TURMOIL AND POWER: A THEMATIC AND CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY OF DYNASTIC TRANSITION IN LATE PERIOD EGYPT

By

Jared Krebsbach

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Major: History

December 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The creation and completion of this dissertation has been, as many of you may know, a long and at times arduous project but on the whole also one that has been intellectually and spiritually fulfilling. I could not have done this alone, so I would like to take a few words to thank my many family, friends, and mentors from around the world who have helped make this possible. I would first like to thank my major advisor of my dissertation committee – Dr. Peter Brand. You provided the framework and guidance for this work, but also gave me the freedom to formulate my own ideas which coincided well with my personality. I would be remiss if I did not thank the other members of my dissertation committee as well. Dr. Mariam Ayad has stood as a paragon of Egyptian grammar and provided her much needed assistance not only on this work, but also throughout my graduate studies as I learned how a dead language can truly come alive. Dr. Suzanne Onstine offered help not only on my research but also with my teaching as part of my assistantship and supported me with recommendation letters for fellowships and conference funding. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Lorelei Corcoran for agreeing to be part of this committee at a late date, although it seems appropriate since you were my primary advisor for my Master's thesis, so in a way this has come full circle.

I would like to thank the History Department's Administrative Associate, Karen Bradley, and the Graduate Secretary, Karen Jackett, who have provided logistical support not only for this dissertation, but have helped me complete the proper forms for assistantships, fellowships, and travel funding throughout my time in the history

department. Also, Wayne Key of the Interlibrary Loan Department for helping me locate books and articles integral to my research.

I cannot forget a couple of friends and fellow graduate students who have been there since the beginning. Dr. Kevin Johnson your humor early in graduate school and logistical support in the last steps has been most helpful. Jack Lorenzini, Tigers basketball games were a much needed distraction at times! Finally, Dev Starrett, you have been the brother I never had and your unofficial airport taxi and pet care service was truly helpful when I was travelling.

Finally, I would like to thank my father James, mother Dianne, sister Marni, brother in-law Corey, and niece Keelie for your moral and financial support. Despite the assistantships, fellowships, scholarships, and financial aid I received your additional funding meant that I could still live a reasonably comfortable life as I went through graduate school. Your positive words often helped me push on when things looked bleak.

ABSTRACT

Krebsbach, Jared. University of Memphis. December 2012. Turmoil and Power: A Thematic and Chronological Study of Dynastic Transition in Late Period Egypt. Major Professor: Dr. Peter J. Brand.

Egypt's Late Period (728-341 BC) was a time of frequent political transition where dynasts, many of them foreign, usurped the throne and established new dynasties through a number of different methods. This was a stark contrast to earlier periods in pharaonic Egypt where dynasties were usually long-lived and violent dynastic transition was the exception not the rule. The turbulent political situation in the Late Period affected many different facets of life in Egypt so a complete examination of the historical processes that were taking place at the time will help current scholarship illuminate more about this often enigmatic period.

This dissertation employs a multi-faceted approach in its interpretation of Late Period history. Instead of merely studying the period from a chronological *or* thematic perspective, the author has combined both to provide a more complete picture of the period. Chronology is important in any historical work and provides the general framework of this study, but its strength and original contribution to field is found in the thematic approach. By identifying and examining the major historical processes, or patterns, of political transition in the Late Period which were: invasion, regicide, and political legitimization through monument building and other types of propaganda programs then important questions can be raised, and some possibly answered. Some of these questions include: how was invasion used as a tool to attain power, why did regicide become more common in this period, and what were the methods of political legitimization and propaganda used by the dynasts of the Late Period? A careful

consideration of these and other questions will help our understanding of the nature of political transition not just in Late Period Egypt, but in the entire first millennium BC Near East.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: Introduction

The following is a study of dynastic transition in Egypt's Late Period beginning with Piankhy's invasion of Egypt in 728 BC and ending with the second Achaemenid Persian conquest of Egypt in 341 BC. The intent of this dissertation is to provide a study of the Late Period that considers the turbulent socio-political situation in Egypt at that time and how dynastic transition usually followed patterns or processes that can be discerned by modern eyes with the aid of primarily historiographical techniques, but also augmented through philological, archaeological, and art historical methods. Hopefully this dissertation will add to the existing scholarly corpus of modern works[1] concerning the Late Period by providing more than a mere chronological or thematic approach to the period, but by combining the two methods in an effort to provide a more complete picture of the historical processes at work in the period. By examining the political, geo-political, religious, and social currents which were stirring throughout Egypt during the Late Period, as they were interconnected – as opposed to examining them in isolation – then a more complete picture of this period can be painted.

Since this study encompasses a wide chronological frame and several different cultures – most of which were literate – a paucity of primary sources is not a problem in this study. Published translations of the major texts from Persia, Assyria, the Levant, and Greco-Roman historians were collected, collated, and analyzed for this dissertation. Since the author's educational background is in Egyptology, ancient Egyptian texts were given primary attention and personal translations were made when appropriate and placed in the appendix. Because most of the texts used in this study have already been

[1] For a historiographical survey of modern scholarly works pertaining to the Late Period, see Chapter II of this dissertation.

published, the primary concern was to arrange them in order to determine which texts corroborated each other and/or which texts disproved, or at least, shed doubt on others. Obviously, this was no simple task and despite this being a "completed" version, the author considers this work to be ongoing. This brings to light an important consideration that needs to be made when working with any texts from the ancient world – what constitutes the statements in said texts as "historical" versus hyperbole? Perhaps hyperbole may be too strong a word and so should be substituted by *topos* or *motif*, but whichever word the scholar prefers the reality is that although most of these texts were based on a historical reality, the details are often formulaic. The texts used in this study are therefore examined in multiple layers that consider not just the event in itself, but also any political and/or religious message that may have been being conveyed along with any possible formulae used based on earlier texts.[2]

The chronological time frame of this dissertation – 728-341 BC – is quite vast as it encompasses nearly four hundred years and six dynasties of pharaonic history, but the dates are not arbitrary. Since the ancient Egyptians never referred to periods in their own history the way modern scholars do (Old, Middle, New Kingdoms etc.), the precise years which encompass the "Late Period" are open to scholarly interpretation.[3] Because of this, what term is used to characterize this period is less important than defining the

[2] Chapter IV of this dissertation, in particular, addresses the various nuances of different texts.

[3] Oftentimes the Third Intermediate Period is treated separately from the Late Period, but even then where it starts and the other begins is open to interpretation. Among the more eminent scholars Kenneth Kitchen places the Third Intermediate Period chronologically from the end of the New Kingdom (ca. 1075 BC) until the establishment of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty in 664 BC, with everything after that being the Late Period. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: (1100 to 650 BC)*, 2nd ed. (Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris and Phillips, 1995). On the other hand in his seminal work, Bernard Bothmer included the Third Intermediate Period *and* the Greco-Roman Period along with the traditional Late Period in, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 100* (New York: Arno Press Incorporated, 1969). Since the definition of the term "Late Period" can be a bit ambiguous, the author of the current work believes that establishing a precise origin and terminal date of the study is important.

chronological length of the period and more importantly identifying the historical processes that make this period unique and important. The starting and terminal points of this dissertation are both dates where Egypt was invaded and conquered and provide concrete and tangible points of study as well as good book ends. Between 728 and 341 BC definite historical patterns and processes are discernible as well as changing cultural currents that combine to make this a cohesive historical period. The period was ushered in with Piankhy's invasion of Egypt in 728 BC and although he returned to Nubia[4] his deeds helped to set the tone of the period as all of Egypt came under direct foreign domination. The period under consideration here ended in 341 BC with Artaxerxes III's successful conquest of Egypt which put Egypt under Persian control once more, although briefly and for the most part brought an end to the frequently re-occurring cyclical patterns of invasion, regicide, and monument building and political legitimization by competing foreign and native dynasts.[5] More important than a survey of the chronology, an examination of the re-occurring cyclical patterns is the thesis of this dissertation.

A detailed thematic study of the Late Period reveals that historical processes were at work that occurred in a cyclical pattern; three chapters of this dissertation are dedicated to each of these patterns, or phases, as identified. Before a survey of the historical processes of the Late Period is conducted however, a historiographical study of both contemporary scholarly literature pertaining to the Late Period and the works pertaining

[4] For more on this see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[5] That is not to say these processes disappeared –quite the contrary. After the ephemeral rule of the Persian Thirty First Dynasty, Alexander the Great invaded Egypt and established a foreign-born dynasty of Macedonians – the Ptolemies. The Ptolemies followed the foreign Nubian and Persian kings before them by investing in building projects and patronizing Egyptian cults. After the last Ptolemaic ruler of Egypt, Cleopatra VII, was defeated at Actium in 31 BC, Egypt became a Roman province but the emperors maintained similar interest in Egypt and in portraying themselves as legitimate kings.

to Egyptian history written by Greco-Roman historians must be conducted. An analysis of the modern scholarly secondary sources on the Late Period reveals that although many insightful and useful studies have been published on the period, the literature remains disparate and more narrowly focused on certain regions and periods. Most of the existing studies focus on the reign of a single king or dynasty – the Nubians or the Saites for example – while others take a stance that reveals the authors' erudite but sometimes narrow backgrounds in Egyptology, Assyriology, the Classics, and/or Biblical history. Some scholars, such as Kitchen[6] and Redford,[7] have managed to present a cohesive, continuous, and usable image of the Third Intermediate and Late Periods from the variety of sources available to modern scholarship, but none have investigated the period from the perspective taken in this dissertation.

Since many accounts of Late Period historical events are derived from Greco-Roman historians – primarily Herodotus, Manetho, and Diodorus – a chapter is dedicated to the veracity of these accounts and how they can be used by modern scholars in order to construct a reliable chronology of the period. An examination of the Greco-Roman historians led to the realization, by the author of this dissertation, that the Egyptians were not merely passive onlookers as the above mentioned historians wrote about Egypt, but were actually playing an active role in historical recording as their priests were selective in the information that they disseminated to the historians.

---

[6] See Kitchen, *Third*, particularly for his treatment of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty.

[7] Donald Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992). Redford presents a narrative in this book that concerns most of ancient Egyptian history, including the Late Period, particularly how the Egyptians interacted with their neighbors.

The three chapters that concern the thematic historical cycles comprise the core of this study. One of the initial findings of this study is the level of political complexity and acumen demonstrated by the competing dynasts in the Late Period. Perhaps because we are citizens of a modern world where information is available instantly at a keystroke, we tend to think of ancient peoples – especially those before the Greeks and Romans – as unsophisticated, politically speaking, but the reality is that rulers in the ancient world used a number of different methods to attain and hold power. Each of these methods was employed repeatedly by the successive dynasts as they usurped the throne, legitimized their rule and in turn, has their power usurped in a cyclical pattern throughout the Late Period.

The first method employed by hopeful dynasts desirous of the Egyptian throne in the Late Period, and the subject of Chapter IV, was invasion. At first glance this may seem fairly self-evident; a hopeful dynast looking from the outside must first usurp the throne and in many of the cases in the Late Period the dynast to-be was a foreigner so an invasion of Egypt was his only alternative. An examination of invasion in the Late Period from the primary sources available reveals that the process of invasion itself was often more complicated than a mere military maneuver and was often couched – at least in the texts – with religious verbiage and symbolism that vindicated the foreign conqueror as an order-restoring Egyptian king. Also, it is revealed that when some of these competing dynasts came to power they attempted to pursue imperial aims modeled on the empire builders of the New Kingdom, but alas their efforts were for the most part futile and ephemeral.

Chapter V concerns the method used after the new dynast came to power through a successful invasion – regicide. Regicide was an extremely rare occurrence throughout pharaonic history – at least it was never mentioned explicitly in any texts – until the Late Period. In the Late Period regicide became a common method of holding power that successive dynasts used against the previous ruling kings in order to ensure that no rival could legitimately claim the throne. In the Late Period, the old religious taboos against regicide and concepts of divine kingship were replaced with a more cynical *weltanschauung*, or world view, where foreign kings only gave heed to Egyptian traditions when it suited them politically.

The final political method used by the successive dynasts of the Late Period examined in Chapter VI of this dissertation is political legitimatization through building programs and patronage of native Egyptian cults and religious institutions. Since many of the dynasts examined in this period were foreign and most came to power through forceful means, how they portrayed themselves, and wished to be portrayed, was an integral aspect of their rule. First, what constitutes an act of political legitimization must be considered, namely what actions were taken by the dynasts in question *consciously* in order to legitimize their rule and the stability of their dynasty. The term "propaganda" may come to the readers mind here, but it should be pointed out that the modern concept of this term – which often conjures images of the Soviet Union or Nazi Germany – is often not applicable to the ancient world where media was limited and public opinion was never considered. The research reveals that each new dynast was quick to add to existing monuments – especially if they were of prime importance during the period – even if that meant following his previous rival. Patronage of religious cults and institutions, such as

the Apis cult and the God's Wife of Amen, was also another method used by the dynasts of the Third Intermediate and Late Periods to ingratiate themselves and control and/or influence the powerful priest class who ran those institutions.

The cyclical methods employed by the successive dynasts of the Late Period to obtain and hold power in Egypt did not take place in a vacuum, but sent shock waves throughout the country that fundamentally affected its culture – especially among the non-royals. As Egypt began to enter into uncertainty in the late New Kingdom a greater portion of the population began to express itself spiritually in what modern scholars term "popular religion."[8] Popular religion reached its heights during the Late Period when the cults of sacred animals became focal points for both non-royal religious practices and community activities.[9] Popular religion in the Late Period and its physical manifestation, the animal cults, was an extremely creative and positive reaction to the instability of the Late Period and was echoed in the artistic currents of the period. The art of the Late Period, especially statuary, is arguably the most technically masterful and aesthetically pleasing of all Egyptian art. Far from being "degenerate," Late Period artists combined tried and true techniques from Egypt's glorious artistic past with new innovations that created another positive response to the challenges of the Late Period.[10]

Since this dissertation is a historical study, the author would be remiss if he did not explain his own "philosophy of history" and any historiographical and philosophical influences which have aided in arriving at the conclusions presented in this work. It

---

[8] For a detailed study of Egyptian popular religion see Iskander Sadek, *Popular Religion in Egypt During the New Kingdom* (Hiledesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1998).

[9] For these ideas see J. D. Ray, "The World of North Saqqara," *World Archeology* 10 (1978): 149-57.

[10] For more about the art of the Late Period and publications pertaining to it see Chapter II of this dissertation.

should be clear already that the author is a believer in historical patterns and therefore one could say that the current work follows previous works that espouse theories of "cyclical history." Of course, many influential cyclical histories have been written in the past by controversial, yet esteemed, historians such Oswald Spengler,[11] and most notably Arnold J. Toynbee.[12] Despite the fact that these works concern the history of the entire world they provide a template for understanding how historical processes work and Toynbee's work in particular has given much inspiration to this dissertation.

In order to understand Toynbee's influence on this dissertation, a brief survey of some aspects of his philosophy of history and background is needed followed by a brief survey of other scholars' praise and criticism of his ideas. The primary emphasis of Toynbee's study was not nation-states or the entire mass of humanity, but what he classified as "civilizations." He wrote:

> If the argument of this chapter is accepted it will be agreed that the intelligible unit of historical study is neither a nation state nor (at the other end of the scale) mankind as a whole but a certain grouping of humanity which we have called a society.[13]

It was not that Toynbee was opposed to regional or national histories – he was in fact a respected and well published historian of ancient Greece and Rome[14] – but he believed

---

[11] Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, trans. Charles Francis Atkinson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989).

[12] Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, ed. D. C. Somervell, Two Volumes (New York: Dell Publishing, 1974). It should be noted that cyclical histories of the world were not written by only modern Western authors. Perhaps the best known non-Western historian who adopted a cyclical view of history was Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005).

[13] Toynbee, Study, 1:26.

[14] Cornelia Navari, "Arnold Toynbee (1889-1975): Prophecy and Civilization," *Review of International Studies* 26 (2000): 290. Among Toynbee's works on Greek history that is still relevant see, *Greek Historical Thought from Homer to the Age of Heraclius* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1924).

that when studying the entire history of the world, vast in its scope, "we must first focus our attention upon the whole, because this whole is the field of study that is intelligible in itself."[15] Toynbee identified twenty-one civilizations in his study,[16] but it is both out of the scope and not integral to this dissertation how he arrived at that number. Of primary importance to this work is Toynbee's theories of how civilizations are born, grow, and eventually collapse.

It is not the intent of this chapter, or the dissertation itself, to prove or disprove Toynbee's ideas – he was in fact wrong on some points which will be discussed below – since it is difficult to assign empirical laws to a study such as history that is contingent upon human factors which are by nature unpredictable. The purpose here then is to "cherry pick" some of Toynbee's ideas that are applicable to the history of Late Period Egypt and use them as inspiration for the current study. First, Toynbee's basic philosophy of history must briefly be examined. Toynbee was a true believer in the cyclical nature of history and that philosophy provided the backbone of his thesis in *A Study of History*. He perhaps best described his philosophy concisely in this passage:

> What of those movements of Yin and Yang, Challenge and Response, Withdrawal and Return, Apparentation and Affiliation, which we have elucidated? Are they not variations on the trite theme that 'History repeats itself'? Certainly, in the movement of all these forces that weave the web of human history, there is an obvious element of recurrence.[17]

Despite believing in the cyclical nature of human history, Toynbee was much less of a determinist than Spengler, he wrote: "the metaphor of the wheel in itself offers an

---

[15] Toynbee, *History*, 1:20.

[16] Ibid., 1:28-54.

[17] Ibid., 1:296.

illustration of recurrence being concurrent with progress."[18] The metaphor can also be applied to the historical processes of the Late Period; the processes of dynastic transition may have repeated themselves to a certain extent and brought varying levels of destruction and distress to Egypt, but Egyptian civilization continued on and prospered in many ways.

As a historian though, the author of this dissertation would be remiss to not discuss valid criticisms of Toynbee's ideas since they at least partially serve as inspiration for the current work. A river of criticism of Toynbee's *Study* flooded academia in the 1950s as the final volumes of his monumental work were published and at the vanguard was Dutch historian Pieter Geyl. Geyl found fault with Toynbee's assertion that he had identified historical laws that could be studied scientifically and empirically and argued that Toynbee did not follow those rules or laws himself instead preferring a system that was more theological than scientific. Geyl stated, "in reality the sovereignty and the freedom of the spirit are his main concern, and his Bible texts are more than a mere decoration of his argument."[19] Geyl's criticism of Toynbee's emphasis on religion is valid, especially when one considers the later volumes of the *Study* where his work took an abrupt turn as he relegated civilizations below "higher religions" as the primary focus of the study.[20]

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Pieter Geyl, "Toynbee's System of Civilizations," in *Toynbee and History: Critical Essays and Reviews*, ed. Ashley M. F. Montagu (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1956), 43.

[20] Toynbee, *Study*, 2:12-15. Essentially the latter volumes – volume II in the abridged version – concerns his comparisons of "universal churches"/higher religions and how universal states served as incubi for those churches.

Another valid criticism Geyl had of Toynbee's was the lack of empiricism in his work, although the latter claimed he could present world history in a scientific manner. Geyl wrote:

> When you fish in a cauldron you cannot select, and to select is exactly what he is doing all the time: he selects the instances which will support his theses, or he presents them in the way that suits him, and he does so with an assurance which hardly leaves room for the suspicion, not only that one might quote innumerable others with which his theses would not bear company, but especially that those cases he does mention can be explained or described in a different way so as to disagree no less completely with his theses.[21]

Geyl's polemics against Toynbee continued for several years and even involved a live radio debate,[22] but as the later volumes of Toynbee's *Study* were published and released to the public, his criticism focused more on Toynbee's philosophies than methodologies.

As noted above, the later volumes of Toynbee's *Study* diverged sharply, philosophically speaking, from the earlier volumes. He downplayed the importance of civilizations *per se* and instead argued that higher religions, or Universal Churches, were the primary agents of world history among the third generation of civilizations.[23] The reasons for Toynbee's change – or perhaps one may say evolution if inclined to agree with him – may be that he lived through both World Wars and lost many friends, especially in World War I.[24] It is in the latter volumes that Toynbee let his prophetic

---

[21] Geyl, "Toynbee," 45; Pieter Geyl, *Debates with Historians* (New York: Meridian Books, 1958), 178.

