THE CRITERIA OF PERIODIZATION IN ANCIENT EGYPTIAN HISTORY AND THEIR SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

Zulfiya Alimjanovna Makhmudova
Andijan Branch of Kokand University
Senior Lecturer, Department of History and Social Sciences
call:+998997895853
zulfiya.mahmudova.89@mail.ru
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3236-5476

Annotation: *This paper explores the issue of chronological periodization in Ancient Egyptian history. It examines stages such as the Early (Protodinastic and Dynasties I–II), Old Kingdom, First Intermediate, Middle Kingdom, Second Intermediate, New Kingdom, and Third Intermediate / Late periods. The political, economic, and cultural characteristics of each period are analyzed, alongside the reasons and criteria for their division. The paper is based on key English-language sources (e.g., Shaw, Grimal, Wilkinson).*

Keywords: *periodization, Ancient Egypt, First Intermediate Period, Middle Kingdom*

Аннотация: *Данная статья исследует проблему периодизации истории Древнего Египта. Рассматриваются такие этапы, как ранний (прото-династический и I–II династии), Древнее царство, Первый переходный период, Среднее царство, Второй переходный период, Новое царство, а также Третий переходный и поздний периоды. Анализируются политические, экономические и культурные характеристики каждого периода, а также причины и критерии разделения на периоды. Статья основана на ключевых источниках на английском языке (например, Shaw, Grimal, Wilkinson).*

Ключевые слова: *периодизация, Древний Египет, Первый переходный период, Среднее царство*

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu maqola qadimgi Misr tarixining davrlashtirish muammosini tadqiq qiladi. Ilk (Protodinastik va 1-2 sulolalar), Qadimgi Podsholik, Birinchi o‘tish, O‘rta Podsholik, Ikkinchi o‘tish, Yangi Podsholik hamda Uchinchi o‘tish va kech davrlar tushuniladi. Har bir davrning siyosiy, iqtisodiy va madaniy xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi hamda davrga bo‘linish sabab va mezonlari muhokama qilinadi. Maqola ingliz tilidagi muhim manbalarga tayangan holda (masalan, Shaw, Grimal, Wilkinson) yozilgan.*

Kalit so‘zlar: *davrlashtirish, Qadimgi Misr, Birinchi o‘tish davri, O‘rta Podsholik*

Introduction: The history of Ancient Egypt spans millennia, crossing multiple epochs of political centralization and fragmentation, cultural florescence and decline, as well as

external interventions and internal reforms. Establishing a clear and rigorous periodization framework for this complex history is not only a methodological necessity but also a gateway to understanding how the civilization evolved. Periodization helps historians to segment long historical trajectories into coherent segments, enabling comparison, pattern detection, and causal inquiry (Shaw 2000).

One of the classical and widely accepted chronologies divides Egyptian history into several major eras: the Early Dynastic / Protodinastic period, Old Kingdom, First Intermediate Period, Middle Kingdom, Second Intermediate Period, New Kingdom, followed by the Third Intermediate and Late periods. However, the boundaries and internal subdivisions of these eras often spark scholarly debate. Some segments — particularly the intermediate periods — were long labeled as "dark ages" due to fewer surviving sources, but modern archaeological and textual research has begun to fill those gaps (Shaw 2000; Grimal 1992).

In establishing period boundaries, historians rely on multiple criteria: the strength of central authority and degree of political unity, economic stability (often linked to fluctuations in the Nile's inundation), material culture change (such as architectural styles, funerary practices, and art), as well as external pressures (invasions, foreign rule). Only when several of these indicators converge at a turning point do historians typically mark a new period (Grimal 1992; Wilkinson 2010).

This study aims to (1) present a synthesized periodization scheme for Ancient Egypt; (2) analyze the distinguishing features of each major period (political structure, economy, culture, external interactions); and (3) examine and critique the reasons and criteria underlying transitions between these periods.

Early Dynastic or Protodinastic Period (c. 3100 – c. 2686 BC)

The Early Dynastic (also called Protodinastic) era represents the formative stage of Ancient Egypt's centralized political system. During this era, a number of autonomous city-states—each with its own local elite—gradually coalesced into a unified state. The traditional narrative credits Narmer (also known as Menes) with uniting Upper and Lower Egypt, thereby inaugurating a continuous dynastic rule (Shaw 2000, p. 35).

