

# ANNOTATIONS (A) TO TABLE XV.

## (1)

### The DURATION OF DYNASTY XII REIGNS AND THEIR CHRONOLOGICAL PLACING.

The reigns and coregencies of the first 4 kings are fixed by their contemporary records to the 3<sup>rd</sup> year Senusert II. The latest contemporary record of Senusert II is of his 13<sup>th</sup> year and the Turin Papyrus gives him a reign of 19 years (Petrie, Brugsch, Maspero, Sayce, and Breasted). The duration, then, from Dynasty XII beginning to the death of Senusert II is 113 years, as fixed by Brugsch, Sayce, and Breasted.

No monumental or other evidence exists to show that Senusert III, who succeeded Senusert II, was partly coregent with the latter. In consequence, authorities are agreed that the regnal years of Senusert III, for the earlier portion of his reign, are years of sole rule. This is confirmed by the remarkable astronomical dating of the 7<sup>th</sup> year Senusert III, (refer ¶ 317) as defined in relation both to B.C. reckoning and the A.K. chronology of Table XV. The latter relationship, again, is confirmed by the evolution of the Dynastic Lists outlined in Annotations (D).

The contemporary records identify the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty river improvement works at the 1<sup>st</sup> Cataract with the 8<sup>th</sup> year of Senusert III (¶¶ 319-321 and Table XXII and Annotations). The records show that to make these works effective the country South of the 1<sup>st</sup> Cataract was more effectively occupied (the Nubians being driven back or placed under subjection). This is a consequence to be noted also in regard to the similar river improvement works of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty of Kings.

The records indicate that the Southern activities of Senusert III continued up to his 19<sup>th</sup> year. Little activity in works or conquest is shown anywhere from the 19<sup>th</sup> year of Senusert III onwards in this reign, although Senusert III is known to have reigned 20 years longer. This fact suggests that Amenemhat III was associated as coregent in the 19<sup>th</sup> year of Semisert III. This suggestion receives confirmation from the fact that Amenemhat III, as early as his 2<sup>nd</sup> year, continued the work of his father. Now Amenemhat III is known to have reigned jointly with his father for an uncertain period. By making the joint rule date from the 19<sup>th</sup> year of Senusert III, the great irrigation and water storage works of Amenemhat III fall into chronological place as an immediate continuation of the work of Senusert III. (Refer Table XXII and Annotations.)

The last recorded dating of Amenemhat III is of his 46<sup>th</sup> year. From the monuments we know that his son, Amenemhat IV, reigned jointly with him for an uncertain period. The records of Amenemhat IV, by commencing in his 5<sup>th</sup> year, supply an indication as to his first 4 years being jointly with his father. According to the Turin Papyrus, Amenemhat IV reigned 9 years, and was followed by his sister Sebekneferu for 4 years. The fact that the names of Amenemhat III and his daughter Sebekneferu occur at Hawara, while the name of Amenemhat IV is absent points to the 4 years of Sebekneferu having been jointly with the last 4 years of Amenemhat IV. This conclusion is confirmed by the Tablet of Abydos, which gives Amenemhat IV as the last ruler of Dynasty XII.

The resulting arrangement and chronology of Dynasty XII are stated on Table XV ; the details obtained as above described, being confirmed as to total and chronological placing by the identities (1), (2), and (3) of Table XV.

For the evidence fixing that Dynasties XIII and XIV were contemporaneous with Dynasty XII and with the Hyksos, refer Annotations (B).

For further evidence fixing that the Hyksos were contemporaneous with Dynasty XII, refer Annotations B., relating to the Hyksos Mathematical Papyrus.

## (2)

### THE INCURSION OF THE HYKSOS IN RELATION TO DYNASTIES XII AND XVIII.

Table XV, by giving the interval of 25 years between the termination of Dynasty XII and the beginning of Dynasty XVIII, shows that the war of Egyptian independence, and the expulsion of the Semitic Hyksos or Shepherd Kings is limited to this interval. The chronological sequence thus disclosed rejects the theory—and it has never been anything but a theory—that the Hyksos entirely dominated the whole of Egypt. During the rule of the XII<sup>th</sup> Egyptian Dynasty, the monuments of the period show that Dynasty predominant. Other dynasties—as Annotations (B)—reigned contemporaneously, together with the Semitic Hyksos in the North. Access to the quarries of the South for building and monumental materials, together with the use of waterways, was either permitted to those Dynasties, or could not be prevented.

Referring to the domination of the Hyksos, Queen Hatshepsut of Dynasty XVIII, in a record in the rock cut temple near Beni-Hasan, states:—” *There had been Aamu in the midst of the Delta and in Hauar* (the Avaris of Manetho’s account in Josephus), *and the foreign hordes of their number had destroyed the ancient works; they reigned ignorant of the god, Ra.*” This record, while identifying the Hyksos with the *Aamu*—the Egyptian name for Asiatics—clearly limits their territory, in Egypt, to the delta. From this it seems clear enough that the power of these Aamu or Hyksos—except during the initial period of the War of Independence, and prior to that, except for occasional raids and expeditions to execute works within the domains of the contemporaneous Egyptian dynasties— did not extend far South of the Delta.

Now these *Aamu* first began to appear in Egypt in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of Senusert II, 2063 A.K. Khnem-hotep depicts and records, at Beni-Hasan, his receiving, in the year noted, 37 *Aamu* of *Shu*, whose chief Absha is given the title *heg setu*. The title *heg* (prince) combined with the racial name *Shu* is obviously the derivation (Heq-shu) of the name Hyksos. The deputation of 37 was obviously a detached party from a colony of these Aamu of Shu just settled in the Delta. The title, *heq setu*, applied to the leader Absha, is, moreover, as Petrie has pointed out, identical with the title applied to the Hyksos king Khyan User-en-Ra, whose name occurs below the position of Senusert III, and in a line of Kings parallel with the line of XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty kings, in the Karnak List of Tahutmes III.

*Aamu* of *shu* were, therefore, settled in the Delta in the 6<sup>th</sup> year Senusert II, 2063 A.K. This settlement of the Hyksos in the Delta was, at first, a peaceful process, as is narrated by Manetho. It is not until the records of the reign of Amenemhat III are examined that evidence indicates the Hyksos becoming assertive. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of Amenemhat III trouble in *the* Delta is first indicated by the reference to an expedition to “ *open up the way of the Aamu,*” *i.e.*, the Wady Tumilat, the road to the Sinai mines (refer Plate LXIII). The historical indications are completed by the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty records at the Egyptian mining works in Sinai. These records show that actual hostilities between the Hyksos and the Egyptians did not commence until the end of Dynasty XII. They are dated as late as the 45<sup>th</sup> year of Amenemhat III, and the 7<sup>th</sup> year of Amenemhat IV, so that work continued at Sinai until 2144 A.K.= 1856 B.C., 1 year before the end of Dynasty XII. The lack of records”, prior to the next dated inscription in Sinai, shows that the mines there lay idle until the reign of Amosts I of Dynasty XVIII.

“*In the XIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty they seem to have been temporarily abandoned.*” Budge, “Hist. Egypt,” III, 115.

“*After a long period of neglect, during which no expeditions were sent to Sinai, we find offerings made by Aahmes*” 1st King Dyn. XVIII after the expulsion of the Hyksos). Petrie, “ Researches in Sinai,” p. 103.