[22] Geyl, *Debates*, 157. The debate was broadcast from London, England by the British Broadcasting Company in 1948.

[23] Toynbee, *Study*, 2:63-68. In this chapter for instance Toynbee described how laws are carried from one dying civilization to a new vibrant one via religion. Among the various examples he used as comparisons were Roman law codes infiltrating the Western, Russian Orthodox, and Syriac civilizations respectively through Roman Catholicism, Orthodox Christianity, and Islam.

[24] James Joll, "Two Prophets of the Twentieth Century: Spengler and Toynbee," *Review of International Studies* 11 (1985): 94. Lee Grugel argues that the sight of seeing "the names of so many promising young scholars etched into the gray memorial tablets of the Oxford colleges convinced Toynbee

philosophies loose as he claimed that mankind was left with few options in the future – an ecumenical world state was inevitable, it was only a matter of if it would be carried out forcibly by the United States or Soviet Union with nuclear weapons or if it would take place more peaceably under the aegis of an organization like the United Nations.[25] This line of thinking drew considerable criticism from Geyl; this author agrees with Geyl that this is where Toynbee began to lose sight of his original history and veered into the realm of social planning and "futurism" too much. Perhaps Geyl best summed up this latter philosophy of Toynbee when he wrote, "he is no historian. He is a prophet."[26]

Other criticisms of Toynbee's *Study* in academia has ranged from scathing attacks by Hugh Trevor-Roper which impugned his scholarly credibility[27] to more leveled critiques like that of Christopher Dawson who respected Toynbee's work but found problems reconciling "the moral absolutism of his judgments with the cultural relativism of this theory."[28] Besides Geyl's assessment of the later volumes of the *Study*, this is perhaps the best appraisal of one of the most irreconcilable aspects of Toynbee's work. If one is to work under the assumption that every civilization and/or higher religion surveyed in Toynbee's *Study* has essentially the same inherent value and that visible differences are only the results of superficial cultural expressions then how can one also

---

that he had been spared, not for the leisure of learning, but for producing results," and so was the inspiration of his *Study*. "In Search of a Legacy for Arnold Toynbee," *The Journal of General Education* 31 (1979): 39.

[25] Toynbee, *Study,* 2:167-68; 361-64.

[26] Geyl, *Debates*, 195.

[27] Hugh Trevor-Roper, "Testing the Toynbee System," in Montagu, 122-24. Most of Trevor-Roper's criticism of Toynbee bordered on juvenile name calling and deserves little more than what has been said in this dissertation. For instance he stated that, "he compares himself with the Prophet Ezekiel; and certainly, at times, he is just as unintelligible." 122.

[28] Christopher Dawson, "Toynbee's Study of History: The Place of Civilizations in History," in Montagu,131.

assume a unitary philosophy of history? Despite ample amounts of criticism of Toynbee's *Study* that arose among scholars, there was also a fair amount of praise, which was also sometimes given by his critics.

Grugel is more forgiving of Toynbee's propensity to prophecy than Geyl was as he points out that he is merely carrying on a tradition of earlier historians such as Thucydides and Livy.[29] In fact Grugel takes a different approach than most scholars to the inconsistencies touched on above in Toynbee's *Study* – namely the change in philosophy from the early to the later volumes – seeing them as a "secularized *Divine Comedy* in which the culture escapes its deserved fate by a return to communion with the Good."[30] More recently Toynbee's central idea of the civilization, not the nation-state, being the focus of historical studies has acquired more prescience in the era of globalization. As cultures continue to come into contact with each other and sometimes clash, Toynbee's civilizational model may prove to be more instructive for historians and foreign affairs experts alike.[31] Despite being one of Toynbee's biggest critics, and perhaps the best known, Geyl gave ample credit to the historian in certain respects including his erudite knowledge of Hellenic history and his insight as a historian. Perhaps the following quote best sums up his thoughts on Toynbee and shows how the work still has value despite falling short academically in some areas:

---

[29] Grugel, "Toynbee," 37.

[30] Ibid., 42.

[31] Navari, "Toynbee," 289. Perhaps one of the better known scholars influenced by Toynbee in recent decades was Samuel Huntington who wrote, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003).

> Could we but lay aside his system, with its precise subdivisions and sequences, we could find in his analyses and parallels, in his interpretations and even in his terminology, so much to stimulate thought and to activate the imagination![32]

The reality is that one *can* lay aside part or even all of Toynbee's system and still be left with a work with inherent value. The beauty of history is that it is *not* a hard science and therefore any rules or "laws" pertaining to it are subject to revision depending on the situation and era, which means that Toynbee's *Study* can be cherry picked by contemporary scholars, such as the author of this dissertation, and used to understand and explain numerous historical processes from various cultures – nation-states as well as civilizations according to Toynbee's definition – in order to add to existing scholarship.

By utilizing *some* of Toynbee's ideas critically, combined with tried and true Egyptological methods of study pertaining to chronology, texts, archaeology, etc., a new understanding of Late Period Egypt can be achieved. The historical processes that were active during the Late Period were significant, but merely assembling a chronology of the period based on the relevant texts gives modern scholars an incomplete image. The true significance of the Late Period and its historical processes of dynastic transition can only be truly understood if one realizes that processes followed patterns and did not take place in a vacuum, but were both contingent and influential upon other events and processes throughout the Near East. Once this is established then a more complete image of the often enigmatic Egyptian Late Period can be arrived at that considers these numerous challenges that Egypt faced and how pharaonic culture responded in ways that were significant in terms of being both creative and destructive. As the Late Period progressed, the world that the Egyptians lived in began to expand to the point that they were a part of

[32] Geyl, "Toynbee," 65.

a larger system, where their civilization clashed with others to the point that they were eventually overcome politically, but the strength of their culture continued on and in some respects even flourished. Perhaps that is the true legacy of the Late Period; pharaonic culture soldiered on and truly proved to be eternal in the face of enormous odds that may have extinguished the light of other cultures.

Chapter II: A Historiographical Essay of Modern Late Period Scholarship

The available scholarly literature on the Third Intermediate and Late Periods is sparse compared to earlier periods of pharaonic history, but there are a number of useful studies that relate either directly or indirectly to this dissertation. Unfortunately the past consensus of Egyptologists concerning this period has been one of dismissal and a propensity to let scholars in other fields such as Assyriologists, Biblical scholars, and Classicists conduct most of the research and writing. The result is a collage of books, articles, and reports that often concerns only one point of view i.e. Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, etc. in a very limited chronological framework without considering the period as whole and the various nuances that make it unique, namely the interaction between various cultures. Therefore it is the task of the scholar to determine which secondary works are relevant and how the often disparate literature on this period can be pieced together in order to create a solid base for further research. This chapter will present the major secondary works concerning the Third Intermediate and Late Periods and their usefulness to current scholarship.

Friedrich Kienitz was the first scholar to publish a historical survey of the Late Period.[1] The book is divided into two sections – the first being concerned mainly with historical issues while the second primarily chronology – that are further divided into twenty-two total chapters. Kienitz's work was visionary not only because it was the first complete survey of the Late Period, but also that it utilized a number of available primary sources which presented the history from an Egyptian perspective. He noted that before his work the image of this period was dominated by the Greeks and to some degree the

[1] Friedrich Karl Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundet vor der Zeitwende* (Berlin, Akademie Verlag), 1953.

Persians.[2] Although Kienitz provided the Egyptological community with a work that is still relevant in many aspects, such as Chapter Six of Section One, "Der Niedergang der persischen Herrschaft,"[3] other parts like Chapter Ten of Section Two, "Denkmälerliste der Pharaonen des 4. Jahrhunderts,"[4] are dated due to the fact that all of the monuments on the list were published before World War II.[5]

The next major scholarly work published on the Late Period was *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit: Ihre Geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Bedeutung* by Eberhard Otto.[6] *Die biographischen* is a collection of German translations of seventy-five statues and stelae from the Third Intermediate through the Roman periods, with the emphasis being on the inscriptions more than art historical observations.[7] Otto argued that the Egyptian of the Late Period lived in a world where the "ideal" of his centuries old world view was juxtaposed with the reality of foreign occupation, which created a tension that manifested itself in the art and inscriptions of this period. He stated that despite this tension the Egyptian did not adopt the foreign world view:

---

[2] Ibid., 1.

[3] Ibid., 113-122. Before this work, Twenty Seventh Dynasty Egypt was given little attention from the Egyptian perspective, with one notable exception which will be discussed below in this chapter.

[4] Ibid., 190-233.

[5] For monuments of the last native Egyptian dynasties published after World War II see Herman D. Meulenaere, "La famille royale des Nectanebo," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 90 (1965): 90-93, and "Les monuments du culte des rois Nectanebo," *Chronique d'Egypte* 35 (1960): 92-107. Also see M. Raziq, "Study on Nectanebo Ist in Luxor temple and Karna," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 22 (1968): 150-161.

[6] Eberhard Otto, *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit: Ihre Geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Bedeutung* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), 1954.

[7] Ibid., 130-199.

> Eines jedenfalls ist klar: Dass unter solchen Umständen die Spannung zwischen der Idee vom agyptischen Staat und seinem Leben, wie der einzelne sie in sich trug, und zwischen der Tatsächlichket nahezu unterträglich warden musste. Und doch hat der Ägypter – und das beweist seine innere Stärke und Ungebrochenheit – sein Weltbild nicht unter dem Druck der Verhältnisse der Wirklichkeit angepasst.[8]

He further argued that the biographical texts of the Late Period present an enormous value to scholarship because they display this tension between the "ideal" and reality.[9] One criticism of Otto's work may be that the time period it covers is too vast and so lacks historical continuity, but he argued that Egyptian worldview from the Twenty Second Dynasty through the Roman period was for the most part similar.[10] Otto's publication of Late Period biographical inscriptions did much to illuminate the social structure of Late Period Egypt and no doubt influenced an equally if not more important work by Bernard Bothmer.

Bothmer's *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 100*[11] was the first true art historical study of the Late Period. Bothmer's study was obviously influenced by Otto's work to some degree as it covered nearly the same time period, although *Egyptian Sculpture* covers a period that begins almost two hundred years later.[12] Where Otto focused almost entirely on the inscriptions on the statues Bothmer dedicated his study to the stylistic and iconographic features of the statues. Bothmer noted that Late Period statuary was "archaizing," that is it borrowed features from early periods of

---

[8] Ibid., 2-3.

[9] Ibid., 4.

[10] Ibid., 6.

[11] Bernard Bothmer, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 100* (New York: Arno Press Incorporated), 1969.

[12] Despite the difference in starting points, both studies terminate with the Roman Period.

Egyptian history such as the seated scribal statue which was popular in the Old and Middle Kingdoms.[13] Perhaps Bothmer's greatest contribution to Egyptology in general and Late Period scholarship in particular was his identification of a "pre" or "proto" portraiture in the sculpture of this period that would influence the art of the Greeks. He wrote:

> One of the many fascinating aspects that lend to Late Period sculpture a mark of distinction is the treatment of the human face. As in all previous periods of Egyptian art, there is a fair share of idealization, arising from the desire to create for posterity a harmonious, contented, eternally youthful countenance. From the middle of the seventh century on, we find the outspoken "smile," which - together with the rigid frontality and stance of the Egyptian statue - was soon to be taken over by the Greeks, but at the same time a new conception of the human face made itself felt.[14]

Bothmer also gave considerable consideration to the art of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty, which up until then had received little historical attention and no art historical consideration. Far from being a period of degenerate art, Bothmer proved that the sculpture of the Late Period was not only technically sound but also innovative and that the art of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty was the pinnacle of the period. It was during the Persian occupation of Egypt that true portraiture was first used. Bothmer stated:

> After the half-century of the reign of Psamtik I, this realism is discontinued, only to crop up again under Persian rule. Although Dynasty XXVII is archaeologically but little explored, we have enough evidence to claim that after 525 B.C. there begins a development that quickly ripens to true portraiture in the Western sense, revealing the outer as well as the inner characteristics of a human being in the lineaments of his face.[15]

---

[13] Ibid., xxvi-ii.

[14] Ibid., xxxviii.

[15] Ibid.

Bothmer's *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period* is perhaps one of the most important works on the Late Period because of its ground-breaking assessment of the subject matter and the fact that it is still relevant and an important resource for any study of the period.

Dieter Arnold significantly added to the scholarship of the Third Intermediate and Late Periods by providing an extensive catalog of all the major temples of these periods in his book *Temples of the Last Pharaohs.*[16] Arnold's work is primarily concerned with architectural aspects instead of the iconography and texts in the reliefs of the temples. Similar to Bernard Bothmer's view in *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period* that Late Period sculpture was in many ways superior to the periods which preceded it,[17]Arnold stated that the temples of the Late Period "demonstrate that architecture took significant steps."[18] *Temples* is divided chronologically – beginning with the Third Intermediate Period and ending in the Roman Period – and thematically with two chapters that focus on special architectural features of Late Period temples.[19] One of the most useful aspects of *Temples* is the numerous drawings of reconstructed plans of many of the temples. This is helpful because many of the drawings of temple plans available in Egyptological literature are of low quality and incomplete compared to Arnold's drawings in *Temples.*

The most recently published study of the entire Third Intermediate and Late Periods is Karol Myśliwiec's *Twilight of Ancient Egypt: First Millennium B.C.E.*[20]

---

[16] Dieter Arnold, *Temples of the Last Pharaohs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

[17] See notes 14 and 15.

[18] Arnold, *Temples,* 3.

[19] Ibid., chapters one through eight are chronologically arranged while chapters nine and ten are thematic.

[20] Karol Myśliwiec, *The Twilight of Ancient Egypt: First Millennium B.C.E,* trans. David Lorton (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000).

Although *Twilight* is an enjoyable read it offers nothing new in terms of scholarship. *Twilight* has no foot or endnotes and the bibliography is woefully inadequate for anyone planning to do serious research on the Third Intermediate Period or Late Period. The information presented by Myśliwiec is covered in a much more scholarly manner by the books mentioned above. Despite the lack of scholarly value in *Twilight*, Myśliwiec contributed a very useful work to the study of Third Intermediate and Late Period art with *Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI-XXX* .[21] *Portraiture* is a solid study of royal art in the period and is a good complement to Bothmer's *Egyptian Sculpture* and Otto's *Die biographischen*.

There have been a number of useful books and articles published about the specific foreign ethnic groups that ruled Egypt during the Third Intermediate and Late Periods. Jean Yoyotte wrote the first major work concerning the Third Intermediate Period and the advent of Libyan rule in Egypt.[22] The purpose of Yoyotte's work was to reveal Egypt's politically fragmented history from the Ninth through Seventh centuries BC through published primary sources which he admitted was sparse in the Delta region. Yoyotte wrote:

> "C'est donc autant l'étude des chefs locaux que celle des dynasties royales qui révèle le cadre politque dans lequel s'est déroulée l'histoire égyptienne du IXe au VIIe siècle . . . la documentation relative à la Basse Égypte est beucoup plus clairsemée et paraît preque inexistante."[23]

---

[21] Karol Myśliwiec, *Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI-XXX* (Mainz: Phillipp von Zabern, 1988).

[22] Jean Yoyotte, "Les principautés du delta au temps de l'anarchie libyenne," *Mélanges Maspero* 4 (1961): 121-181.

[23] Ibid., 121.

Yoyotte divided his work into chapters concerning the Libyan tribes, Meshwesh and Libu, and geographic locations of importance such as Sebennytos and Athribis.[24] Farouk Gomaà also produced a study of the various Libyan kingdoms in a 1974 book.[25] Gomaà's study follows Yoyotte's for the most part, as it used many of the same sources and so is essentially only a newer German language version of "Anarchie." More recently, Robert Ritner has produced a volume of many of the same translations in Yoyotte's work on the Libyans.[26] Ritner provides more up to-date translations that may prove more accessible to native English speakers.

Kenneth Kitchen conducted the most comprehensive and accurate study of the Third Intermediate Period in his monumental work *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*.[27] The purpose of Kitchen's book was to establish an accurate chronology of the Libyan period, which has often been complicated by the fact that dynasties existed simultaneously. Kitchen writes:

> The aims of the present book are simple: to reconstruct the basic chronology of the 21st-25th Dynasties, and therewith to present an historical outline (Part IV) that should incorporate the results gained and serve as a compact, reasonably up-to-date survey of almost five centuries of Egyptian history for a wide scholarly and interested public.[28]

---

[24] Yoyotte wrote many articles concerning the Third Intermediate and Late Periods over his long and Illustrious career. For a discussion on Bakenrenef, the lone king of the Twenty-Fourth dynasty, and his possible attempt to conquer all of Egypt see "Bocchoris à Tanis et l'expansion des premiers rois saïtes ver l'orient," *Kemi* 21 (1971): 35-45. Yoyotte based his theory on a fragment of a monument with the cartouche of Bakenrenef from Tanis. He stated that "Ce succès fut sans doute obtenu par la violence," 45.

[25] Farouk Gomaà, *Die libyschen Fürstentümer des Deltas vom Tod Osorkons II. bis zur Wiedervereinigung Ägyptiens durch Psametik I* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974).

[26] Robert Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy: Inscriptions from Egypt's Third Intermediate Period* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

[27] Kenneth A. Kitchen, . *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: (1100 to 650 BC),* 2nd ed. (Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris and Phillips Limited, 1995).

[28] Ibid., xi.

Kitchen successfully met his aims by utilizing a wide range of Egyptian, Assyrian, Biblical, and Greek primary sources in a well-organized book comprised of twenty-four chapters including numerous tables and maps that further help to make chronological sense of this often confusing period. Kitchen added that the apparent confusion of this period has often diminished its importance in the eyes of scholars but "that the period in question is far from being chaotic (unlike its earlier supposed analogues), and so not merely 'intermediate,' but significant in its own right."[29] Although the chronology of the Third Intermediate period provided by Kitchen is the primary purpose of his work, he also offered numerous arguments on important historical issues of the period such as the importance the Delta city of Sais held not only in Egypt but in the entire Near East from the Eighth through Sixth centuries BC, and what he believed to be its faulty association with the So of 2 Kings 17:4.[30] *The Third Intermediate Period* has proved to be such a valuable resource to Egyptology that a new edition with a revised and updated preface was published in 1995.

Scholarship on Nubia and the Twenty Fifth Dynasty can trace its origins to the American Egyptologist George Reisner. Reisner was curator of Egyptian art at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and professor of Egyptology at Harvard when he was given the authorization to excavate the site by the Sudanese government in 1910 and then began

---

[29] Ibid.

[30] Kitchen states, "Sais was merely the seat of a line of Chiefs of Ma, from a Pimay to Tefnakht in our inscriptional sources." Ibid., xxxv. He argued that So was Osorkon IV of the Twenty-Second dynasty. Ibid., 374. For the argument that the biblical So is Sais see Donald Redford, "Sais and the Kushite Invasions of the Eighth Century B.C," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 22 (1985): 15. For more on this historiographical argument see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

his work in 1913.[31] Reisner contributed as much to archaeology as he did to Nubian studies because his two volume publication of his expedition to Kerma contains meticulous cataloging of most of the pottery shards his team discovered. This scientific method of archaeology proved to be the way that future archaeologists would conduct their expeditions. Perhaps most interesting is Reisner's personal bias and how it affected his ideas of Nubian culture. Concerning modern Nubians he wrote:

> I take it that a race which cannot produce or even fully utilize the products of a higher culture must, from an historical point of view, still be counted in its former state. The evidences of the fortuitous possession of the products of a higher culture only deepen the impression of cultural incompetence.[32]

Reisner's view of modern Nubians no doubt was one of the factors that led him to conclude that "The Nubian race was negroid, but not negro; it was perhaps a mixture of the proto-Egyptian and a negro or negroid race, possibly related to the Libyan race."[33] Despite the problems inherent in some of Reisner's ideas, his work provided the basis for later Nubian and Twenty Fifth Dynasty studies.

Helene von Zeissl's *Äthiopen und Assyrer in Ägypten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Spätzeit* was the first major historical study published which concerned the Twenty Fifth Dynasty.[34] As the title suggests, this study focuses on the Twenty-Fifth dynasty and the subsequent Assyrian invasions and brief occupation of Egypt, but it also

---

[31] George Reisner, *Excavations at Kerma* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1923), 1:3.

[32] Ibid., 7.

[33] Ibid., 8.

