus to Athene, reminding the god of all the honours he has paid him. 'Shall it be for nothing that I have dedicated to thee many temples, and sacrificed tens of thousands of oxen? Nay, I find that Amon is better to me than millions of warriors, than hundreds of thousands of horses. . . . . Amon heard my voice, and came at my cry (saying), "I am with thee, and am more to thee than hundreds of thousands of warriors."' This is like the reply of Athene to Odysseus: 'And now I will tell thee plainly, even though fifty companies of men should compass us about, and be eager to slay us in battle, their kine shouldst thou drive off, and their brave flocks.'

These resemblances, and many others, are, no doubt, the result of similar ideas prevailing in societies not wholly uninfluenced by each other. The point we have tried to prove is, that the Homeric civilisation had been influenced by occasional contact with Egypt. The pre-Homeric Greeks seem to have mixed, in their years of youthful audacity and unsettled temper, with the most civilised people of the earlier world, and to have looked, with their eager eyes and teachable minds, on the marvels of the empire of Ramses. They were in connection, in short, with the highly developed art and culture which the Phoenicians spread from the Euphrates to Egypt, and through the islands to the Hellenic coasts. Centuries of these oriental influences gradually ripened society into the free and flexible organisation which we meet in the lays of Homer.

A. LANG.

SONNET

SUGGESTED BY THE PICTURE OF THE ANNUNCIATION, BY E. BURNE JONES.

Woman, whose lot hath alway been to bear
  Love's load beneath the heart, set there to hold
  It high, and keep it resolute and bold
To clasp God's feet, and hang on to the fair
Wide skirts of light,—thy sealëd sense can spare
  The open vision, thou being called to fold
  From time's mischance, and from the season's cold,
The wonder in thy breast, and nurse it there.
What though thy travail hath been long and sore,
  Love being borne in so great heaviness,
Through loss and labour, joy shall be the more
  Of love that living shall the nations bless:
Love that shall set man's bounden spirit free,
The 'holy thing' that still is born of thee.

EMILY PFEIFFER. Not cat.
MS