This unification laid the institutional foundations for pharaonic rule: the creation of a royal titulary (including Horus and Nebty names), the development of a centralized bureaucracy, and the early use of hieroglyphic script for administrative and ritual purposes (Grimal 1992, p. 18). Funerary architecture in this period evolved from simple mastabas to more complex communal tomb complexes, signaling a growing concern for kingship and afterlife ideology.

Key features of the Early Dynastic period include:

Consolidation of royal authority over regional centers

Institutional innovations in bureaucracy and ritual court

The emergence of state-sponsored religious ideology centered on the king

However, the Early Dynastic period was still transitional: many features were experimental, systems were fluid, and documentation is relatively limited compared to later eras. Still, it is widely accepted as the logical starting point for dynastic Egypt (Wilkinson 2010, p. 47).

Old Kingdom (c. 2686 – c. 2125 BC)

The Old Kingdom is perhaps the best-known era of Ancient Egyptian history, often called the "Age of the Pyramids." It encompasses Dynasties III through VI and is marked by political centralization, economic prosperity, and monumental architectural projects (Shaw 2000, p. 110; Grimal 1992, p. 64).

Political and Administrative Structure

Under rule by strong pharaohs—such as Djoser (III Dynasty) and Sneferu, Khufu, Khafre, and Menkaure (IV Dynasty)—Egypt's central government developed a complex bureaucracy. Regional governors (nomarchs) administered provinces (nomes) under tight royal oversight. The king was presented as a divine ruler, mediator between gods and men, consolidating ideological control as much as political power.

This period is especially renowned for the construction of the great pyramids at Giza (Khufu, Khafre, Menkaure) and the Step Pyramid of Djoser at Saqqara (designed by the vizier Imhotep) (Shaw 2000, p. 115). These structures required sophisticated organization of labor, resources, and logistics, indicating a high degree of state capacity.

The funerary cult of the king became institutionalized: massive mortuary complexes, funerary temples, causeways, and subsidiary pyramids underline the intertwinement of royal ideology, religion, and state economy.

Egypt's agricultural base—reliant on the annual flooding of the Nile—provided the economic foundation of the Old Kingdom. Productive harvests enabled the state to mobilize surplus labor for monumental construction and maintain bureaucratic machinery (Wilkinson 2010, p. 125). There is evidence that trade with Nubia and the Levant existed, though on a limited scale.

Socially, an elite class of priests, administrators, artisans, and scribes supported the pharaonic system. The majority of the population engaged in farming, irrigation, and maintenance of local temples and infrastructural works.

Towards the end of the Old Kingdom, Egypt may have faced a combination of structural stresses:

Overextension of state resources for pyramid building

Reduced Nile inundation causing agricultural shortfalls

Growing power and autonomy of nomarchs undermining central control

These pressures are often cited as among the causes prompting a destabilization that led into the First Intermediate Period (Grimal 1992, p. 89; Shaw 2000, p. 130).

Thus, the Old Kingdom stands as a high point of early state development in Egypt: a period when regal ideology, centralized power, and monumental culture converged. At

the same time, its end underscores the inherent fragility of complex early states when faced with ecological, economic, and political stressors.

First Intermediate Period (c. 2160 – c. 2055 BC)

The First Intermediate Period marks a prolonged phase of political disunity and regional competition following the decline of central authority at the close of the Old Kingdom. During this interval, the authority of the pharaoh waned significantly, and nomarchs (provincial governors) became increasingly autonomous, often operating almost as kings within their domains (Grimal 1992, p. 95; Shaw 2000, p. 135).

With the demise of strong central control, Egypt fractured into multiple centers of power. Rival dynasties emerged in Herakleopolis (Lower Egypt) and Thebes (Upper Egypt). The division led to intermittent struggles for supremacy, with shifting alliances and military campaigns. In such a climate, legitimacy claims—especially linking a ruler to a previous great king—became more ideologically important (Wilkinson 2010, p. 160).

The breakdown of stable central redistribution systems adversely affected resource flows. Maintenance of irrigation and large-scale public works suffered, and agricultural productivity likely declined in some regions. Some archaeological evidence suggests that local elites invested more in regional projects and funerary monuments, reflecting a shift in priorities from state to local identities (Shaw 2000, p. 140).

Despite political instability, cultural and literary activities did not cease. The First Intermediate Period is notable for the proliferation of “autobiographies” of local officials, often inscribed on tomb walls, expressing personal piety, local pride, and appeals to posterity. The so-called Coffin Texts (funerary spells written on coffins) began to replace the earlier Pyramid Texts, reflecting democratization of afterlife doctrine (Grimal 1992, p. 100).