[34] Helen von Zeissl, *Äthiopen und Assyrer in Ägypten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Spätzeit* (J.J. Augustin: Glückstadt, 1955).

includes a short chapter about Persian, Greek, and Roman rule in Egypt.[35] Although this book is for the most part dated because subsequent studies have provided a more thorough bibliography of published primary sources,[36] it first forwarded the argument for the identification of Piru, from the annals of Sargon II, with the sole king of the Egyptian Twenty Fourth Dynasty, Bakenrenef. Von Zeissl wrote:

> Denn wenn Sargon auch den König von Assyiren, berichtet, dass er in seinem 7. Jahr von dem König von Ägypten nicht miet seinem Eigennamen, wodurch jeder Zweifel behoben wäre, sondern Piru=Pharao nennt, so ist doch mit Sicherheit anzunehmen, dass es sich hier um Bokchoris handelt.[37]

Unfortunately it appears that without a definite name attributed to the Egyptian king in question, this will continue to be a circular argument.

Jean Leclant produced the next major scholarly work on the Twenty-Fifth dynasty with his extensive study *Recherches sur les monuments thébains de la XXVe Dynastie dite ethiopienne.*[38] Leclant's study focused on Upper Egypt in order to provide an investigation of Twenty Fifth Dynasty historical sources, "Tout d'abord, travaillant à une enquête sur les sources de l'histoire de la XXVe dynastie, dite ethiopienne."[39] He also hoped that his study would add to the scholarly corpus of Egyptological studies further by

---

[35] Ibid., 83-7.

[36] Such as Robert G Morkot, *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers* (London: The Rubicon Press, 2000).

[37] Ibid., 12. For another argument for the identification of Piru with Bakenrenef see Anthony Spalinger, "The Year 712 B.C. and its Implications for Egyptian History," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 10 (1973): 96-7. For the argument that Piru was either Piankhy or Shabaqa see Kitchen, *Third,* 143-44. Also see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[38] Jean Leclant, *Recherches sur les monuments thébains de la XXVe Dynastie dite ethiopienne* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Oreintale, 1965).

[39] Ibid., vii.

illuminating the importance of the city of Thebes.[40] The study is arranged according to temples and the respective kings who built them, but with most of the hieroglyphic texts coming from the statues of high officials discovered in the Karnak cachette.[41] Although there are a limited number of plates of the monuments, and the images are in black and white and not very clear, *Recherches* continues to be academically relevant as it provides a catalog of all the important monuments of Thebes in the Nubian period with complete bibliographical information for each entry.

Perhaps the most complete historical study of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty was presented by Robert Morkot in *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers.*[42] Morkot went beyond a simple survey of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty in this well written and meticulously noted book, by acknowledging that in order to understand Egypt in the Eighth and Seventh centuries BC one must understand that "the ancient world was as complex and dynamic as ours, and not just a group of societies . . . which can be treated in isolation."[43] He accomplished this by utilizing all available primary sources; art historical, archaeological, and textual from all pertinent cultures into a coherent narrative of the period.

Also recently, László Török has contributed to Nubian scholarship with the monumental book, *The Kingdom of Kush*[44] which presents the history of Nubia from the

---

[40] Ibid., viii.

[41] Ibid., xi.

[42] Morkot, *Pharaohs.*

[43] Ibid., x.

[44] László Török, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

archaic period through the Meröitic period. Török makes ample use of textual and archaeological sources in this work that is divided into seven chapters. Of special interest to this dissertation are the chapters that concern the Twenty Fifth Dynasty's rise to power in Egypt and its subsequent expulsion. Török also co-edited a multivolume work of transliterations and translations of Nubian inscriptions[45] which were utilized in this work and provide a much needed update to Breasted's *Ancient Records.*

Various aspects of the Saite period have been dealt with in numerous books and articles by several different scholars. Jean Yoyotte wrote important articles concerning foreign policy in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, especially during the short reign of Psamtek II.[46] Herman de Meulenaere's *Herodotus over de 26ste Dynastie* was the first book that exclusively concerned the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, although the number of published secondary sources has greatly increased since its publication making it dated to some degree.[47] Anthony Spalinger contributed to understanding the nature of Saite kingship in a 1978 *Orientalia* article.[48] Spalinger took a cynical view of Saite Egypt, stating that it "had come to resemble the decadent Roman Empire more and more,"[49] and that Psamtek

---

[45] L. Török, T. Eide, T. Hägg, and R.H. Pierce eds. and trans., *Fontes Historiae Nubioram: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region Between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD*. 3 Vols (Bergen: University of Bergen, 1994-2008).

[46] For a short article on Psamtek II's journey to the Levant see Jean Yoyotte, "Sur le Voyage Asiatique de Psammetique II," *Vetus Testamentum* 1 (1951): 141-144. On Psamtek II's year three campaign into Nubia see Le campagne nubienne de Psammétique II et sa signification historique." *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 50 (1952): 157-207, and "Le martelage des noms éthopiens par Psammétique II." *Revue de Egyptologie* 8 (1951): 215-239. Yoyotte provided a catalog of defaced Twenty Fifth Dynasty monuments in Egypt and Nubia in "Le martelage," which he argued was committed by Psamtek II during his campaign into Nubia.

[47] Herman de Meulenaere, *Herodotus over de 26ste Dynastie* (Leuven: Leuven University, 1951).

[48] Anthony Spalinger, "The Concept of Monarchy during the Saite Epoch – An Essay in Synthesis," *Orientalia* 47 (1978): 12-36.

[49] Ibid., 20.

II's "victory over Kush in his third year is a little vainglorious."[50] Ultimately Spalinger viewed the Saite kings as weak and "the best image of the Saite monarchy is that of one desperate king after the other vainly attempting to halt the tide of invasion."[51] Peter De Manuelian wrote one of the more recent studies of Saite Period Egypt in 994.[52] Linguistic archaism is the focus of Manuelian's book, which he demonstrated with numerous grammatical examples from Twenty Sixth Dynasty texts. If nothing else this is a useful book because of the number of important texts that are complete with hieroglyphic transcriptions, transliterations, and English translations.

The Twenty Seventh or Persian Dynasty has received little attention from Egyptologists, but there have been some important studies conducted that are worth mentioning here. There have been a number of useful works published that concern the greater Achaemenid Empire, of which A.T. Olmstead's classic *History of the Persian Empire* must be considered first.[53] *History* is a basic chronological survey of the Achaemenid Persian Empire that drew heavily from the Greek sources but also made significant use of Persian, Mesopotamian, biblical, and Egyptian sources. Although the book may appear as a simple event by event retelling of history, Olmstead wanted to present the larger picture of the Achaemenid Empire as a collage of ancient cultures. He wrote:

---

[50] Ibid., 22.

[51] Ibid., 35.

[52] Peter D. Manuelian, *Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty* (London: Keegan Paul International, 1994).

[53] A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948).

> The real purpose of the book, however, will be exposition of culture – or rather, of cultures, for Achaemenid history presents a fascinating picture of various civilizations at different stages of evolution and all in the process of intermingling.[54]

There have been many other surveys conducted of the Achaemenid Empire since *History*, two of the most recent being John Boardman's *Persia and the West*[55] and Lindsay Allen's *The Persian Empire.*[56] Boardman's work is art historical in nature while Allen's is historical but more thematic than chronological. Perhaps the best work of the Achaemenid Empire done recently was Pierre Briant's,[57] which combined both a thematic and chronological approach to provide the most extensive and exhaustive – in terms of primary and secondary sources utilized – study of the period.

Persian theology occupies a key position in chapter seven of this dissertation, so a brief assessment of the available primary and secondary sources is needed here. Roland Kent provided the academic world with a valuable tool with his 1953 publication of Achaemenid period Persian texts.[58] The first half of Kent's *Old Persian Texts* consists of a grammar guide and lexicon for students of Old Persian while the second half is a collection of English translations and transliterations of Achaemenid period Old Persian historical/religious texts, which were taken primarily from monumental inscriptions in Persia. The collection is the most comprehensive of the period, although unfortunately

---

[54] Ibid., xiii.

[55] John Boardman, *Persia and the West: An Archaeological Investigation of the Genesis of Achaemenid Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000).

[56] Lindsay Allen, *The Persian Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

[57] Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire,* trans. by Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002).

[58] Kent, Roland G, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon,* 2nd ed. (New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1953).

the translations are only of the Old Persian cuneiform inscriptions while most Achaemenid period monumental texts were written in multiple languages along with Old Persian.[59] Since Persian theology was not fully articulated in writing until the fifth century AD[60] one often has to study later texts in order to understand the religion.[61] Perhaps the most complete English translation of Persian religious texts is L. H. Mill's translation of the *Zend-Avesta.*[62] Mill's translation was originally published in 1887, but given its scholarly importance was republished in 1965 as part of the Sacred Books of the East series. More wide ranging and perhaps more accessible is Mary Boyce's *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism.*[63] Boyce's work contains a variety of Persian religious texts from the Achaemenid period to modern times divided thematically into such chapters as, "Tradition and Doctrine"[64] and "The Fate of the Soul at Death, and a Vision of Heaven and Hell."[65] Although *Sources* provides scholars with a sizable

---

[59] For example both the statue of Darius I from Susa and the Red Sea stelae, which are discussed in Chapter VI of this dissertation, contain Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions along with cuneiform inscriptions in Old Persian, Akkadian, and Elamite. Among some of the more important publications of Achaemenid period inscriptions in Akkadian and Elamite cuneiform are; Marie-Joseph Steve, "Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse," *Studia Iranica* 3 (1974): 135-69. Also see François Vallat "Deux inscriptions elamites de Darius Ier (DSf et DSz)," *Studia Iranica* 1 (1972): 8-11; and "Un fragment de tablette achemenide et la turqoise," *Akkadia* 33 (1983): 63-68.

[60] Mary Boyce, trans. and ed., *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 1.

[61] The range of Persian, or Zoroastrian, religious texts spans a long chronological period ranging from the Achaemenid period until the mid-nineteenth century; Boyce, *Sources,* 5. It is outside the scope of this dissertation to include all of these sources so only the most important, and relevant to the Twenty Seventh Dynasty, historical and theological texts will be considered in this study.

[62] L. H. Mills, trans. and ed., *The Zend-Avesta* 3 vols. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965).

[63] Boyce, *Sources*.

[64] Ibid., 27-45.

[65] Ibid., 80-4.

number of Persian religious texts, the historical and theological background of Persian religion is better explained in other secondary sources

Unfortunately there is a dearth of secondary material concerning Persian religion, but there are three noteworthy books that can aid the scholar in this subject. Mary Boyce, who was discussed above for her publication of Persian religious texts, wrote perhaps the best known secondary source on Persian religion.[66] Boyce's important work was first published in 1979 but had to be reprinted in 1983 and 2001 due to "notable advances in the study of Zoroastrianism."[67] *Zoroastrians* follows a chronological framework from pre-historic Persia to the unique situation of modern Zoroastrians. Boyce provided a valuable tool to scholars with this book although it is not without problems. There is a bibliography for each chapter but no foot or endnotes which makes trying to locate primary sources used in the book difficult. Where Boyce's *Zoroastrians* falls short, two other books on Persian religion fill in the gaps. A more thorough treatment of ancient Persian religion was given by William Malandra in 1983.[68] Malandra intended for his book to be accessible, for both scholars and lay people, and to provide "an outline of the religion in its historical, cultural, and spiritual setting."[69] One final secondary source worth mentioning here is Peter Clark's *Zoroastrianism: An Introduction to an Ancient Faith*.[70] Clark's work is more anthropological and theological in nature as it concentrates

---

[66] Mary Boyce, *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London: Routledge, 2001).

[67] Boyce, *Zoroastrians,* xiii.

[68] William W. Malandra, *An Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religion: Readings from the Avesta and the Achaemenid Inscriptions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983).

[69] Ibid., v.

[70] Peter Clark, *Zoroastrianism: An Introduction to an Ancient Faith* (Portland, Oregon: Sussex Academic Press, 1998).

more on rituals and practices in a modern context while "historical events are only discussed when they relate directly to doctrine or practice."[71] Historians are still aided by this book – despite the lack of historical background – especially concerning the unique Persian funerary practices which Clark described in detail in terms of both ritual and theology.[72]

Despite there being few Egyptology articles or books that concern the Twenty Seventh Dynasty exclusively, an academic leap early on was taken with the publication of George Posener's *La première domination perse en Égypte: Recueil d'inscriptions hiéroglyphs*.[73] There was no significant Egyptological publication of any historical aspect of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty before Posener's collection of royal and non-royal hieroglyphic texts was published in 1936. After *Première* was published it significantly aided later studies of the Late Period such as Kienitz's *Geschichte*.[74] Posener acknowledged that most of the knowledge Egyptologists' had of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty came from Greco-Roman sources such as Herodotus, which had a tendency to be distorted especially concerning the Achaemenid Persians who were the rivals of many of the Greek city-states. He intended for his collection of texts to fill in the gaps that were often left by the Greco-Roman sources. He wrote:

---

[71] Ibid., ix.

[72] Ibid., 114-17.

[73] George Posener, *La première domination Perse en Égypte: Recueil d'inscriptions hiéroglyphs* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Oreintale, 1936.

[74] Kienitz, *Geschichte.* Kienitz cites monuments from Posener's *Première* on numerous occasions in chapter five, "Ägypten als Satrapie des persichen Weltreiches," and chapter six, "Der Niedergang der persichen Herrschaft," 55-67.

> Le present travail a précisément pour objet de chercher à combler cette lacune et de permettre à l'historien d'embrasser d'un coup d'oeil l'essentiel des documents comtemporains des premiers Achéménides.[75]

Posener realized that not only specific events and nuances of the First Persian period would be illuminated through examination of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty hieroglyphic texts, but also those same texts would help Egyptologists develop a chronology of the period independent of the Greco-Roman sources. "Le désir de constituer un ensemble chronologique et philologique nous a conduit a éliminer les passages de la literature ptolémaïque relatifs à la Perse."[76] Truly, Posener's *Première* has been the single most important publication for the Egyptological community's understanding of the Twenty-Seventh dynasty and continues to aid and influence scholarly works of this period including this dissertation.

The next major Egyptology publication of Twenty Seventh Dynasty subject matter was H. E. Winlock's publication of the excavation and epigraphic recording of the Hibis Temple in the El-Kharga oasis.[77] Although archaeologists from the Metropolitan Museum of Art first began work on the Hibis temple in 1909, the delayed publications[78] followed Posener's which actually may have suited scholarship best because the Hibis temple represented another filled lacuna in the history of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty.

---

[75] Posener, *Perse*, vii.

[76] Ibid.

[77] H. E. Winlock, *The Temple of Hibis in El Kharga Oasis*, part 1 *The Excavations* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1941).

[78] Also see Norman Davies, *The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis*, part 3 *The Decorations* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1953).

More recent excavations and publications of the Hibis temple have been done by Eugene Cruz-Uribe.[79]

Because king-lists such as the *Turin Canon* only cover the New Kingdom and prior, Egyptologists often turn to the transmissions of Manetho and the *Demotic Chronicle* for chronologies of the Third Intermediate Period and Late Period. Manetho was a priest who "doubtless held office at one time in the temple at Sebennytus" in the Delta in the third century BC and compiled a chronology of Egypt's thirty -one dynasties.[80] Waddel's translation and commentary of Manetho's transmissions continues to be useful to the modern scholar, although we only possess second and third hand accounts of the ancient historian's work.[81] Despite the inherent problems that can accompany using Manetho's transmissions in scholarly research, his chronology of the Third Intermediate and Late Periods continues to be used by modern scholars and has been the focus of two major Egyptological studies.

---

[79] For field reports see, "The Hibis Temple Project 1984 -85 Field Season, Preliminary Report," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 23 (1986): 157-166. For translations of the temple inscriptions see, *Hibis Temple Project Volume I: Translations, Commentary, Discussions, and Sign List* (San Antonio: Van Siclen, 1988). For a survey of the first invasion of Egypt by the Achaemenid Persians with a critique of the Egyptian and Greco-Roman primary sources see Cruz-Uribe, "The Invasion of Egypt by Cambyses," *Transeuphratène* 25 (2003): 9-60.

[80] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca,* trans. W.G. Waddell (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004), xi.

[81] Waddell divided the transmissions into two categories: "Excerpts from the original work are preserved by Josephus, along with other passages which can only be pseudo-Manethonian. The Jews of the three centuries following the time of Manetho were naturally keenly interested in his *History* because of the connexion of their ancestors with Egypt," while the other category is comprised of the transmissions of the Christian historians Africanus and Eusebius, which modern historians refer to as the *Epitome,* whose "aim was to compare the chronologies of the Oriental nations with the Bible, and for this purpose the *Epitome* gave an ideal conspectus of the whole *History*, omitting, as it does, narratives such as the account of the Hyksos preserved by Josephus." Ibid., xv-vi.

Wolfgang Helck was the first Egyptologist to conduct a major study of Manetho.[82] Helck believed that the Egyptian historical tradition and the way Egyptians transmitted their tradition was important, therefore understanding Manetho's transmissions is also important if one is to truly understand Egyptian history. Helck stated: "Viel bedeutsamer sind sie für die Frage, in welcher Weise die Ägypter selbst ihre geschichtliche Überlieferung weitergegeben und betrachtet haben."[83] More importantly, Helck raised questions concerning the historical accuracy of Manetho's transmissions and some discrepancies between them and the older king-lists. He wrote:

> Bei einer dergestaltigen Untersuchung erhebt sich zunächst die Frage nach den Beziehungen zwischen den genannten Texten und den Königslisten, die wir seit der Ramessidenzeit besitzen. Bestehen solchen Verbindungen? Wie erklären sich, wenn wir diese Frage bejahen, Diskrepanzen zwischen den ramessidischen Königslisten gegenüber den zeitgenössischen Urkunden auftreten? Ergibt sich also am Ende eine durchgehende Linie Ägyptischer Überlieferung? Im folgenden soll, soweit es möglich ist, eine Antwort auf diesen Kreis von Fragen gegeben warden, durch die Manetho und die anderen genannten Zusammenstellungen als Produkte echt ägyptischer Überlieferung erkannt warden sollen.[84]

Helck's work is full of useful charts that compare the named kings from Manetho's transmissions and their regnal years with other king-lists and Greco-Roman historical traditions. Of particular interest to this dissertation and other Late Period historical studies is the chart and commentary he listed for the Twenty Sixth Dynasty. In the chart, Helck compares the Manetho transmissions of Africanus and Eusebius with that of Herodotus' *Histories* and the *Sothis Book*, which reveals that Africanus lists Apries' regnal years at nineteen while Eusebius and the earlier Herodotus list it as twenty five.

---

[82] Helck, Wolfgang, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956).

[83] Ibid., 1.

[84] Ibid.

Helck argued that this discrepancy was the result Eusebius taking his information from Herodotus.[85] Helck's Egyptological study of Manetho would be the only one published for thirty years.

Donald Redford produced the next major Egyptological study of Manetho's transmissions.[86] Although Redford's book covers all aspects of the nature of Egyptian historical thought, which did not include any "distinct historiographical genre,"[87] a significant portion of the book concerns Manetho and the Late Period.[88] Redford's *King-Lists* is a more accessible study than Helck's, at least for native English speakers, and in many ways superior since it dives deeper into the overall Egyptian historical tradition. Redford also attempted to reach an understanding not only of the chronology of Manetho's transmissions but also the nature of their origins. He believed that discrepancies between the Manetho transmissions according to Josephus, Africanus, and Eusebius can be understood better if one considers the purpose of the transmissions. Redford wrote:

> First of all, it is quite clear that a large percentage of the material considered necessary to be included in the Epitome was designed to satisfy the appetites of two groups: 1. Hellenists interested in Egypto-Hellenic synchronisms, and 2. Participants in controversies centering upon Biblical matters. . . The first group, in all probability is to be credited to Manetho himself whose interest in correctly informing the Greek audience is manifest in his diatribes against Herodotus. The second group comes from later Jewish or

[85] Ibid., 74.

[86] Donald B. Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study Of the Egyptian Sense of History* (Mississauga, Canada: Benben Publications, 1986).

[87] Ibid., xvi.

