

ARCHAEOLOGY, HIEROGLYPHIC STUDIES, ETC.

23

between the end of the XIIth and the beginning of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Important evidence exists against the possibility of so short an interval in the large number of royal names—about 150—which the Turin Papyrus seems to assign to this period, as well as in the fact that Manetho attributes six dynasties to it. All the evidence from the time itself is, however, so obscure that the new date may be accepted at least as a working hypothesis. If we were to throw back the date to another Sothic period (1360 years) it would give a total interval of 1560 years between the XIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties. This seems excessive, the lengths of reign for kings of the XIIIth—XVIIIth Dynasties preserved in the Turin Papyrus being short—mostly only three or four years, the highest twelve. Borchardt also quotes H. Wallis' opinion that the slight development of art between the Middle and New Kingdoms forbids us to imagine that there was a long interval between them. The new Sothic date cannot be admitted as final evidence, for a slight alteration of the calendar such as Maspero postulates in his *Les Origines, or Dawn of Civilization*, pp. 209-210, would throw out the calculation entirely. The Egyptians, moreover, were careless and inaccurate. DE RICCI, *Rev. Arch.* xxxv. 338, has a note on the subject.

LIEBLEIN on Dynasties VII.-XI.: *Rec. de Trav.* xxi. 216.

ROST, the reading "Kachares" for Lachares: *Or. Litt. Zeit.* iii. 29.

STEINDORFF has written a popular historical monograph on the XVIIIth Dynasty, touching lightly on the earlier periods. It is enlivened by a multitude of interesting and well-chosen illustrations, and provided also with map and index, but is without bibliographical references. It may be remarked that the price of this handsome book—*Blüthezeit des Pharaonenreichs*—is only four shillings.

M. NAVILLE, *Ä.Z.* 1899, 48, says his last word in the discussion as to the succession of Thothmes I., II., III. Writing from Der el Bahri itself, with most of the evidence upon the original monuments close around him or within easy distance, he decides that Sethe's theory of the succession (*Archaeological Report*, 1897-8, pp. 26-7) is impossible, and that the old arrangement of Lepsius and De Rougé is correct. The re-engraving of mutilated cartouches is due in all cases to Rameses II., who restored the names of Thothmes II. and Thothmes III. Rameses never restored the name of Hatshepsut, though sometimes he would re-engrave the name of the god Amen when it had formed part of the queen's cartouche. Hatshepsut's name and figure were chiselled out of the monuments by Thothmes III. after her death. Akhenaten attacked the name and figure of Amen. Rameses II., restoring the latter, in some