This period is often viewed as an era of transition and adaptation, rather than complete cultural decline: it set the stage for re-centralization in the Middle Kingdom.

Middle Kingdom (c. 2055 – c. 1650 BC)

The Middle Kingdom stands as a “renaissance” era in Ancient Egyptian history, in which political unification, economic revitalization, and cultural renewal converged under strong Theban leadership (Shaw 2000, p. 155; Grimal 1992, p. 110).

Under kings such as Mentuhotep II, Upper and Lower Egypt were reunified, reestablishing central authority (Wilkinson 2010, p. 180). The subsequent 12th Dynasty (Amenemhat I, Senusret family) further reinforced monarchical power through administrative reforms: nomarchs were often replaced by royal appointees, the bureaucracy was tightened, and military control was centralized.

Agricultural production recovered, and state investment was directed into irrigation works, canals, and reclamation projects. Trade expanded, particularly with Nubia to the south and Libya to the west, enabling revenue diversification and material exchange

(Shaw 2000, p. 160). The exploitation of resources like gold and precious stones financed royal workshops and building projects.

The Middle Kingdom is renowned for its sophisticated literature—The Tale of Sinuhe, The Instructions of Amenemhat, and The Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor are among the classics that reflect introspection, moral instruction, and existential reflection (Grimal 1992, p. 120). Artistic styles matured: statuary became more realistic, and tomb architecture incorporated rock-cut tombs in addition to mastaba and pyramid styles.

While the Middle Kingdom remained stable for many centuries, pressures eventually mounted. The weakening of central authority, coupled with external threats (notably the influx of foreign groups into lower Egypt), allowed for the erosion of state borders. This culminated in the onset of the Second Intermediate Period, when foreign rulers (Giksos) controlled parts of the delta region (Shaw 2000, p. 170).

Second Intermediate and New Kingdom (c. 1650 – 1070 BC):

The Second Intermediate Period represents a time of renewed fragmentation, marked by the domination of the Hyksos (foreign rulers of likely Asiatic origin) over the northern Delta region. These rulers introduced new technologies such as the horse-drawn chariot, composite bow, and certain metallurgical techniques, which later became instrumental in Egypt's military modernization (Shaw 2000, p. 180; Grimal 1992, p. 131).

The eventual reunification under Ahmose I (founder of the 18th Dynasty) inaugurated the New Kingdom, often regarded as Egypt's imperial age. Politically, Egypt transformed from a regional to a territorial empire, extending its influence into Nubia, Syria, and Palestine. Kings such as Thutmose III, Amenhotep III, and Ramses II consolidated vast military and diplomatic networks (Wilkinson 2010, p. 205).

The New Kingdom is characterized by its robust military organization, efficient bureaucracy, and unprecedented state wealth. The reign of Hatshepsut exemplifies internal consolidation through monumental architecture and foreign trade, while Akhenaten's religious reforms (Amarna Period) reveal tensions between centralized cult ideology and traditional priesthood (Shaw 2000, p. 210).

The artistic and architectural output of this era—including the temples of Karnak, Luxor, Abu Simbel, and the royal tombs in the Valley of the Kings—demonstrates technical mastery and theological sophistication. The "imperial art" of the 18th–19th Dynasties reflects both power and piety, uniting political legitimacy with divine symbolism (Grimal 1992, p. 142).

However, internal corruption, costly military campaigns, and priestly autonomy gradually eroded state coherence, paving the way for decline after Ramses III.

Third Intermediate and Late Periods (c. 1070 – 332 BC)

The Third Intermediate Period marks a long trajectory of political decentralization. Egypt became divided between Theban High Priests of Amun in the south and secular rulers in the north (especially at Tanis). This bifurcation produced a dual structure—religious and political—reducing effective national unity (Wilkinson 2010, p. 230).

External pressures also intensified: Libyan dynasts, Nubian kings of the 25th Dynasty, and eventually Assyrian incursions further complicated Egypt's sovereignty. Despite this, Egypt retained its cultural vitality, producing innovative funerary art, temple inscriptions, and a refined theological synthesis of earlier traditions (Shaw 2000, p. 225).