[88] Ibid. Chapter six concerns Manetho and the Late Period while chapters seven through nine also deal with Manetho's *Aegyptiaca.*

> Christian writers who apparently felt free to gloss the Epitome vouchsafed to them.[89]

Redford also addressed the primary sources Manetho used in his original work. He argued that since "Manetho had access to all the temple literature and to monuments as well, both of which the Greeks were unable to see,"[90] his work was authentically Egyptian, which includes the many legends that accompany the chronology.[91]

Where the transmissions of Manetho are important to this dissertation for the information and chronology it gives of the Twenty Second through Twenty Seventh dynasties,[92] the pseudo-historical *Demotic Chronicle* provides a chronology of the last three native Egyptian dynasties. The *Demotic Chronicle* was first translated from demotic into German by Wilhelm Spiegelberg,[93] but more recently Janet Johnson has made large strides to further unravel this Late Period document.[94] Johnson's articles help to illuminate some of the more difficult aspects of the *Demotic Chronicle* which are sometimes at odds with the transmissions of Manetho. Johnson believes that although

---

[89] Ibid., 209.

[90] Ibid., 225.

[91] Ibid., 229.

[92] For a more in-depth examination of how the Egyptian priests and their philosophy of history influenced the writings of Manetho and the other Greco-Roman historians who wrote about ancient Egyptian history see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[93] Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris nebst den auf der Rückseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914).

[94] Johnson has written four significant articles on the importance and various aspects of the *Demotic Chronicle*. "Multiple Meaning and Ambiguity in the Demotic Chronicle," in *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, ed. Sarah Israelit-Groll, 494-506 (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990), 494-506. "The Demotic Chronicle as a Statement of a Theory of Kingship," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 13 (1983): 61-72. "Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?" in *Grammatica Demotica: Festschrift for Erich Lüddeckens*, ed. Heinz Thissen and Karl Zauzich (Würzburg: Gisela Zauzich, 1983), 107-124. "The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source," *Enchoria* 4 (1974): 1-17.

both the transmissions of Manetho and the *Demotic Chronicle* are historically valid, the *Chronicle* is more reliable concerning the last native Egyptian dynasties. She stated:

> The Demotic Chronicle was written somewhat latter than Manetho's history. But, where the facts presented in Manetho and the Demotic Chronicle are independently verifiable, the Chronicle is more accurate than the versions of Manetho which have survived. For instance, the Demotic Chronicle shows that the Egyptian name of the first king of the 30th dynasty, Manetho's Nectanebes, was *Nḫt-nb.f*. Thus the Egyptian name *Nḫt-ḥr-ḥb.t* must correspond to Manetho's Nectanebos. In addition, the Demotic Chronicle has the correct order of the kings of the 29th dynasty, the second and third of which are switched in Manetho.[95]

Although Johnson's articles are of immense help to scholars lacking knowledge of demotic, a comprehensive English translation of the *Demotic Chronicle* is still needed.

The final aspect of Third Intermediate and Late Period scholarship to be discussed in this chapter is religion. Eberhard Otto wrote one of the only studies specifically of Late Period religion in 1964.[96] Otto's study was centered on the religious significance and rituals associated with the numerous sacred bull cults,[97] although he recognized that the Apis was unique and perhaps the most important of the bull cults.[98] A recent study of Late Period religion that may prove important for future studies is Mariam Ayad's *God's Wife, God's Servant.*[99] Ayad explored the various political and religious aspects of the office of God's Wife of Amen from the Twenty-Second through Twenty Sixth Dynasties in order to determine that the "office of God's Wife continued to change and evolve even

---

[95] Johnson, "Historical Source," 6.

[96] Eberhard Otto, *Beiträge zur Geshicte des Stierkulte in Ägypten* (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag, 1964).

[97] Ibid.

[98] Ibid., 57

[99] Mariam F. Ayad, *God's Wife, God's Servant: The God's Wife of Amun (c. 740-525 BC)* (London: Routledge, 2009).

within the relatively short span of this 200 year period."[100] An ample use of images and charts helps make this well written book a must for scholars of the Third Intermediate and Late Periods. 96 papers were published in 1998 as part of a two part book in honor of the late Jan Quegebeur.[101] These volumes contain a number of well written and researched chapters contributed by numerous scholars, but few concern how religion in Egypt changed as a result of dynastic transition, which is the focus of this dissertation.

A survey of scholarship of the Third Intermediate and Late Periods reveals that although much work has been done, there is a lack of continuity and much work that can still be conducted. Comprehensive surveys of both periods are rare and most of the studies that have been published are now dated.[102] This dissertation will rectify this by providing a new study of the Late Period that utilizes the available primary sources and gives a new political and religious interpretation of the events from 728-332 BC. The most visible lacuna of Late Period scholarship is in the field of religion. The significance of religion in the Late Period cannot be overstated, particularly, how non-royals practiced their religion in the face of foreign invasion and occupation.

[100] Ibid., 1.

[101] Willy Clarysse, Antoon Schoors, and Harco Willems, eds., *Egyptian Religion the Last Thousand Years: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur* (Leuven: Departement Oosterse Studies, 1998).

[102] The notable exception is Kitchen's, *Third*.

Chapter III: A Historiographical Assessment of the Classical Historians

Since much of the chronology of Late Period Egypt has been constructed by modern scholars through classical historians – namely Herodotus' *Histories*[1], Diodorus' *Library of History*[2], and Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*[3] – a critical study of these three sources, both directly by this author and with reference to modern scholars' assessment of these sources, is warranted. The ultimate object of this chapter intends to go beyond a mere regurgitation of contemporary arguments concerning the classical historians – although certain important points of contention in the primary sources will be discussed –and instead intends to asses both what is truthful and useful for the current study while at the same time discerning what was Greek and what was Egyptian in the ancient histories. By analyzing the ancient histories in their proper cultural context, in particular the philosophy of history that was being or least intended to be transmitted through the writings, one can then begin to discern the Greek and Egyptian aspects in each history. Ultimately, it will be shown that the Greek and Egyptian historical traditions often converged to create a narrative history of the Late Period that was for the most part fairly

---

[1] The translations used in this chapter and throughout this dissertation include Herototus, *The Histories*, trans. A. D. Godley (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926); and Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 1996). Godley's translation, like Oldfather's *Library of History* and Waddell's *Aegyptiaca*, is part of the Loeb Classic Library series, all come with the Greek text on one page and the accompanying English translation on the next. De Sélincourt's translation is the newer and more accessible to a wider audience, while both have fine introductions, De Sélincourt's is more meticulously noted.

[2] The translation used in this dissertation is Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of* History, trans. C. H. Oldfather (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004).

[3] The translation used in this dissertation is Manetho, *Aegyptiaca,* trans. W. G. Waddell (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004). Critical commentaries of all three historians are utilized and discussed below in the detailed examinations of each. There is a dearth of translations of Diodorus and Manetho but a number of other translations of Herodotus are available. David Grene's translation – which is interestingly titled *The History* instead of *The Histories* – is both academic and accessible as is the recently published Oxford Classics version. *The History*, trans. David Grene (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1988); *The Histories*, ed. Carolyn Dewald and trans. Robin Waterfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

accurate in terms of both facts and chronology, but also full of mythological and historical motifs that were sometimes displayed in an anachronistic fashion. An examination also demonstrates the importance of the Egyptian priesthood in transmitting the historical record, which was manifested in the numerous oral accounts that the ancient historians, primarily Herodotus and Diodorus, related in their histories.

In order to better understand the objectives of Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho and the veracity of their works, a brief examination of the Greek and Egyptian concepts of history must first be conducted. A brief comparison of the two historiographies will allow a proper critique of the three ancient historians that will help illuminate what was Greek and what was Egyptian in their historical views, which will in turn help modern scholarship better understand the overall historiography of the Late Period. The Greek philosophy of history revolved around the concept that history was the result "not of the mercy or wrath of God, but of the great deeds of men."[4] Furthermore, Greek historiography explored the world in epic terms as it "expressed the life of societies deliberating and acting with clear purposes under the leadership of far-seeing men."[5] Ultimately, the purpose of history to the Greeks was didactic in nature – for future generations to learn from the successes and failures of past men. Momigliano noted:

> The Greek historian almost invariably thinks that the past events he tells have some relevance to the future. The events would not be important if they did not teach something to those who read about them. The story will provide an example, constitute a warning, point to a likely pattern of future developments in human affairs.[6]

---

[4] Oswyn Murray, "Greek Historians," in *The Oxford History of Greece and the Hellenistic World*, eds. John Boardman, Jasper Griffin, and Oswyn Murray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 215

[5] Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 17.

[6] Ibid., 18. On the relationship between the Greek historian and the his audience, the public, see J. Malitz, "Das Interesse an der Geschichte: Die greichischen Historiker und ihr Publikum," in *Studies in*

The educational, or one could say utilitarian, aspect of ancient Greco-Roman historiography was tinged with moralistic lessons from an early point, but by the "fourth century, history became openly judgmental."[7]

Despite the edifying purpose of Greek historiography, the discipline remained secondary or even tertiary to the more established intellectual studies:

> The Greeks liked history, but never made it the foundation of their lives. The educated Greek turned to rhetorical schools, to mystery cults, or to philosophy for guidance. History was never an essential part of the life of a Greek – not even (one suspects) for those who wrote it.[8]

The secondary importance of historical studies in the Greek world may account for its slow development and inaccuracies in particular works, which will be discussed below, but does not diminish the fact that the modern concept of historical studies is based directly on that of the Greeks.[9] It should also be noted that Greek historiography was still considered rhetoric and as such was subject to the same rules that governed poetry or oratory[10] and although the historian's subject matter may have been different, he was expected to "give care and attention to the arrangement, language, and presentation of his material; that his finished product would be 'artistic' and appealing."[11] Of primary importance to the current study are not necessarily the origins or development of Greek

---

Greek History from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C., ed. H. Verdin (Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 1990), 323-49 esp. 327-34.

[7] Charles William Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988), 107.

[8] Momigliano, *Historiography*, 20.

[9] Murray, "Historians," 214.

[10] John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 13.

[11] Ibid.; Fornara, *History*, 142-68.

historiography itself, but more so how that historical tradition viewed non-Greeks, especially Egyptians, and how those perceptions could skew the historical record.

Thomas Harrison has noted that the Greek perspective of Egypt was complex, but not antagonistic as was the relationship with the Achaemenid Persians.[12] The Greek perspective of Egypt could range from admiration to a patronizing attitude of the perceived "exotic" nature of the Egyptians. Roger Matthews writes:

> The perspective on Egypt, may be described as openness towards the skills of the people from the Nile Valley, admiration, maybe, for what they could do in handling stone and other materials, and for their ability to produce life-size or even larger sculpture and to assemble columns higher and bigger than any living tree.[13]

Donald Lateiner adds that the Greeks possessed a "fitful awareness of cultural relativism"[14] that allowed their culture to "thoughtfully assimilate alien ideas."[15] Despite this respect of the "barbarian" Egyptians, Oswyn Murray has pointed out that a "tension between the real barbarian world and its Greek stereotype is never absent from the best Hellenistic prose writers."[16] Alan Lloyd points out that Herodotus in particular was no stranger to demonstrating the differences between Egyptian and Greek cultures and that "everything in Egypt was topsyturvy as compared with Greek customs."[17] Lloyd also

---

[12] Thomas Harrison, "Upside Down and Back to Front: Herodotus and the Greek Encounter with Egypt," in *Ancient Perspectives on Egypt*, eds. Roger Matthews and Cornelia Roemer (London: University College London Press, 2003), 146.

[13] Roger Matthews and Cornelia Roemer, "Introduction: The Worlds of Ancient Egypt – Aspects, Sources, Interactions," in Matthews and Roemer, 13.

[14] Donald Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 103.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Oswyn Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56 (1970): 166.

[17] Alan Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 1:141.

notes that despite the curiosity inherent in Herodotus and other Greek writers of foreign cultures there was still a marked attitude that they were different than the Greeks.[18] Harrison further adds to these observations by arguing that the Greek perception of the "other" was intensified and became better articulated as a result of the Persian Wars:

> Though many of the elements of the Greek portrayal of foreign peoples – the association with incomprehensible speech, with monarchy or excessive wealth – originate in the archaic period, such stereotypes are only organized and brought into sharper focus in the light of the Greek-Persian wars.[19]

This is an important aspect of Greek historiography one must consider when using the Greek, Hellenistic and even Roman historians as primary sources. Despite reporting factually correct events, peoples, and places, there is always a degree of bias in the writing of the Classical historians concerning non-Greeks.[20]

Since one of the objectives of this chapter is to ascertain the amount of Greek and Egyptian influences on the works of Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho, one must consider if there were any foreign influences, particularly Egyptian, on Greek historiography. Momigliano has analyzed the potential influence of the Persians on Greek historiography in particular, which caused him to ask the question; what was the nature of the influence? At first glance, one may not see a connection but "the list of persons who travelled in Persian territory and wrote about Persian history goes on

---

[18] Ibid., 153.

[19] Harrison, "Upside," 146.

[20] In the case of Diodorus, who was a citizen of the late Roman Republic and early Roman Empire, the Romans are considered here as inhabitants, descendants, and inheritors of the same cultural sphere and civilization as the Greeks. They also held the same views towards the non-Greco-Roman world as the Greeks.

throughout the fourth century."[21] He further identified three ways in which the Persian influence on Greek historiography could be seen: the direct influence from Persian historiography, the influence of other Near Eastern historiographers, and the influence of Near Eastern institutions and traditions other than historiography.[22] He further noted that many Greek biographies and autobiographies originated in the Persian controlled areas of the Greek speaking world:

> Another observation is perhaps more important. Scylax wrote a biography of Heraclides, the tyrant of Mylasa. Both the writer and his subject lived in the Persian sphere. In Herodotus the best personal stories (for instance, the biography of Democedes) come from the Eastern side. Metropolitan Greece provided very little biographical material for Herodotus. Even Thucydides pays attention to biographical details only when his heroes – Pausanias and Themistocles – are to be found on the fringes of the Persian Empire. We may suspect that the Greeks of Asia Minor were more interested in biographical details than the Greeks, say, of Sparta or Athens.[23]

Although Momigliano believed that the Persians influenced Greek historiography, he came to the conclusion that "if there is specific Persian influence, it is limited to the use of documents – and perhaps to the autobiographical style."[24] The lack of direct Persian influence on Greek historiography does not necessarily mean that there was *no* foreign historiographical influence on the Greek historical tradition, or more importantly concerning this dissertation, that foreign historical – especially Egyptian – thought did not manifest itself in the writings of Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho.

---

[21] Momigliano, *Historiography*, 10. Perhaps the best known Greek traveler and historian to visit Persia in this period was Xenophon who wrote his *Anabasis* – more commonly known in the English speaking world as *The Persian Expedition* – while serving in Persia as a mercenary in a failed *coup d'état*. For an English translation of the *Anabasis* see Xenophon, *The Persian Expedition*, trans. Rex Warner (London: Penguin Books, 1972).

[22] Momigliano, *Historiography*, 12.

[23] Ibid., 15.

[24] Ibid., 16.

In terms of historical thought, the Egyptians had no word for history itself, which, when one considers the current topic "is of considerable significance."[25] Redford further argued that the Egyptians had no true "historiography" as modern historians know it; instead Egyptian historical texts can be divided into mythology and record keeping. He writes:

> The search for a form of Egyptian composition (during pharaonic times) to which we could apply the term 'historiography' has thus come to an abrupt end: we cannot find one. Rather, we find our inquiry suddenly deflected into an exercise concerned more with what might be called 'the form, transmission and use of national traditions.' Here the road divides. One branch leads into a study of mythology since, as pointed out above, this is one form the national tradition takes in the thoroughly Egyptian way of interpreting the past. The other leads into an analysis of records and record keeping, for putting into writing the events of the *immediate* past was the traditional way of demonstrating the thoroughly Egyptian tenet of the *continuum* of history.[26]

Redford's explains that his definition of "historiography" revolves primarily around "history writing in a classical sense"[27] i.e. a narrative written to edify those in the present concerning the successes and failures of peoples of the past and that Egyptologists need to establish a discipline specific practice of evaluating "historical" texts.[28] Although Redford is correct in arguing that Egyptologists need to view Egyptian historical texts from the perspective of the Egyptians by considering the audience and the message they intended to send with any particular text – instead of viewing Egyptian historical texts from the prism of Greco-Roman or modern historiography – one should not discount

---

[25] Donald B. Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study Of the Egyptian Sense of History* (Mississauga, Canada: Benben Publications, 1986), xiii.

[26] Ibid., xv-xvi.

[27] Ibid., xvi.

[28] Ibid.

Egyptian texts as a-historical. One must consider the Egyptian historical tradition in all its aspects in order to determine if there was any influence on the classical historians.

The Egyptian historical tradition or historiography in the sense of texts that record and relate Egypt's past can be placed primarily into three categories: king-lists, annals, and biographies. All three of these historical genres represented the important way "in welcher Weise die Ägypter selbst ihre geschichtliche Überlieferung weitergegeben und betrachtet haben."[29] The Egyptian king-lists represent perhaps the most known and "historical" of all the categories of Egyptian historiography. The king-lists are simply any listing of historical kings from the past to the present, but Redford argues that there exists only one true king-list in Egyptian history:

> Under this heading should be placed all groupings of kings, their representations and/or names which set out (a) to arrange the names in correct historical sequence, (b) to give for each name the length of reign, (c) to note conscientiously any gaps in (a) or (b). Thus the document enables its users to identify rulers of antiquity and to place them in correct chronological sequence, and to tell exactly how long, as well as how long ago, they had reigned. Given this definition of a king-list, the Egyptologist must admit that for Pharaonic times he can produce but one exemplar, viz. the Turin Canon of kings, although it is quite clear that this is only the sole survivor of a long line of similar lists which must have been copied over many centuries.[30]

There are also other king-lists, or groupings of kings as Redford calls them,[31] known today. The historical purpose of Egyptian king-lists went beyond a mere chronology

---

[29] Wolfgang Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956), 1.

[30] Redford, *King-Lists*, 1-2.

[31] Ibid., After the Turin Canon, which he considers to be the only true king-list, he divides other lists into: royal cultic assemblages of deceased kings (Abydos and Thebes), cultic assemblages of deceased kings (private, Memphis), private lists of royal names in cartouches (Thebes), royal late New Kingdom lists (Thebes), kings mentioned in private titularies and related texts, sequences of kings' names in genealogies, and "miscellaneous" examples. 18-64. For a less detailed but informative study of the Egyptian king-lists see; Ludlow Bull, "Ancient Egypt," in *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Robert C. Denton (New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1983), 7-9.

recorded for posterity, but instead represented a spiritual and royal connection of the present king with his long dead ancestors. King-lists were not meant to edify the present as Greco-Roman and modern historiography does, but to legitimize the reigning king. Roberto Gozzoli writes:

> Most of the king's list are essentially cultic. They come from temples – Thutmose III's Room of the Ancestors at Karnak, Sethi I and Ramesses II from Abydos, Ramesses II's Ramesseum and Ramesses III's Medinet Habu – and are celebrative: the ruling pharaoh is represented as offering to his predecessors, who are distant temporally, or venerable for fame or antiquity. In effect, the reverence to illustrious ancestors was probably dependent from the legitimacy they cried for: Thutmose III wanted to reassert his rights after stepmother Hatshepsut disappeared from the scene. In the case of the Ramessides (Sethi I and Ramesses II, Ramesses III), they feared to be considered as *parvenus*. Therefore, a desire to create links with legitimate kings was at the base of this appropriation of the past.[32]

Royal king-lists were written for the *past* unlike Greek historiography which was written for future generations. It should be noted, as Gozzoli states, that *most* of the king-lists come from temples, but as written above, many of these lists also came from private tombs and biographical inscriptions, which raises the question; was the function the same? Considering the perspective and context of these private king-lists – they were created in a funerary/ritualistic setting – the function appears to be the same, writing history to connect with the past, not as a record for posterity. The biographical texts mentioned above were written primarily in the Late Period,[33] with many displaying a genealogy that spans over 750 years.[34] The chronological scope and historical

---

[32] Roberto B. Gozzoli, *The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millennium BC (ca. 1070-180 BC): Trends and Perspectives* (London: Golden House Publications, 2006), 7.

[33] Redford, *King-Lists*, 62; Bull, "Egypt," 10. Perhaps the best example of a Late Period biographical/historical text used in this study is the naophorous statue of the official/doctor Udjahorresnet. See Chapter IV of this dissertation for a historiographical analysis of the statue.

[34] Bull, "Egypt," 10. One of the longer Late Period genealogies published is an offering table of the official Khnumibra. He traces his genealogy from the Twenty Seventh Dynasty back to king Djoser of

knowledge of previous kings demonstrated by the individuals, such as Khnumibra, demonstrates that private individuals also possessed a sense of their historical past, but the function of the biographies, similar to the king-lists, also appears to be to connect with the past rather than future generations.

Perhaps the most historical of all Egyptian genres of writing, and which therefore needs to be considered in this study, are the various historical annals that were written throughout pharaonic history. The word for annals in Egyptian, *gnwt*, is probably the nearest to the modern English world "history" that exists in the ancient Egyptian lexicon.[35] More specifically, the word *gnwt* has an etymological origin that may involve record keeping. Redford notes:

> The Egyptian word which is usually rendered 'annals' is *gnt*, singular, which is far more common in the plural, *gnwt*. Its fundamental meaning is rather difficult to determine, but the following cognates help to set the parameters of its reference: *gnw*, 'twig, branch, piece of a tree', *gnn*, 'aromatic wood', *gnw*, (a kind of bird); *gnw*, (a kind of pool); *gnwty*, 'wood carver', It would seem best to postulate the existence of an otherwise unattested (or perhaps obsolete?) root *gn* (or *gni*), 'to cut, inscribe,' whence we might derive 'cut or detached piece of wood,' i.e. a branch, a prepared wooden tablet (*gnt*), and a *nisbe* from the latter, inscriber of a piece of wood.[36]

The tradition of writing historical annals in ancient Egypt can be dated to at least the Fifth Dynasty, possibly earlier,[37] with the first being the so called *Palermo Stone* which has

---

the Third Dynasty, a span of well over 2,000 years. For the publication see Georges Posener, *La Première Domination Perse en Égypte: Recueil d'Inscriptions Hiéroglyphs* (Cairo: *L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 1936), 92-107.

[35] Bull, "Egyptian," 3n.

[36] Redford, *King-Lists*, 67.

[37] The king Den label from the First Dynasty, currently housed in the British Museum #EA 32650, may be an example of an earlier or "proto" annal as it mentions "first occasion of smiting the east," accompanied by a *rnpt* or year sign. A.J. Spencer, *Early Dynastic Objects: Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities in the British Museum* (London: British Museum Press, 1980).

been housed in the Palermo museum since 1887.[38] Historical annals continued to be written throughout Egyptian history, with some of the more detailed coming from the Eighteenth Dynasty during the reign of Thutmose III who recalled his numerous exploits in the Levant and Nubia.[39] The ancient Egyptian annals were considered impressive enough in ancient times that "Herodotus more than once registers his admiration for their gifts."[40]

Until recently, modern scholars have failed to see any connection between the Greek idea of history and the Egyptian without any serious consideration if those two streams of thought converged at all. Recently, Antonio Loprieno has proposed the thesis that due to Egypt's expanding knowledge of the outside world, a new "multi-layered" historiography developed in eight century BC Egypt that reached its peak in the Ptolemaic Period.[41] Loprieno argues that in the Late Period, the way Egyptians viewed their past changed from a "reproductive" to a "productive" history:

> In New Kingdom king lists, such as those in Abydos, Saqqarah or Thebes, the chronological sequence of clearly identified names of past kings is placed at the service of the present king's power display. The very *topos* of surpassing past achievements conforms in fact to this ideological model, because the present is always presented as following in the past's footsteps, i.e. as adhering to the existing interpretive paradigm. In the Late Period, this type of *reproductive* historical knowledge is challenged, and to a certain extent superseded, by a less sequential view of the past in which periods and individuals often acquire mythical traits: the past is remembered, retrieved and also *productively*

---

[38] Bull, "Egyptian," 4; For an English translation of the stone see James Henry Breasted, trans. and ed., *The First to Nineteenth Dynasties*, vol. 1 of *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 76-167.

[39] For English translations of Thutmose III's exploits see Breasted, *The Eighteenth Dynasty*, vol. 2 of *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001),175-217.

[40] Redford, *King-Lists*, 65.

[41] Antonio Loprieno, "Views of the Past in Egypt during the First Millennium BC," in *'Never Had the Like Occurred': Egypt's View of Its Past*, ed. John Tait (London: University College, London Pres, 2003), 139-40.

> reconstructed in a variety of texts ranging from literary to religious, with a frequent juxtaposition of figures and times. . . 'Reconstructed' history thus equals 'mythical' as opposed to 'archival' history, the history of a past that has acquired symbolic cultural relevance for the present, but that cannot be easily segmented in a sequential way; a point *in illo tempore* that linguists might call a 'perfective' aspect.[42]

He further states that the ideology of a native victory over the foreign rulers of Egypt manifested itself in the third century BC.[43] It is at this time that Manetho wrote his history of Egypt and the fantastic story of the Hyksos' origins.[44] Loprieno provides a valuable contribution to modern historiography with his assessment of Egyptian historiography in the Late Period, but his theory does little to explain what if any influence Egyptian culture, historiography, and historical thought had on Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho. Loprieno is correct in arguing that the Egyptian concept of history and historiography changed as a result of foreign influence and domination, but one would be remiss to overlook Egypt's influence on Greek historiography. A detailed examination on the writings of the ancient historians will help to determine if there was an Egyptian influence on their writings and if so to what extent – was it merely superficial or was there a more profound influence that stemmed directly from the Egyptian concept of history?

The first of the three historians to be discussed here – due to primarily the fact that his work came first chronologically but also that his is also the most known work both in and outside of academia – is Herodotus. According to Aulus Gellius, Herodotus was born around 484 BC in the Achaemenid Persian controlled Greek-Ionian city of

---

[42] Ibid., 141-2.

[43] Ibid., 146.

[44] See below in this chapter for a more detailed discussion of Manetho, Josephus, and the Hyksos.

Halicarnassus.[45] Herodotus then left his native city near the age of thirty and began to travel extensively around the Mediterranean where he compiled the research for his *Histories*.[46] He was unable to return to Halicarnassus, as he was exiled and later lived and probably died in Italy,[47] which may have played a role in his philosophy of history, namely his choice of topics. De Sélincourt wrote:

> The tradition of exile may be an explanation for the wide travels that Herodotus portrays in his work; and since exile was not uncommon for historians of later times (Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, to name a few), this may have been retrojected onto Herodotus, the 'father of history.[48]

There are many questions that cannot be accurately answered concerning Herodotus' life, such as the nature of his exile, which as De Sélincourt noted may have influenced his historical thought, but currently this is of less importance than when Herodotus compiled and wrote his work.

Perhaps more important than when Herodotus lived may be when he completed his *entire* work. Lloyd believes that Herodotus was "inactive from the early years of the Peloponnesian War" and dead by 414 BC[49] which Asheri agrees with,[50] while Murray boldly gives a more precise date of 425 as the latest date for the publication of *The*

---

[45] Aubrey De Sélincourt, "Introduction," in Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 1996), xi. A.D. Godley, "Introduction," in Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. by A.D. Godley (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926), vii.

[46] David Asheri, "General Introduction," in *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I-IV*, eds. Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 5.

[47] Ibid.

[48] De Sélincourt, "Introduction," x.

[49] Lloyd, *Book II*, I:66.

[50] Asheri, "Introduction," 2.

Histories.[51] In terms of Egypt, the last king mentioned is the once rebel and sole king of the Twenty Eighth Dynasty, Amyrtaeus (Book III,15), who ruled from 439-404, which would coincide with the above mentioned scholars. Again, until further evidence is discovered it is futile to assign a precise date to the publication of *The Histories*.

In order to better understand the historian from Halicarnassus's philosophy of history a brief assessment of his sources, objectives, and methodology must first be performed. Herodotus gathered most of his information from two sources – things he observed first hand (όψις) and oral testimony (άκοή)[52] which was usually, at least in the case of Egypt, in the form of the accounts of scribes and priests.[53] Compared to his observational and oral sources, the amount of source material he collected from existing libraries concerning Egypt appears to be negligible because no known Greek authors had written extensively on Egypt at the time and "Hecataeus is the only such author Herodotus mentions."[54] In fact, it should be pointed out that of the more than one thousand ancient Greeks who wrote history, almost all of them wrote about the recent history of Greece,[55] which makes Herodotus that much more interesting and important. Obviously there can be many problems associated with oral testimony as a source for

---

[51] Oswyn Murray, "Historians," 222.

[52] Asheri, "Introduction," 15.

[53] In Book II, 28 for instance, Herodotus describes how a scribe from the Temple of Neith related to him the source of the Nile River. In Book II, 120 Herodotus stated that the Egyptian priests gave him their own version of the story of Helen and the start of the Trojan War. More importantly for the current study, in Book II, 100 while Herodotus related his jumbled version of Egyptian chronology he stated that the priests read to him from a list of over 300 kings. This may have been a copy of the above discussed Turin Canon and will be considered more thoroughly below in this chapter.

[54] Murray, "Historians," 220. In Book II, 143 Herodotus stated that Hecataeus was in Thebes and discussed genealogy with the priest of Amen.

[55] Robert Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 2.

writing a historical narrative, even if those entrusted with the protection of the historical knowledge try their best to be as unbiased as possible in their transmission of said knowledge from generation to generation because "in the course of three or four generations they undergo considerable changes."[56] This ancient version of "telephone" was further aggravated in Herodotus' case by his lack of knowledge of any language other than Greek, but despite this barrier his information was probably more correct than not:

> Add to this the linguistic barrier in the Eastern countries, the total dependence upon interpreters and guides, the limitations encountered by a foreigner who has no access to sacred places and religious rites, and Herodotus' instinctive tendency, as well as that of his guides, to interpret foreign gods, institutions, and customs in Greek terms. Herodotus' skepticism towards most of his oral sources is entirely understandable, as is modern skepticism towards the reliability of Herodotus himself, at least as far as non-Greek cultures are concerned. However, it cannot be excluded that Herodotus sometimes managed, perhaps in spite of his ignorance, to collect reliable sources even in the East. Six of the seven names of the conspirators against the false Smerdis (III 70,1-3) are confirmed by Darius' inscription at Bisitun.[57]

Despite the sometimes unreliability of oral accounts, Herodotus was able to collect and observe enough factual evidence to comprise a fairly reliable account of many aspects of Egyptian culture and history.

One of the more interesting and correct observations Herodotus made is his listing of the Achaemenid satrapies and their tribute in Book III, 89-95. Herodotus listed twenty satrapies, which fluctuated in numbers throughout the Achaemenid dynasty, but all

[56] Asheri, "Introduction," 16.

[57] Ibid., 17. For a discussion of the Behistun inscription and its significance relating to the death of Cambyses, attempted usurpation of the Achaemenid throne by the false Smerdis/Bardiya see Chapter V of this dissertation.

known lists comprise more than twenty.[58] Herodotus' source of this list is unknown, although he may have acquired it from a "documentary source"[59] but Hecataeus may also have been consulted.[60] The possibility may also be that he learned of the list from one of his observations. Since Herodotus never visited Persia proper, he did not view the lists at Susa or Persepolis, but he may have come into contact with one of the satrapal lists in Egypt. The possibilities here include the Darius Statue from Susa[61] and the Red Sea Canal stelae from the reign of Darius I.[62] Herodotus even mentions the/a statue of Darius in Book II, 110, although he stated that the priests would not allow it to be erected at the Ptah Temple in Memphis, he did not elaborate if it was placed somewhere else or if he personally observed it. Considering that Herodotus usually cited inscriptions, he probably would have stated if he received his satrapal list from the Darius Statue or the Red Sea Canal stelae, but at the same time one cannot absolutely dismiss these texts as

[58] For instance, the Red Sea Canal stelae and Statue of Darius I, which are discussed in Chapter VI of this dissertation lists twenty-four satrapies. Other prominent inscriptions from Persia include: DPe, which lists twenty-five, the eastern staircase which depicts twenty-three, and DNa, which lists thirty satrapies respectively. For a translation of DPe and DNa inscriptions see Roland Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1953). For the staircase see Erich Schmidt, *Persepolis I: Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953); Gerold Walser, *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis: Historiche Studien über den sogenannte Tributzug an der Apadanatreppe* (Berlin: Akadamie Verlag, 1966).

[59] Lateiner, *Method*, 102.

[60] De Sélincourt, *Histories,* 649n; Lateiner, *Method*, 101. Lateiner expounds on this point adding that the "actual sources of Herodotus' knowledge of Median and Persian life and history are impossible to identify with precision. He mentions personal observations and Persian reports that he had himself heard; once he refers to a Persian inscription; he mentions the 'scholars' noted above; often of course, no source at all is identified."

[61] See Chapter VI of this dissertation for a discussion of the subject peoples (satrapies) on the Darius Statue.

[62] See Chapter VI of this dissertation for a discussion of the subject peoples (satrapies) on the Red Sea Canal stelae.

his source since he did not always give credit to his sources.[63] Although Herodotus' satrapy list and the numerous other monuments he observed firsthand may be placed in a separate category of source material from the oral histories, they were still for the most part subject to the cooperation and interpretation of the Egyptian priests.[64]

With so much of Herodotus' information on Egyptian history coming directly or indirectly from the priests one must consider the importance of them as a source of Egyptian historical memory and the influence they had on not only Herodotus' narrative, but also the works of Diodorus and Manetho. As noted above, the priests read to Herodotus from a list 330 kings "all of them Egyptians except eighteen, who were Ethiopians."[65] If Herodotus had access to the Turin Canon through an Egyptian proxy, then why was the chronology so garbled? For instance Rhampsinitus (Ramesses) is listed as the king who immediately preceded the Fourth Dynasty king Cheops (Khufu),[66] while the chronology of the Twenty Fifth and Twenty Sixth Dynasty kings is fairly accurate. With the post Ramesses II kings one must assume that his information was derived from a list no longer extant since the Turin Canon is dated to the reign of Ramesses II. Loprieno believes that the inconsistencies in his "king-list" has more to do with the cultural shift in Egypt that took place during the First Millennium than any apparent problem with Egyptian chronology or historiography. He noted:

---

[63] Lateiner, *Method*, 101.

[64] Another example is when Herodotus described the "entrance gates" of king Rhampsinitus – no doubt a Ramesside king and probably Ramesses II (see Lloyd) – erected at the Temple of Hephaestus in Memphis in Book II, 121. He was no doubt given this information by the priests because he would have been unable to read any Egyptian inscription on the pylons. His description also shows that he was not sure of the true function of a pylon as they were much more than a mere "gate."

[65] Book II, 100.

[66] Book II, 124.

> The break between the former and latter sequence of Egyptian kings in Herodotus' *logos*, therefore, is not factual or chronological, but rather cultural and ideological. It is motivated by the perception of a loss of solidarity between the past and the present that emerges between the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth Dynasties and determines the Egyptian views of the past in the following centuries.[67]

Loprieno's theory goes far to help explain the chronological problems with Herodotus' Egyptian king-list, but does little to explain factual problems and obvious opinions of the Egyptian priests. His theory also implies that Herodotus' chronological problems were the result of an *unconscious* view of the past by the Egyptians rather than a conscious effort by the priests to omit or amend the deeds of certain kings, according to their opinions, when they related the king-list to Herodotus. A good example of the Egyptians relating their own nuanced view of Egyptian history to Herodotus, and thereby influencing his work concerns the account of Khufu.

Khufu is described by Herodotus as a terrible and unpopular king who closed the temples, forced his subjects to build his pyramid, and even prostituted his own daughter in order to acquire funds needed to finish the project.[68] Why does Herodotus dedicate so much negative attention to Khufu? The answer to this question and the problem with the chronology lies not with Herodotus, and goes beyond the idea of a cultural and political break with the past as argued by Loprieno, but can be found with the priests who gave him that information. In his account of Egyptian chronology, Herodotus was merely an intellectual pawn of the Egyptian priests who dictated either directly or indirectly not only what kings he would write about, but how they were to be remembered. For whatever reason, Khufu was not a popular king with the Egyptian priests in the fifth

---

[67] Loprieno, "Views," 150.

[68] Book II, 124-26.

century BC and Herodotus, not being able to read Egyptian, had no choice but to report what they told him. The Egyptian priesthood transferred their historical memory and historiography into Herodotus' narrative and with it part of the Egyptian sense of history also seeped into *The Histories.*

The overall purpose of *The Histories* went beyond a history of the Persian Wars – although they were the central events of the narrative – by incorporating aspects of geography and anthropology which are "representative of a stage of thought."[69] Herodotus always remained true to the general nature of Greek historiography as discussed above by presenting history to the reader for edification purposes. Asheri notes that most of the edifying aspects of *The Histories* came in the form of historical speeches:

> Here too there is no dearth of digressions: for example, the didactic speeches at Xerxes' court (VII 5-21), the dialogues between Xerxes and Artabanus (VII 44-53), and between Xerxes and Demartus (VII 101-5), the review of the Persian troops (VII 59-100), the digression on the history of Sicily (VII 153-67) and the Macedonian kings (VIII 137-9), and the tale about Xerxes and Masistes' wife (IX 108-13) . . . . Herodotus' book ends with a didactic maxim delivered by Cyrus the Great (IX 122).[70]

Herodotus himself states his purpose in the first sentence of *The Histories*:

> Herodotus of Halicarnassus here displays his inquiry, so that human achievements may not become forgotten in time, and great and marvelous deeds – some displayed by Greeks, some by barbarians – may not be without their glory; and especially to show why the two peoples fought with each other.[71]

Herodotus therefore intended for posterity to learn from the events of the Persian Wars, how they began etc., but also to tell the deeds of great men – Greek *and* non-Greek. The above analysis of the sources and methodology of Herodotus helps us to understand

---

[69] Godly, "Introduction," xi.

[70] Asheri, "Introduction," 10.

[71] Book I, 0.

Greek historiography and the influence of the Egyptian philosophy of history on his work, but the perceptions of the non-Greek by Herodotus and other Greco-Roman historians must be further explored.

The Greeks viewed the Egyptians as barbarians, but unlike other foreign peoples such as the Scythians and Celts "Egypt had more to offer; like India it was full of old and venerable wisdom."[72] The Greeks' admiration of Egypt at times turned to obsession, possibly on par with modern "Egyptomania" in many respects; there were many other Greeks of Herodotus' time who wrote about Egypt:

> It is clear, however, that Herodotus' interest in, and knowledge of, Egypt emerged in the context of a much broader Greek milieu of fascination with foreign peoples, one which gave rise, for example, to Phrynichus' play *Egyptians*, the *Aigyptiaka* of Herodotus' near-contemporary Hellanicus of Lesbos, as well as to the wealth of ethnographic material on Egypt contained in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*.[73]

Perhaps the most exalted yet exotic aspect of Egyptian culture Herodotus discussed was the monarchy.

In various chapters of *The Histories*, Herodotus used examples from Egyptian history to depict how a proper monarchy should function. Herodotus described a king Sesostris[74] in Book II, 101-11and Amasis in Book II, 172-74 as examples of just kings as contrasted with Cheops/Khufu in Book II, 124-26 who was used as an example of a bad king. These examples "exemplify and explore the proper role and behaviour of kings in

---

[72] Matthews and Roemer, "Introduction," 11.

[73] Harrison, "Upside," 146.

[74] Lloyd states concerning Herodotus' account of Sesostris that "the core of Herodotus' narrative is provided by an Egyptian tradition which presented Sesostris as a model of the ideal of kingship. This certainly contained an historical element, but it has been supplemented and contaminated by folklore, nationalist propaganda, and Greek attitudes." From "Book II," in *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I-IV*, 1:313.

ways that anticipate later, more theoretical treatises concerned with monarchy such as Isocrates' *Busiris*."[75] Herodotus also claimed that the source of much Greek knowledge was also Egyptian. In Book II, 177 he stated that Solon had taken the idea of tax laws from Amasis and in Book II, 109 even claimed that the mathematician Thales learned of geometry in Egypt and brought the knowledge back to Greece. Lloyd states that "the tradition on Solon's visit and, in particular, his relations with Amasis is suspect and should be treated with extreme caution."[76] And concerning the transmission of Egyptian knowledge, such as geometry, to Greece he writes:

> There is, however, no reason to believe that such surveying techniques as the Egyptians possessed had any effect in Greece. The properties of the triangle, square etc. are the same anywhere and identical techniques for dealing with them are likely to be developed independently.[77]

Herodotus believed that despite being a non-Greek and therefore barbarian people, the Egyptians were a cultured and somewhat enlightened people whom the Greeks were indebted to a certain degree. Despite this, Harrison believes that the "model of polarity" he believes existed, essentially left the Egyptians as exotic, ancient, and superstitious people. He argues:

> The model of polarity, however, is one which tends by its nature to emphasize a small repertoire of features of any culture – and to ensure that such features are exotic and garish. Though Herodotus' account of Egypt may only on rare occasions display explicit chauvinism towards its subjects, in its selection of themes, at least, it tallies neatly with more overtly prejudiced sources. . . . The various anecdotes he records concerning the building of Egyptian monuments – of how Kheops prostituted his daughter to raise funds, or the amount of money spent on radishes for the labourers (Herodotus II. 124-128) – give rise to, and probably

---

[75] Harrison, "Upside," 149.