The Late Period (26th–31st Dynasties) witnessed short-lived revivals under native rulers such as Psammetichus I and Necho II, who attempted to restore imperial ambitions and bureaucratic order. Yet by the 6th century BC, Egypt was subject to successive Persian conquests, followed by Alexander the Great's entry in 332 BC, marking the end of pharaonic independence and the beginning of the Hellenistic (Ptolemaic) Era (Grimal 1992, p. 155).

The chronological framework of Ancient Egyptian periodization—from the Early Dynastic to the Late Period—is not merely a conventional timeline but a reflection of recurring structural cycles: unification → consolidation → decentralization → fragmentation → reunification. These cycles reveal the dynamic interplay between political power, ecology, and ideology.

Key analytical points include:

Political Centralization: Each phase of stability corresponds to periods of strong royal authority and effective bureaucratic integration (Old, Middle, and New Kingdoms).

Ecological Sensitivity: Periods of decline often correlate with low Nile inundations, affecting agriculture and tax revenues, leading to political strain.

Religious Ideology: The pharaoh's divinity was central to state legitimacy; when this ideology fractured—such as during Akhenaten's reforms—so did state cohesion.

Regionalism vs. Unification: The persistence of local identities (nomarchs, priesthoods) repeatedly challenged centralization, showing Egypt's delicate balance between unity and autonomy.

Modern scholarship views these oscillations not as signs of failure but as adaptive transformations. The flexibility of Egyptian civilization, capable of reorganizing itself after each collapse, ensured its survival for over three millennia (Shaw 2000, p. 245).

Conclusion: The study of Egyptian periodization reveals that historical continuity coexisted with episodic fragmentation. Each intermediate period was not a mere interlude of decline but an incubator of renewal—socially, ideologically, and institutionally.

From the unification under Narmer to the imperial grandeur of the New Kingdom and the twilight of the Late Period, Egyptian civilization demonstrated a unique capacity to reinterpret its traditions, adapt to crises, and reconstruct authority.

In contemporary historiography, periodization thus serves not only as a chronological schema but as an analytical model for understanding the resilience, adaptability, and cyclical nature of early complex states.

The Egyptian experience teaches that no civilization's decline is absolute; rather, it is the prelude to transformation.

REFERENCES

1. Shaw, I. (Ed.). (2000). The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt. Oxford University Press.
2. Wilkinson, T. A. H. (2010). The Rise and Fall of Ancient Egypt. Random House.
3. Kemp, B. J. (2006). Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization. Routledge.
4. Trigger, B. G., Kemp, B. J., O'Connor, D., & Lloyd, A. B. (1983). Ancient Egypt: A Social History. Cambridge University Press.
5. Bard, K. A. (2007). An Introduction to the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt. Wiley-Blackwell.
6. Brewer, D. J., & Teeter, E. (2007). Egypt and the Egyptians. Cambridge University Press.
7. Redford, D. B. (Ed.). (2001). The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt. Oxford University Press.
8. Van Dijk, J. (2000). "The Old Kingdom." In The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt (pp. 83–107). Oxford University Press.
9. Hornung, E. (1999). The Secret Lore of Egypt: Its Impact on the West. Cornell University Press.
10. Assmann, J. (2003). The Mind of Egypt: History and Meaning in the Time of the Pharaohs. Harvard University Press.
11. O'Connor, D., & Silverman, D. P. (Eds.). (1995). Ancient Egyptian Kingship. Brill.
12. Watterson, B. (2011). The Gods of Ancient Egypt. Amber Books.
13. Rice, M. (2003). Who's Who in Ancient Egypt. Routledge.
14. Bard, K. A., & Shubert, S. B. (Eds.). (1999). Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt. Routledge.
15. Dodson, A., & Hilton, D. (2004). The Complete Royal Families of Ancient Egypt. Thames & Hudson.
16. Midant-Reynes, B. (2000). The Prehistory of Egypt. Blackwell.
17. Seidlmayer, S. J. (2000). "The First Intermediate Period (c. 2160–2055 BC)." In The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt (pp. 108–136). Oxford University Press.
18. Shaw, I., & Nicholson, P. (1995). The Dictionary of Ancient Egypt. Harry N. Abrams.
19. Breasted, J. H. (1906). Ancient Records of Egypt. University of Chicago Press.
20. Cline, E. H., & O'Connor, D. (Eds.). (2006). Thutmose III: A New Biography. University of Michigan Press.
21. Grimal, N. (1992). A History of Ancient Egypt. Oxford: Blackwell.