[76] Lloyd, "Book II," 372.

[77] Lloyd, *Book II*, 52-3.

> reflect, a *topos* of the Egyptians as, in the phrase of Livingstone, ' a nation of ant-like comically superstitious menial workers'.[78]

Harrison's "model of polarity" adequately explains the basic view that Herodotus, the Greeks, and by extension other classical historians such as Diodorus and Strabo took towards Egypt, but like Loprieno he errs by not attributing the proper influence the Egyptians priests had on *The Histories*. Herodotus may have written his account of Egypt with an exotic topos in mind, but it was the priests who gave him the stories that vilified the reign of Khufu and exalted the rule of Sesostris and Amasis among other stories and observations that Herodotus recorded.

Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*, Book I, is as important as Herodotus' *The Histories* and more so concerning the chronology of fourth century BC since Herodotus' work does not go that far. Diodorus stated in Book I, 46 that he used the Egyptian priests as a source for his history, but that does not mean he collected the information himself, in fact "it is almost certain that he is drawing upon earlier authors who in turn claimed to have acquired their information from the Egyptians."[79] One of the primary authors that Diodorus consulted was the Greek historian Hecataeus of Abdera,[80] so a brief background of that historian is needed here. Hecataeus of Abdera's major historical work on Egypt, *Aigyptiaka*, exists today only in fragments[81] and biographical information of

---

[78] Harrison, "Upside," 152.

[79] Anne Burton, *Diodorus Siculus Book I: A Commentary* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 2.

[80] Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56 (1970): 144. C. H. Oldfather added that, he based "his account of the customs of the Egyptians upon Agatharchides of Cnidus, an historian and geographer of the 2nd century B.C., for his geographical data, and especially for the description of the Nile (cc. 32-41.3) and upon Herodotus."

[81] Felix Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Greicheischen Historkier: Dritter Teil Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)*, Book A (Autoren ueber Verschiedene Staedte) (Leiden: Brill, 1940), 11-64. Book a (Kommentar zu Nr. 262-296) (Leiden: Brill,1954), 29-87.

the historian is sparse. Hecataeus hailed from Abdera, which was first founded as a colony of Clazomenae in Thrace and had trading ties to Egypt and the Near East.[82] He possibly served at the court of Ptolemy Soter of Egypt and may have been in contact with the Egyptian priest and historian Manetho[83] around the time his "work on Egypt was written between about 320 B.C. and 315 B.C., or before 305 B.C. at the latest."[84]

The time period of Diodorus' life, or at least when he compiled *The Library of History*, has been deduced by Oldfather with the "earliest date at which Diodorus is known to have been gathering material for his history is the 180th Olympiad (60/59-57/6 B.C.)"[85] and the latest verifiable date being in Book 16, 7 where he described how Caesar made Tauromenium in Sicily a Roman colony, which was in 36 BC or "soon thereafter."[86] Diodorus apparently visited Egypt, like Herodotus before him, to gather evidence for Book I. He stated in Book I, 44, that he visited Egypt during the 180th Olympiad in the reign of Ptolemy.[87]

The sources used by Diodorus in his history of Egypt, like those used by Herodotus, are extremely important when one considers the nature of his work – namely what parts are Greco-Roman and what parts are Egyptian. Unlike Herodotus, who had few written sources to use, Diodorus, in the first century BC, was much more fortunate in

---

[82] John Dillery, "Hecataeus of Abdera: Hyperboreans, Egypt, and the 'Interpretatio Graeca,'" *Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 47/3 (1998): 256.

[83] John Dillery, "The First Egyptian Narrative History: Manetho and Greek Historiography," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 127 (1999): 109.

[84] Murray, "Hecataeus," 144. Dillery gives "sometime around 300 BC" as the date of Hecataeus' *Aigyptiaka*, "Hecataeus," 256n.

[85] Oldfather, "Introduction," vii-viii.

[86] Ibid., ix.

[87] Oldfather stated the specific monarch was Ptolemy XI (80-51 BC); *Library*, 157n.

that respect. As stated above, Diodorus apparently used the writings of the previous historian Hecataeus for much of his Book I of the *Library of History*, but other historians also provided source material.[88] Oldfather believed that although Diodorus "made no pretense of doing anything more than giving a convenient summary of events which were to be found in greater detail in many works"[89] he also thought that the historian still imparted his personal stamp on the work because concerning the sources he used "he picked and chose more widely and more wisely than has been allowed him by most critics."[90] Besides Hecataeus, Herodotus' *The Histories* is also believed to be one of the previous histories Diodorus used[91] in his work. Some similarities of the two ancient historians' writings, such as a detailed but somewhat garbled king-list, indicated a possible Herodotean influence on Diodorus, but more importantly the influence of the Egyptian priests on both men.

Diodorus, like Herodotus before him, stated several times that his information came from the Egyptian priests. In Book I, 13 Diodorus wrote that the Egyptian priests related to him their creation myths. Apparently the priests related both the Heliopolitan and Memphite myths to Diodorus. He wrote:

---

[88] Burton, *Diodorus*, 1-2. Namely she stated that he drew heavily upon Agatharchides of Cnidos for geographical descriptions in later books.

[89] Ibid., xvii. For the most part Diodorus does not cite his specific sources, for instance in Book I, 15 when he discusses the origins of Thebes he wrote, "many writers say that Thebes was not founded by Osiris." In Book I, 21, concerning the burials of Osiris and Isis he wrote, "According to some writers, however, the bodies of these two gods rest, not in Memphis, but on the border between Egypt and Ethiopia, on the island in the Nile which lies near the city which is called Philae."

[90] Ibid.

[91] Murray, "Hecataeus," 161.

> Helius was the first king of the Egyptians, his name being the same as that of the heavenly star. Some of the priests, however, say that Hephaestus was their first king, since he was the discoverer of fire and received the rule because of this service to mankind.[92]

The Helius is apparently Atum of the Helipolitan or possibly the Hermopolitan creation myth[93] while Hephaestus is clearly associated with Ptah of the Memphite creation myth. In terms of historiography, the identity of the first creation myth account Diodorus was given by the priests is of less importance than the reason why the priests emphasized the Memphite version. Although Diodorus did not state *where* he was given this account, it may simply be that he was in Memphis and spent considerable time in and around the Ptah Temple. He makes numerous references to Memphis when he related his king-list: its founding (Book I, 50), the building of the temple complex (Book I, 51), colossal statues dedicated by Sesoösis (Ramesses II)[94] (Book I, 57), Psamtek I's addition of pylons and statues at the Ptah Temple (Book I, 67), and Amasis' removal of foreign

---

[92] Diodorus, *Library*, Book I, 13.

[93] Without more information it is difficult to say for sure which creation myth in the first example he was given by the Egyptian priests. In the Heliopolitan myth, Atum, the solar and creator god, wills himself into existence from the primordial mound and then goes on to create the Ennead. The Hermopolitan myth is much more amorphous in that there is more than one variation. In one variation the god Amen, who has solar attributes, is given the role of creator while in another a lotus opens to reveal the sun god Ra, while in another variation the lotus releases a scarab beetle, also symbolic of the sun, which then created humanity. Vincent Arieh Tobin, "Creation Myths," in *The Ancient Gods Speak: A Guide to Egyptian Religion*, ed. Donald B. Redford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 246-51.

[94] Diodorus' account of Σεσόωσιν (Sesoösis) in Book I, 53-8, closely matches that of Herodotus' account of "Sesostris" in Book II, 102-11. Oldfather, Library, 185n, like Lloyd in, "Book II," 313, believed that Sesoösis/Sesostris was an amalgam of numerous kings such as Senusret I and III and Ramesses II. The Ramesside influence on this tradition can be seen in Book I, 56-7 of the *Library* where Diodorus described Sesoösis' extensive building activities. Perhaps Tuthmose III can also be seen in this tradition; in Book I, 55 Sesoösis first successfully campaigned against Nubia before turning his attention to subdue the Levant. The source material here may have been the New Kingdom annals that chronicled Thutmose III's campaigns.

mercenaries from the Delta to Memphis (Book I, 67). It could also be that the Ptah priesthood held the most clerical power in Egypt at the time[95] and therefore *consciously* imparted their preferred creation account to Diodorus, thus demonstrating once more an example of the Egyptian priests influencing Greek historiography.

Other examples where Diodorus' used the Egyptian priests as his source of historical information include: the origins of Thebes (Book I, 15), the source of the annual Nile inundations (Book I, 40), the origins of Egyptian education (Book I, 43), and information about the Valley of the Kings (Book I, 46). Perhaps the most important information Diodorus received from the Egyptian priests – at least as far as the current study is concerned – was the abbreviated but garbled king-list he related in Book I, 44-69. Unlike the Herodotus king-list[96] which lists 330 kings, Diodorus' list contains 475 monarchs.[97] Diodorus was much more specific than Herodotus about the way that the Egyptian priests transmitted this historical information:

> About all of them the priests had records which were regularly handed down in their sacred books to each successive priest from early times, giving the stature of each of the former kings, a description of his character, and what he had done during his reign.[98]

---

[95] Redford believes that the priests of Ptah held immense power in the Late Period, namely in their control of important religious cults such as the Apis and the transmission of the Egyptian historical record, *King-Lists*, 297-302. He also states that "if any single city can be said to have shaped the king-list tradition reflected by the Turin Canon, it is Memphis." Ibid., 4. Although Gozzoli agrees with Redford that Memphis was still an important center in the Late Period he adds; "The relevance of the city from a religious and ideological point of view is entirely true, but the history of Dynasties Twenty-one to Thirty has a Lower Egyptian bias, more than just centred on Memphis." *History,* 197n.

[96] Herodotus, *Histories*, Book II, 100-42.

[97] Diodorus, *Library*, Book I, 44. Diodorus lived over three hundred years after Herodotus which would account for some of the discrepancy of 145 kings. Although Diodorus lists the Persians and Ptolemies as Egyptian kings, he is specific that they are not considered with his final number of 475. "Last of all the Macedonians and their dynasty held rule for two hundred and seventy-six years. For the rest of the time all the kings of the land were natives, four hundred and seventy of them being men and five women."

[98] Ibid.

Diodorus' characterization of the priests' historical sources appears to be a combination of annals – the description of the king's character and deeds – and known king-lists such as the Turin Canon and possibly as of yet unknown lists that continued until and possibly through the Ptolemaic Dynasty.

Like Herodotus' Egyptian king-list, Diodorus' list can tell the modern scholar much about how the Egyptian priests viewed their own history. The most villainous king in Herodotus' account was Cheops/Khufu, but in Diodorus' account in Book I, 63 none of the negative anecdotes associated with Cheops/Khufu, referred to as Χέμμις (Chemis), are repeated. Interestingly, the motif of a bad king which Khufu filled in Herodotus' *The Histories* is instead substituted with Menes in Book I, 45 of Diodorus' *Library*. Diodorus wrote that "Menas" lived an ostentatious lifestyle that later came back to hurt the Egyptian monarchy:

> After the gods the first king of Egypt, according to the priests, was Menas, who taught the people to worship the gods and offer sacrifices, and also to supply themselves with tables and couches and to use costly bedding, and, in a word, introduced luxury and an extravagant manner of life. For this reason when, many generations later, Tnephachthus, the father of Bocchoirs the wise, was king and, while on a campaign in Arabia, ran short of supplies because the country was desert and rough, we are told that he was obliged to go without food for one day and then to live on quite simple fare at the home of some ordinary folk in private station, and that he, enjoying the experience exceedingly, denounced luxury and pronounced a curse on the king who had first taught the people their extravagant way of living.[99]

The Twenty Fourth Dynasty king Bocchoris/Bakenrenef is referenced by Diodorus' again in Book I, 65 as a "man who was altogether contemptible in personal appearance but in sagacity far surpassed all former kings." Diodorus appears to be following the same pattern of Herodotus in his king-list version by writing about an example of a bad king, in

[99] Ibid., Book I, 45.

this case Menes, and juxtaposing him with examples of good kings such as Bakenrenef and Shabaqa who was described in Book I, 65 as "in piety and uprightness far surpassed his predecessors." The relevant point here, as was discussed with respect to Herodotus above, is not why Menes was presented as a bad king while Bakenrenef and Shabaqa were examples of good kings – such arguments will remain circular until other primary documents are discovered that can illuminate this further – but how the Egyptian priests interjected themselves into Greek historiography and in doing so left a hint of Egyptian historiography on this particular book.

Other than the Egyptian priests and Hecataeus of Abdera who were direct influences, in terms of source information, on Diodorus' *Library of History* other influences on the historian must be considered in order to determine his impact on Greek historiography, his record of Egyptian history, and ultimately the impact of the Egyptian philosophy of history on his work. Unlike Herodotus who lived in the Greek and Persian cultural milieu, Diodorus lived in the era of Hellenism, the late Roman Republic, and the early Roman Empire. Hellenistic ideas such as the *cosmopolis* and world unity were an influence on Diodorus[100] as well as the Roman Stoic philosophy that stressed the utility of history.[101] The influence of Stoicism can be seen in the story of

[100] Oldfather, "Introduction," xii.

[101] Ibid., xx.

Tnephachthus/Tefnakht discussed above from Book I, 45. The aversion to luxury and the idealization of a man who leads an austere life is indicative of Stoic philosophy.[102]

Diodorus and the Greek historian he used as a source for much of his information on Egypt, Hecataeus of Abdera, also appear to have followed Herodotus' idealization of some aspects of pharaonic culture. One of these is the idea of the Egyptians as the "first discoverers." As noted above, Herodotus attributed the "discovery" of geometry to the Egyptians and in a similar vein Diodorus attributed Egyptian colonization to the spread of medical science and astrology.[103] As noted above, Lloyd gives no credence to these statements by the ancient historians,[104] while Gozzoli further expounds with a reason:

> As Herodotus, Hecataeus accentuates the element of the Herodotean *first discoverer* to its limits; all the most important inventions are attributed to the Egyptians. As far as is known, Hecataeus pushed toward a syncretism between Greek and Egyptian culture, a feature which was particularly notable in the early days of Ptolemy I's control over Egypt.[105]

---

[102] For examples of this see Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, trans. Martin Hammond (London: Penguin Books, 2006. "Theophrastus says that offences of lust are graver than those of anger: because it is clearly some sort of pain which drives the angry man to abandon reason, whereas the lust-led offender has given in to pleasure and seems somehow more abandoned and less manly in his wrongdoings." Book 2, 10. "All your thoughts are straight forward and kindly, the thoughts of a social being who has no regard for the fancies of pleasure or wider indulgence, for rivalry, malice suspicion, or anything else that one would blush to admit was in one's mind." Book 3, 2. "Here is a way to understand what sort of things the majority take to be 'goods.' If you think of the true goods there are – wisdom, for example, self-control, justice, courage – with these in your mind you could not give any credence to the popular saying of 'too many goods to make room,' because it will not apply. But bearing in mind what the majority see as goods you will hear and readily accept what the comic poet says as a fair comment. Even the majority can intuit this difference. Otherwise this saying would not both cause offence and rejection, while at the same time we take it as a telling and witty comment on wealth and the privileges of luxury and fame." Book 5, 12. "At their festivals the Spartans would put seats for visitors in the shade, and sit themselves wherever they could." Book 11, 24.

[103] Diodorus, *Library*, Book I, 28.

[104] Lloyd, *Book II*, 51.

[105] Gozzoli, *History*, 194.

Gozzoli raises an interesting point concerning the syncretism of Greek and Egyptian culture, but to understand why, one may have to look further at how Diodorus/Hecataeus idealized the Egyptian concept of kingship.

Murray argues that the sections in *The Library* that concern the "the subordination of the Egyptian kings to the laws and customs of their office, and the function of the priests in ensuring this"[106] came fully from Hecataeus' own idealization of pharaonic kingship, which happened to coincide with the views of the Egyptian priests.[107] Although this makes sense when considering Harrison's idea of Greek "polarity" discussed above, Murray is taking a big intellectual leap by assuming that Diodorus/Hecataeus' views of kingship coincided with those of the priests. In fact, it would be safer to assume, since Diodorus stated that he received the information from the priests, that the idealization came directly from them and not Hecataeus. Other modern scholars have gone even further in their interpretation of Diodorus/Hecataeus' writings through the prism of Egyptian culture.

Dillery points to ancient Egypt as possibly being Hecataeus' inspiration for the fictional utopia of Hyperborea.[108] Dillery believes that the similarities between Diodorus/Hecataeus accounts of the topography of Egypt as well as the anthropological descriptions are echoed in Hecataeus' Hyperborea. He writes:

---

[106] Murray, "Hecataeus," 153.

[107] Ibid., 166.

[108] Dillery, "Hecataeus," 262.

> It turns out that the Delta is also like Sicily (Diod. 1.34.1), and the land there brings forth every variety of plant; while it is true that πάμφορος is a common word in Diodorus, the fertility of the Delta is a detail that is repeated to such an extent that it is difficult to believe that the concept was not prominent in his source . . . . For Hecataeus, in two fundamental features – namely similarity to Sicily and quality of its soil (a detail absent from earlier accounts) – the Land of the Hyperboreans is like the Delta of Egypt.[109]

He then goes on to point out several examples of the anthropological similarities between the Egyptian and Hyperboreans, namely the highly religious nature of both cultures. Dillery notes that the Hyperboreans were depicted by Hecataeus as pious people:

> Evidently, though, he went even further and made all of them into quasi-priests of Apollo: as Diodorus reports . . . . This is a very important detail. To style a whole people priests of a god suggests Egypt. To be sure, the whole race of Egyptians was always thought of as pious. But in Hecataeus' understanding fully one third of Egypt was given over to the priestly class.[110]

Dillery's theory of Egypt being the inspiration for Hyperborea follows Harrison's model of "polarity" in Herodotus discussed above, but unlike Harrison he believes that Greek and Egyptian culture, although distinct, could both "interpenetrate and interpret the other in meaningful ways."[111] This idea follows more closely with Loprieno's multi-layered "productive" historical philosophy of the Late Period discussed above. As with Herodotus, the important thing to consider with Diodorus' history is the transmission of Egyptian historiography from the priests to Hecataeus and later Diodorus, because it was they who decided which aspects of Egyptian culture were exalted along with which kings were praised and which ones were vilified.

---

[109] Ibid., 262-3.

[110] Ibid., 266.

[111] Ibid., 275.

The final ancient historian, Manetho, to be analyzed here is in many ways the most important because he was actually Egyptian and his work is the basis for the modern dynastic divisions of Egyptian chronology. Manetho's background is obscure, but the fragments of his work provide some information concerning his origins. In Fragment 3, from Syncellus, of his *Aegyptiaca*, Manetho is described as a chief priest from the city of Sebennytus.[112] In a letter attributed to Manetho, but recorded by Syncellus and published as "pseudo-Manetho," written to Ptolemy II Philadelphus, he describes himself as: "high-priest and scribe of the sacred shrines of Egypt, born at Sebennytus and dwelling at Heliopolis."[113] The reference to Ptolemy II in pseudo-Manetho and Fragment 3 as well as a reference to the Mesopotamian priest and historian Berossus in Fragment 3 by Syncellus[114] puts the work sometime after 281 BC.[115] It was in the course of his priestly duties that Manetho not only wrote his history of Egypt, but also helped to introduce the syncretic Serapis cult into Egypt.[116] Since Manetho was an Egyptian priest who lived in Hellenistic Egypt, an assessment of what aspects of his work were influenced by the Egyptian philosophy of history and what were influenced by the Greek may at first glance appear to be simpler than that of the other two historians discussed in this chapter. Unfortunately, determining the "Egyptianness" or "Greekness" of Manetho is clouded by the manner in which his history has been preserved for posterity.

---

[112] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, Fr., 3, from Syncellus.

[113] Ibid., Appendix I, 211.

[114] Syncellus stated that he lived later than Berossus, during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus.

[115] W.G. Waddell, "Introduction," in *Aegyptiaca*, xi.

[116] Ibid.

One of the primary differences between Manetho's history and those of Herodotus and Diodorus – which creates countless problems concerning the validity of his accounts – is the fact that no original manuscript is known to have survived; modern scholars are left with only "transmissions" of the original *Aegyptiaca* that were preserved by Jewish and Christian scholars in late antiquity and the Middle Ages. The transmissions came from two sources, the first being excerpts of the original work preserved by the Jewish historian Josephus,[117] and the other being what is referred to as the *Epitome*, which consisted of fragments preserved by Christian chronographers such as Africanus and Eusebius.[118] Problems concerning the validity of the transmissions as well as how they were manipulated to serve religious polemics will be discussed below, but first Manetho's sources and methodology must be analyzed.

Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* reads in part like a pharaonic king-list, as the various kings are listed in chronological order with the length of their reigns – although not always correctly as will be discussed below – and neatly divided into dynasties, which is a notable divergence from traditional king-lists. The other Egyptian historiographical influence in the *Aegyptiaca* appears to be the annals because "the events from the reigns of Menes to Necherophes are derivative from entries similar to those of the Palermo Annals."[119] Since Manetho was an Egyptian priest and would have been able to read the king-lists, it is safe to assume that he utilized those lists, such as the Turin Canon, to compile at least part of his history. Redford notes:

---

[117] Ibid., xv.

[118] Ibid., xvi.

[119] Gozzoli, *History*, 208.

> To all intents and purposes the tradition of number and sequence of Middle Kingdom dynasties reflected in Manetho, is present in the same form in TC a millennium earlier. The Manethonian divisions of the dynasties of the Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period, however, are not yet part of the tradition in Ramesside times, and are therefore a later development.[120]

Where Manetho learned the chronologies of the post-Ramesside dynasties are unknown at this time – the information may have come from yet unknown king-lists or from other sources that will be discussed below.[121]

Manetho's history though goes beyond a typical king-list in purpose and scope. As noted above, the purpose of the Egyptian king-list was not to record history for posterity but to provide a link for the present king to his long gone illustrious ancestors whom he offers to in the form of the list in order to legitimize his own rule.[122] The purpose of the Egyptian king-lists therefore limited their historicity and scope because certain kings who were viewed as anathema were left out,[123] but this was not the case with Manetho's history. Hatshepsut, referred to as Amensis the sister of Amenophis, is present in Fragments 50, from Josephus, 51, from Theophilus, and 52, from Syncellus according to Africanus, as are the Amarna kings listed as: Acherres, Rathos, and Chebres.[124] Because of this, it becomes clear that Manetho therefore did not receive all

---

[120] Redford, *King-Lists*, 13.

[121] Helck believed that Manetho had access to multiple lists; see Helck, *Untersuchungen*, 15-16.

[122] Gozzoli, *History*, 7.

[123] The Amarna kings and Hatshepsut were routinely omitted from king-lists; Redford, *King-Lists*, 35.

[124] Fragments 50-3 all list these three kings with slightly different variations in the Greek spelling, but interestingly in Fragment 51, from Theophillus, Akhenaten/Acencherses is reffered to as the daughter of Orus/Amenhotep III. The Fragments vary on the number of kings given from the Eighteenth Dynasty. Fragment 50 (from Josephus) lists thirteen; Fragment 51 (from Theophilus) lists sixteen, although the last two are named Ραμέσσης (Ramesses); Fragment 52 (from Syncellus according to Africanus) lists sixteen kings as well with the last two being Ραμέσσης and Αμενωφάθ (Amenoptah); and Fragment 53 lists

of his chronological information by solely "using any or all of these Pharaonic lists"[125] discussed above such as the Turin Canon.

Information from priestly libraries was probably another source of Manetho's history. Manetho's use of library documents would also help to explain the several annalistic type entries from the post-Fifth Dynasty Fragments. In Fragments 34-36 he lists Σέσωστρις (Sesostris) as having ruled for forty eight years and conquering Asia – much like the account of Herodotus and Diodorus discussed above – and another interesting example includes Fragments 64-65 where it is stated that in the reign of βόχχωρις (Bochoris/Bakenrenef) a lamb spoke. The source of these stories may have been the Temple archives and demonstrates that Manetho, an educated priest and "historian," saw these stories as valid enough to publish. Redford noted:

> Through the library of the temple Manetho was privy to the folklore of this people and was not averse to using it. Indeed, he treated it much more seriously than we should ever have imagined *a priori,* and the argument that Manetho, being able to read the native scripts would surely not have used such fanciful legends, is simply – and surprisingly – not the case.[126]

The reason why Manetho chose to include fanciful stories within his history, as fact, may stem from the reason that he was Egyptian and not Greek i.e. he was influenced as much by the Egyptian philosophy of history that stressed the connection with past kings and their deeds and was in fact written for them and not posterity. It should also be pointed out that if the priests were the ones in charge of transmitting Egyptian historical records, by the first millennium BC some things would surely have been misread and folklore

---

fourteen kings. A more thorough examination of Josephus' Fragment 54 and the Amarna period will be discussed below.

[125] Gerald P. Verbrugghe and John M. Wickersham, eds. and trans, *Berossos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 104.

[126] Redford, *King-Lists*, 229.

may have been mixed with real history. Manetho's use of the temple libraries also demonstrates that he was also influenced by the Greek philosophy of history and historiography:

> If Manetho preferred to base himself on something near to hand in the library, this would be quite in accordance with the dominant methods of Hellenistic Greek historiography, Manetho's new adoptive métier. Manetho's main source is most likely, therefore, to have been something both comprehensive, orderly, and portable or on hand.[127]

Therefore, Manetho appears to have gathered his information from two sources – the available annals and king-lists such as the Turin Canon and other material available to him in the temple libraries. Because of his background, Manetho would have no doubt been able to read documents in Demotic, Hieratic, Egyptian hieroglyphs, and Greek as well which means that he had a better grasp of both the Egyptian and Greek primary source materials then his predecessor Herodotus or the later Diodorus.

Manetho, having lived in the Hellenistic world, was no doubt influenced by prior Greek scholars such as Herodotus. Herodotus is referred to in, Fragments 34-36 as discussed above, and Fragment 7, where Manetho cites him as a source for the length of Menes' reign. Fragments 14, 15, and 16 also cite Herodotus as a source for Khufu's building of the Great Pyramid, although in the *Aegyptiaca* the second king of the Fourth Dynasty is named Σοῦφις (Suphis). The *Aegyptiaca* seems to differentiate between Suphis and Cheops as all three Fragments state that Suphis built the Great Pyramid "which Herodotus says was built by Cheops."[128] In Fragment 42, Josephus states that

---

[127] Verbrugghe and Wickersham, *Manetho,* 105.

[128] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, Fragments 14-16. Fragment 14 (from Syncellus according to Africanus) lists two Suphis, with the first being attributed as the builder of the Great Pyramid, while Fragment 15, from Syncellus according to Africanus, and Fragment 16, the Armenian version of Eusebius, lists Suphis as the third, but do not mention a second, and builder of the Great Pyramid. Verbrugge and Wickersham identify Suphis as Khufu in their chart, *Manetho*, 190.

"on many points of Egyptian history he convicts Herodotus of having erred through ignorance," but unfortunately the only Fragment that has survived that sheds more light on Manetho's criticism of Herodotus is Fragment 88 which says nothing about the historian from Halicarnassus.[129] Many modern scholars believe that Greek historiography had an influence on Manetho. Dillery believes that essentially Manetho's work was a mix of the Egyptian and Greek historical traditions:

> Manetho's history of Egypt is an amalgam of two distinct Egyptian forms of relating the past: (i) a king-list that provides a chronology which goes back to the earliest dynasties, indeed, to a period when the gods were thought to have ruled Egypt, and (ii) narratives of varying types, ranging from prophecies and wisdom literature to royal and non-royal autobiography. . . For Manetho to have written in a similar way (if in fact he did so) would have signaled that his work was orientated along Greek historiographic lines.[130]

Dillery is correct in his assessment that Manetho drew on different types of Egyptian historical traditions, but he omits the Old Kingdom annals he may have used. True, the annals only supplied information on the first five dynasties, but the influence the annals had as a *style*, as discussed above, cannot be overlooked. Gozzoli also concurs with Dillery that Manetho represented a combination of Egyptian and Greek historical thought as he was "a bridge between two cultures"[131] and that "he and Hecataeus of Abdera before him had Herodotus as a model."[132] Not all modern scholars are in agreement that Manetho was so indebted to Greek historiography. Redford writes:

---

[129] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, Fragment 88, 205-6. The Fragment merely talks about the etymology of the word λέων (lion) and states that "Manetho says in his *Criticism of Herodotus* that the lion never sleeps."

[130] John Dillery, "The First Egyptian Narrative History: Manetho and Greek Historiography," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 127 (1999): 93.

[131] Gozzoli, *History*, 224.

[132] Ibid.

> That Manetho should have felt inclined to make use of earlier Greek writers on Egypt is most unlikely. Manetho had access to all the temple literature and to monuments as well, both of which the Greeks were unable to see.[133]

That Manetho had access and used the temple literature and monuments, which includes the annals and king-lists, is not in question and was stated above, but to claim that he never used the writings of Herodotus is false when one examines the number of Fragments where he is named. The amount of influence that Herodotus had on Manetho is open for argument, but not the fact that he was familiar with *The Histories* and used it as a source.

Perhaps one of the more confusing aspects of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* is the numerous Greek names of Egyptian rulers that appear to have no connection to their Egyptian equivalent and the sometimes garbled chronology that goes with them. Verbrugghe and Wickhersham divide these into three categories. The first category includes names that are "easy to see which name Manetho was dealing with"[134] such as Ramesses and Bochchoris/Bakenrenef. The second category are names that "allow confident identification but with puzzling differences."[135] One of the examples given by Verbrugghe and Wickersham here includes the Nineteenth Dynasty king Tausret, who is called Thouoris in Fragments 55-56. The final category includes names that "have a 'trick'" in order to identify their Egyptian equivalents.[136] Thutmose II, who in Fragments 51-53 is called "Chebron" is an example of this category. Verbrugghe and Wickersham argue that since Thutmose II's throne name was Ah-a-Kheper-Ra and his name on the

---

[133] Redford, *King-Lists*, 225.

[134] Verbrugghe and Wickersham, *Manetho*, 111.

[135] Ibid., 112.

[136] Ibid., 113.

king-lists is A-Kheper-en-Ra that "Chebron" is an interpretation of the "Kheper" part of his name.[137]

With careful research many of the confusing names can be identified with an equivalent king, but what does that tell modern scholarship about Manetho? Loprieno believes that the confusing aspects of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* can be attributed to the change in the Egyptian philosophy of history that took place in the Late Period. He writes:

> The mythical reading of the past, however, does not go without a price, which is the loss of interest for what had been the cornerstone of Egyptian views of political history, namely the emphasis on the sequence of rulers that had characterized Egyptian annals from the Palermo Stone to Ramesside king lists. . . . Manetho's text, on the contrary, displays a more complex approach: while the five kings following Salitis are indeed organized according to the ancient model, the mythical reading of specific kings such as Salitis or Misphragmuthosis tends to decontextualize them, as it were, and to replace clearly identifiable rulers with composite figures that represent the merger of various historical kings.[138]

Loprieno is referring to specifically Fragments 42 and 50 which are the Josephus sections where he gives his history, based on Manetho, of the Hyksos period in Egypt. These two Fragments deserve special attention here because any useful historiography is buried in a mass of polemics.

The Fragments of the *Aegyptiaca* that the Jewish historian, Josephus, commented on were ones in which "in his opinion are especially important for Jewish national history and identity"[139] while the Christian commentators were more interested in "the first apologetic version of a continuous history of salvation that already began with the book

---

[137] Ibid.

[138] Loprieno, "Views," 146.

[139] Ibid., 143.

of Genesis"[140] in the Fragments they transmitted. This is not to say that Josephus made up or wrote Fragments 42 and 50 but only that he chose to copy those sections that were pertinent to his culture. To view these Fragments as historical and anything other than a propaganda story full of motifs would be to err. Gozzoli argues that the story of the Hyksos invasion and occupation of Egypt was merely a vehicle to express Egyptian political frustrations in the Late Period:

> The Hyksos section is also built on material which was a component of Egyptian propaganda in the last half of the first millennium BC. Therefore, the Hyksos element has a quite general anti-Asian flavour, with a mix of anti-Persian, Assyrian and Jewish resentments. Saving the sacred animals is an intentional contrast with the killing of the Apis bulls of which Cambyses and Artaxerxes III were accused, here characterised by the roasting of the sacred animals.[141]

In both Fragments the enemy of the Egyptians, other than the Hyksos "shepherds," are the Assyrians and in Fragment 50 – the Medes. This would fit with Gozzoli's theory; Manetho simply "packaged" three of the foreign conquerors of Egypt – Hyksos, Assyrians, and Medes (Persians) – into one narrative that dutifully described these disasters in an Egyptian way. The device of using an archetypal foreign menace was used by other Near Eastern cultures as well: "Guti invasion provided a pattern for interpreting all acts of foreign invasion and domination in Babylonian in the same way as the Hyksos invasion provided a pattern for the Egyptian."[142]

The importance of the Egyptian priesthood on the classical historians has been discussed above, primarily concerning the king-lists provided to Herodotus and Diodorus and namely which kings were exalted and which were vilified. As argued, this

---

[140] Ibid.

[141] Gozzoli, *History*, 218-9.

[142] Johnathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 72.

demonstrates that the Egyptian priests had a tremendous impact on how their culture's history was transmitted by the Greeks and also how they were able to imbue Greek historiography with a layer – albeit a thin one most of the time – of Egyptian historiography. Dillery has argued that in the Late Period – but more specifically in the Ptolemaic Dynasty – priestly autobiographies depict the growing importance of the native priests at the expense of the monarch.[143] Ultimately, that is where the importance of Manetho as a historical source becomes clearer. The accuracy of the stories and their relevance to Egyptian history are less important than why Manetho chose to record particular stories, what his intent was, and who the intended audience was. Why he chose to record particular stories probably had less to do with the source material available to him than it did with a particular idea, such as the invader motif, that he wanted to convey. Overall his intent was probably to serve some sort of "patriotic truth"[144] but also to merge the Egyptian and Greek historical traditions for future generations of both Greeks and Egyptians.

An analysis of the works of the classical historians Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho reveals that they were a product of the converging of Egyptian and Greek historical traditions. Manetho, the Hellenistic Egyptian priest, is probably the most obvious example of this convergence, but the works of Herodotus and Diodorus also show a strong Egyptian influence. The Egyptian influence on these historians came from the priests who they received much of their source material either directly or indirectly. The Egyptian priests had much more control over Greek historiography than previously argued; through the reading of king-lists as well as the explanations of monuments and

[143] Dillery, "Egyptian," 107.

[144] Verbrugghe and Wickersham, *Manetho*, 119.

religious festivals they were able to disseminate the historical information they believed important which was then recorded in the traditional Greek format of a narrative.

Chapter IV – Invasion: The First Phase in Late Period Dynastic Transition

The purpose of this chapter is to better understand, through historiographical analysis of the primary sources, the process of invasion and occasional rebellions that took place on numerous occasions in Egypt during the Late Period. Although most of these invasions have been documented by modern scholars[1] as part of larger works and a recent article by Daniel Kahn and Oded Tammuz has surveyed most of the invasions of this period and into the Ptolemaic Dynasty,[2] but more work is needed and new questions need to be raised. Some of the questions that will be addressed in this chapter and will hopefully be answered by the end include: how was invasion significant in this period? How did these invasions take place and more significantly what were the catalysts? The condition that Egypt was left in after each of these invasions must also be considered whenever possible. Also, the importance of the historiographical corpus concerning invasion itself must be examined, which means one cannot always merely repeat the information from the texts as factual in every situation but must consider the purpose and audience of said texts and how those texts have been interpreted, or misinterpreted, in modern times.

In the previous chapter of this dissertation the classical histories as primary source material was explored in relation to their veracity, but probably more importantly, how

---

[1] Kenneth Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: (1100 to 650 BC)*, 2nd ed. (Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris and Phillips, 1995); Donald Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992); Friedrich Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundet vor der Zeitwende* (Berlin: Akademieverlag, 1953).

[2] Daniel Kahn and Oded Tammuz, "Egypt is Difficult to Enter: Invading Egypt – A Game Plan (seventh to fourth centuries BCE)," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Ancient Antiquities* 35 (2008): 37-66.

the Egyptian philosophy of history and historiography influenced those works. The primary sources used to reconstruct the events in this and subsequent chapters come from a variety of different places – Egypt, Assyria, Mesopotamia, the Levant, and Persia – and also different genres – historical annals, the Old Testament, and religious/mythological texts – so a consideration of these texts in a general sense must first be conducted. Of primary importance here when analyzing and using ancient texts from any geographic/cultural area and of any genre is how modern scholars perceive the purpose of these texts compared to how the ancients *meant* for these texts to be viewed. Mario Liverani has advocated a more nuanced approach to analyzing ancient texts that involves viewing texts not for just what they state but to see the importance of the information itself. He wrote:

> The thing to do should be to view the document not as a 'source of information', but as information in itself; not as an opening on a reality laying beyond, but as an opening on a reality laying beyond, but as an element which makes up that reality . . . Not as an informer, but as a member of the community under study.[3]

This approach to ancient historiography is juxtaposed with a more simplistic and rudimentary analyses of texts as true narratives of events which can lead to problems and errors in constructing chronologies. If one blindly assumes that the text in question is entirely factual concerning the events it details and if "the textual information is wrong, as might be the case for various reasons, the error passes inevitably into the historical reconstruction."[4] Liverani further advocated that the modern historian should consider the ancient texts in question from the perspective of the author:

---

[3] Mario Liverani, "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographical Texts," *Orientalia* 42 (1973): 179.

[4] Ibid.

> Let us on the other hand try to view the document as *a source for the knowledge of itself* – i.e., as a source of the knowledge on the author of the document, whom we know from the document itself. In this type of approach our attention is no more centered on the events, but on how they are narrated . . . The peculiarity of the narration is the element by which we may hope to gain some enlightenment on the historical environment of the author, and possibly even on the single author in the context of his environment.[5]

Ancient texts should then be considered first from the point of view of the author, which will help modern historiography better determine *why* a particular text was written. After consideration of the author's intent is explored then the modern historian can further analyze ancient texts in their entirety and "*from all possible points of view*."[6] As noted in Chapter III of this dissertation, Egyptian historiography, if one could call it such,[7] was usually not written for posterity and never in a narrative form in the manner that the Greeks first wrote history which has evolved to become the modern form that we have today. Because of this, Liverani's approach to the use and analysis of ancient texts appears to be the best way to construct ancient chronology.

The first invasion of Egypt in the period examined in this dissertation came from the south with the Nubians led by their king Piankhy[8] in 728 BC.[9] The primary intent here and throughout this chapter is not to critique the military maneuvers of either side,

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., 180.

[7] Redford believes that the Egyptians did not possess a true historiography in the modern sense. See Chapter IV of this dissertation for his commentary on this matter.

[8] For recent examination of the spelling and pronunciation of the name see Claude Rilley, "Une nouvelle interprétation du name royal Piankhi," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 101 (2001): 351-368.

[9] For the dating of the chronology see Kitchen, *Third*, 147, 369.

that topic has been successfully investigated in the past,[10] but more to examine the socio-political and religious aspects of the two Nubian invasions of Egypt. Gozzoli is the most recent scholar to examine Piankhy's invasion and particularly *Piankhy's Triumphal Stela*[11] as a text that uses religious justifications for the campaign[12] – i.e. religious propaganda – so his study will aid this dissertation. First, in order to understand Piankhy's and later Shabaqa's invasions of Egypt, one must first briefly examine the rise of both Nubian and Saite power in the eighth century BC.

Before Piankhy's invasion, the Nubians had been gradually gaining more influence in Upper Egypt[13] while Tefnakht, the chief of Sais, was acquiring power in the Delta.[14] Nubian military garrisons were established in Thebes during the reign of Kashta,[15] Piankhy's predecessor, and the Nubian rulers became more culturally enmeshed with Thebes through their worship of the Egyptian national god Amen.[16] Perhaps the most important move the Nubians made to consolidate power in Upper Egypt was to have

---

[10] Anthony Spalinger, "The Military Background of the Campaign of Piye (Piankhy)." *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 7 (1979): 273-301.

11 The stela is currently housed in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo #JE 48862. The stela is made of grey granite and is 1.84 meters wide, 1.8 meters high, and .43 meters thick. For a complete line by line transcription of the hieroglyphic text divided by clauses and accompanied with a French translation and grammatical commentary see Nicholas Grimal, *Le stèle tromphale de Pi(ankh)* (Cairo: *L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 1981).

[12] Roberto B. Gozzoli, *The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millennium BC (ca. 1070-180 BC): Trends and Perspectives* (London: Golden House Publications), 54-67.

[13] Spalinger, "Military," 273.

[14] Ibid; Kitchen, *Third*, 362-3.

[15] Robert Morkot, *Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers* (London: Rubicon Press, 2000), 179; László Török, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 144-5. Török places the dates of Kashta's Upper Egyptian occupation at 755-50 BC.

[16] Kitchen, *Third*, 369-70; Redford, *Canaan*, 344; Török, *Kush,* 144.

Amenirdis made the adopted daughter of the God's Wife of Amen,[17] which effectively "secured the Thebiad for Piankhy."[18] The rise of Nubian power in the south was taking place simultaneously as another group of foreigners was beginning to consolidate a hold on the Delta.

In the Delta, the Libyan population had grown so significantly over a 250 year period that by the eighth century BC they were able to assume political power over most of Egypt.[19] The Libyans were a fragmented ethnicity though as they would establish the Twenty Second, Twenty Third, and Twenty Fourth Dynasties which overlapped chronologically.[20] The most important of the Libyan-Egyptian dynasties, at least in reference to this dissertation, was the tribe that established itself in the western Delta city of Sais around 870 BC.[21] The rise in prominence of Sais coincided with the entry into the historical record of a man named Tefnakht, who was the leader of the Libyan tribe known as the Ma and the mayor of Sais. Two stelae from the city of Pe, which are dated to years

---

[17] For more on the importance of the office of the God's Wife of Amen and how the rulers of the Twenty Fifth and Twenty Sixth Dynasties used it to legitimize their rule in Egypt see Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[18] Redford, *Canaan*, 344.

[19] Anthony Leahy, "The Libyan Period in Egypt: An Essay in Interpretation." *Libyan Studies* 16 (1985): 54.

[20] For an early but still relevant study of each Libyan tribe, the specific regions of Egypt they migrated to, and their subsequent connections to the dynasties of the Third Intermediate Period see Jean Yoyotte, "Les principautés du Delta au temps de l'anarchie Libyenne," Mélanges Maspero 4 (1961): 121-181; Farouk Gomaà, *Die libyschen Fürstentümer des Deltas vom tod Osorkons II. bis zur wiedervereinigung Ägyptiens durch Psametik I* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974). For a more recent study see Kitchen, *Third.*

[21] Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East: c. 3000-330 BC* (London: Routledge, 1995), 2:628.

thirty six and thirty eight of an unknown king[22] are the first records of Tefnakht and his titles. Part of the stelae states:

> *sr ꜣ ḥ3ty-ꜥ wr ꜣ n lby* and *iw sr ꜣ m3 ḥ3ty-ꜥ t3yfnḫt*; which is translated: "great chief, mayor, great chief of the Libu" and "great chief of the Ma, mayor, Tefnakht."[23]

Tefnakht posed a threat to Piankhy in the south as he galvanized the "Delta into a political and social unit hostile to any moves" the Nubian king made.[24] It is from this perspective that Piankhy's invasion of Egypt should be examined – an Egypt fragmented both geographically and culturally which became a battleground for aspiring kings.

Piankhy's Triumphal Stela relates the political situation and the war between Piankhy and Tefnakht, as the latter began to consolidate his power in the Delta and move south with his army. The stela states:

> *wn nn sriw ḥ3ty-ꜥw imi-r mšꜥw ntt m niwtw.s h3b n ḥm.f mi rꜥ nb ḏdin iw gr.n.k r smḫ rsw sp3wt nw ḫnw t3fnḫt m iṯi ḥr.f nn gm.f ḫsf ꜥ.f*; which is translated: Then these chiefs, mayors, and generals who were in their towns sent to his majesty everyday saying, "Why are you silent concerning ignoring the southland and the nomes of the interior while Tefnakht takes possession (of all) before him and he does not see opposition against him?"[25]

The text goes on to describe Tefnakht's growing influence in Egypt as the potentate marched south he acquired the fealty of various chiefs:

---

[22] On the identification of the pharaoh named on the stela Morkot notes, "Such a high regnal year, however, can only belong to one of two Libyan pharaohs, Sheshonq III or Sheshonq V." *Pharaohs,* 181.

[23] Yoyotte, "Libyenne," 152-3.

[24] Spalinger, "Military," 273.

[25] Grimal, *Pi(ankh)*, 18-19, line 6.

> *ḥ3ty-ʿw nb ḥḳ3w ḥwt ḥr imnt ḥr i3bt iw-ibw dmḏ ḥr-mw wʿ m rdw sri n imnt ḥḳ3w ḥwt mḥw ḥm-nṯr Ntt s3w sm n Ptḥ t3fnḫt*; which is translated: The mayors and all the rulers of the dominions to the west and to the east and the Isles of the Midst were united in loyalty at the feet of the Chief of the West, the ruler of the dominion of Lower Egypt, the high priest of Neith, mistress of Sais, the *sem* priest of Ptah, Tefknakht.[26]

At this point in the text Tefnakht is portrayed as a rebel who works against the order or *Maat*, while Piankhy has yet to make his personal appearance in opposition to the rebel. When Piankhy finally makes the journey north to confront Tefnakht, order begins to be restored and the latter is faced with the first repercussion for his sins when his son is killed[27]. The text states:

> *ir ḫ3yt ʿ3t im.sn nn rḫ tnw ḥnʿ s3 n sri n mʿ t3fnḫt ʿḥʿ.n h3b.sn n ḥm.f ḥr.s nn ib.f r.s*; which is translated: As for the great massacre among them, the number is not known, but the son of the Chief of the Ma, Tefnakht, was with them. Then they sent to his majesty concerning it but his heart was not pleased.[28]

After Piankhy joins his army, he then leads them in successive successful sieges of the cities still held by Tefnakht and his allies beginning with Hermoplis.[29] Despite the obvious military tone of the text, the religious overtones are probably more important.

In the sections of the stela where Piankhy is personally present he is usually involved in some type of religious pilgrimage or offering along with his role as *generalissimo*. Early in the text he makes a pilgrimage to Thebes to partake in the Opet

---

[26] Ibid., 36-37, lines 19-20.

[27] Although Gozzoli notes concerning his rebellion that because Tefnakht never pledged his loyalty to Piankhy he "was acting outside Piye's jurisdiction; somehow his is justified" while Nimlot, who betrayed Piankhy, is blamed (lines 67-68) because, among other things, he "had recognized Piye's divine origin." *History,* 55. The author of the dissertation contends that all of the Libyan chiefs, including and especially Tefnakht, were considered outside the order and therefore working against *Maat*.

[28] Grimal, *Pi(ankh)*, 46-47, line 28.

[29] Ibid., 52-53, line 32.

festival[30] and then starting with the successful siege of Hermopolis he gives offerings to the local deities of every city he conquers. The stela states concerning his post-victory visit to the Temple of Thoth in Hermopolis:

> *ʿḥʿ.n sḫʿy* [*ḥm*]*.f m ʿḥ.f wḏ3w pr ḏḥwti nb ḫmnw s3.f iw3w wnḏw iti.f ḏḥwty nb ḫmnwy rmṯ 8 pr nw rmṯ 8*; which is translated: Then his majesty appeared in splendor in his palace and proceeded to the Temple of Thoth of Hermopolis. He offered oxen, short horned cattle, and fowls to his father, Thoth of Hermopolis, and the Eight (Ogdoad) in the Temple of the Eight (Ogdoad).[31]

The religious aspects of the stela can be viewed from two perspectives; as a sincere expression of religious conviction by the Nubian king or perhaps more cynically as a calculated political move meant to elicit support from the priests of the various cult centers he conquered. Redford believes that Piankhy and the Nubians saw themselves as true followers of the Egyptian religion as opposed to the more degenerate Libyans,[32] while Grimal argued that Piankhy's religious pilgrimages were more pragmatic and political. "Cette visite aux dieux d'Hermpolis est un acte plus politique que religieux.'[33] Ultimately it is not important if Piankhy actually believed in the various deities he patronized after his victories, although evidence seems to indicate that he did, but that the text portrayed him as pious. That appears to be the purpose and therefore it would be propaganda to a certain extent as Grimal argued.

The religious pilgrimage Piankhy made to the Temple of Heliopolis after his victory over that city was important in a religious-political sense as he visited the home of the Heliopolitan creation myth and of the god Atum who was prominent in the Late

---

[30] Ibid., 42-43, lines 25-26.

[31] Ibid., 68-69, lines 58-60.

[32] Redford, *Canaan*, 344.

[33] Grimal, *Pi(ankh)*, 72n.

Period.[34] When Piankhy visited Heliopolis he purified himself like he did in Thebes and then gave offerings. The text states:

> *ir wꜤb n itm m ḫr-Ꜣ psḏt m pr-psḏt im ḥt-pr nṯrw im.sn m iȝw wnḏw Ꜥḳw di.sn Ꜥnḫ wḏȝ snb pꜤnḫy Ꜥnḫ ḏt wḏ ḥm.f r iwnw ḥr ḏw pf n ḫr-Ꜣ ḥr mit nw wȝt sp r ḫr-Ꜣ wḏ ḥm.f r im im(ȝ)w ntt ḥr imntt iti ir wꜤb.f swꜤb.f m-ib š ḳbb iꜤi ḥr.f itrw nt nwn iꜤi rꜤ ḥr.f im*; which is translated: A purification was done for Atum in Kher-Aha – the Ennead and the cave of the gods in it – of: oxen, short horned cattle, and fowls so they shall give life, prosperity, and health to the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Piankhy, who lives forever. He proceeded to Heliopolis past that mountain of Kher-Aha on the road of Sep to Kher-Aha. His majesty proceeded to the camp to the west of Iti. He purified and he was cleansed in the lake of Kebeb and his face was washed in the river of Nun, where Ra washes his face.[35]

After Piankhy made the important pilgrimage and offerings in Heliopolis he then temporarily resided in the Delta city of Arthribis where he received a number of potentates, described as "plume wearing chiefs,"[36] which was clearly a reference to their Libyan ethnicity and non-Egyptian "otherness."[37] The final rebel kings and chiefs then appeared in person to surrender to Piankhy – with the exception of Tefnakht who sent a surrogate[38] – but were not allowed in the palace because they were uncircumcised and ate fish.[39] This was another reference not just to the perceived physical uncleanliness of the Libyans, but more so the spiritual uncleanliness as Piankhy appears as the true purveyor

---

[34] On the importance of Atum and the Persian patronage of his cult in the Twenty Seventh Dynasty see Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[35] Grimal, *Pi(ankh)*, 130-31, lines 100-1.

[36] Ibid., 140-41, line 107.

[37] On the issue of cultural identity and the "Egyptianness" of the Libyans and Nubians during this period see Robert Rittner, Robert K. Ritner, "Libyan vs. Nubian as the Ideal Egyptian," in *Egypt and Beyond: Essay Presented of Leonard H. Lesko upon his Retirement from the Wilbour Chair of Egyptology at Brown University, June 2005*, ed. Stephen E. Thompson and Peter Der Manuelian (Providence: Brown University Press, 2008), 305-14. Also see Chapter VI of this dissertation for a further discussion of this issue

[38] Ibid., 160-61, line 127.

[39] Ibid., 176-77, lines 150-51.

of Egyptian religion and culture. *Piankhy's Triumphal Stela* tells the story of the Nubian king's temporal conquest of Egypt sometimes detailing specific military tactics he used, but more importantly it relates how he *spiritually* conquered – or one may say rescued – Egypt from the forces of chaos, led by Tefnakht and a host of other foreign rebels, and established *Maat* once more. As Piankhy made his pilgrimages his victories continued – the military victories were contingent upon him following the proper religious protocols – so that eventually all the foreign rebels could do was submit to the rightful king of Egypt. Despite the hard fought victory Piankhy achieved, he soon after returned to Nubia never to return to Egypt, which created another power vacuum and facilitated a new invasion of Egypt from the south.

From Sais a new potentate emerged, Bakenrenef, who is listed by the transmissions of Manetho as the sole king of the Twenty Fourth Dynasty.[40] Bakenrenef and Shabaqa, the first king of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty listed by Manetho,[41] became engaged in a battle with each other that resulted in the consolidation of the Nubian Twenty Fifth Dynasty's rule over a united Egypt and the death of the upstart Bakenrenef.[42] Unfortunately, only one Egyptian source that documents Shabaqa's assent to power in Egypt exists and like the Manetho transmission mentioned above, skepticism remains about its veracity.[43] Shabaqa's invasion most likely took place sometime in the

---

[40] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca,* trans. W.G. Waddell (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004), Fragments 64-65, 164-67.

[41] Ibid., Fragments 66-67, 166-69.

[42] Ibid. For an in-depth discussion on this case of regicide see Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[43] See Chapter III of this dissertation for a historiographical analysis of the historical veracity of these transmissions.

year 712 BC[44] and was precipitated by a probable campaign to conquer Lower Egypt by Bakenrenef.[45] Possibly the best source that documented the war between Bakenrenef and Shabaqa is a scarab currently housed in the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.[46]

The scarab was obtained by Gaston Maspero in Jerusalem in 1910,[47] but was believed to be a fake for years by many people.[48] Yoyotte argued convincingly that the scarab was indeed authentic as he first pointed to its material properties. He cited the findings of the conservator at the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto and a secondary examination at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts as proof:

> Tout compte fait, l'étude préliminaire du conservateur aboutit à un verdict favorable . . . Déjà en possession de ces premières analyses qualitatives et quantitatives, Mademoiselle Needler a demandé qu'un examen plus systématique soit fait dans les laboratoires du Boston Museum of Fine Arts, où l'object a été expertise par les soins de Monsiuer William Young. Le scarabée est revenue à Toronto "with the Mr. Young's statement that he could find nothing suspicious about the object."[49]

---

[44] Donald Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History* (Mississauga, Canada: Benben Publications, 1986), 322. Also for this date see Anthony Spalinger, "The Year 712 B.C. and its Implications for Egyptian History," *Journal Of the American Research Center in Egypt* 10 (1973): 95-101; Hayim Tadmor, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 12 (1958): 22-100; Kitchen, *Third*. The chronology composed by these scholars places the flight of Iamani of Ashdod to Egypt, his return by the unnamed Nubian king to Sargon II of Assyria, Shabaqa's invasion of Egypt, and the death of Bakenrenef all in the year 712 BC. Interestingly, Edna Russmann attributes the date of Shabaqa's invasion to 715 BC but offers no corroborating evidence for this date, see "Egypt and the Kushites: Dynasty XXV," in *Africa and Africans in Antiquity*, ed. E. M. Yamauchi (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2001), 113-31.

[45] Although there is no primary source that definitively states this, Yoyotte believed that a fragment of a monument with Bakenrenef's cartouche discovered in Tanis proves that he controlled the Delta and that "Ce succès fut sans doute obtenu par la violence." Jean Yoyotte, "Bocchoris à Tanis et l'expansion des premiers rois Saïtes ver l'Orient," *Kemi* 21 (1971): 48.

[46] The scarab, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto #910.28.1 is made of steatite and measures 6.8 cm wide and 9cm long.

[47] Jean Yoyotte, "Plaidoyer pur l'authenticité du scarabée historique de Shabako," *Biblica* 37 (1956): 463.

[48] Ibid., 458.

[49] Ibid., 462.

Yoyotte also pointed out that the scarab stylistically matched those found at the Nubian royal cemetery of el-Kuru in Nubia.[50] The short inscription on the scarab provides an interesting textual supplement to this dissertation as it describes a "rebellion" in Egypt and a campaign into Asia. It states:

> [*ḥrw*] *sbḳ-tȝwy ḥrw sbḳ-tȝwy nswt biti nfr-kȝ-rᶜ sȝ rᶜ šbȝkȝ di ᶜnḫ mry imn r nswt nbt ḫprt ḏr wȝḥ tȝ smȝ.n.f sbiw r.f m šmᶜw mḥw m ḫȝstw nb ḥryw-šᶜym bdš r.f ḫr n šᶜt.f ii.sn ḏd.sn m sḳᶜ ᶜnḫw nḏr n wᶜ snwyit im.sn hr ir.n.f ȝḫt n iti(.f) ᶜ ᶜȝ n mr.f sw*; which is translated: [Horus], Sebeq-tawy, Horus, Sebeq-tawy, king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Nefer-ka-Ra, son of Ra, Shabaqa, given life, beloved of Amen more than any king, manifested since the beginning of the Earth. He destroyed the rebels who were against him in Upper Egypt, the Delta, and in all the foreign lands. The Sand Dwellers were weak against him, falling from his slaughter. They returned carrying captives who were captured by one of the companions among them. He made profit for (his) father, greatly his beloved.[51]

Although neither Bakenrenef nor the city of Sais are mentioned by name, this text combined with the Manetho transmissions and the monument fragment with Bakenrenef's cartouche mentioned above corroborates that a war probably took place between Shabaqa and Bakenrenef. Yoyotte also noticed that the Shabaqa scarab shared textual similarities to other notable Late Period inscriptions from Kawa[52] which further points to the authenticity of the piece. Shabaqa's successful invasion of Egypt meant that any Saite claim to the Egyptian throne was at least temporarily "definitely extinguished"[53] because besides killing Bakenrenef he "probably installed a Nubian

---

[50] Ibid., 465.

[51] Ibid., The hieroglyphic text on the scarab is printed on plate II in the article while Yoyotte's French translation is on 468.

[52] Ibid., 473.

[53] Kuhrt, *Ancient*, 2:631.

governor, at least initially" in Sais.[54] The immediate and obvious effect that Shabaqa's invasion had on Egypt was the installation of the Nubian Twenty Fifth Dynasty, but the more long term effect was the hostility it instilled between the Saites and Nubians. The hostility between the Nubians and Saites began with the regicide of Bakenrenef and the installation of a Nubian governor in Sais and continued for over one hundred years to include the regicide of another Saite regent, the invasion of Nubia by a Saite king, and the probable regicide of a Nubian prince.[55]

After the Nubians established the Twenty Fifth Dynasty, Egypt was subjected to more invasions from the outside; this time by the Assyrians led by the kings Esarhaddon in 671 BC and Assurbanipal in 669/8 and 664/3 BC. Before exploring the reasons for and results of the Assyrian invasions of Egypt, a brief overview of the Assyrian concepts of kingship and war must be conducted in order to fully understand the invasions Egypt suffered at their hands. In ancient Assyrian culture kingship was "directly linked to the acquisition of empire"[56] and justifications for and the protocols of war were meticulously worked out by the king.[57] The king also assumed a priestly role as he celebrated the rituals associated with war, which included offerings to various Assyrian deities and overseeing parades of defeated peoples.[58] These defeated peoples were forced to accept

---

[54] Kitchen, *Third*, 379. See Manetho *Aegyptiaca*, Fragment 69 (from Syncellus), 170-71. It lists as the first king of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty: Ἀμμέρις Αἰθίοψ "Ammeris the Ethiopian." This is the only evidence for a possible Nubian governor/mayor installed at Sais by Shabaqa.

[55] For a full historiographical discussion of these occurrences see Chapter V of this dissertation.

[56] Kuhrt, *Ancient*, 2:505.

[57] Ibid., 511.

[58] Ibid.

the superiority of the Assyrian god Assur "and his representative, the Assyrian king."[59] In effect, the Assyrian concept of kingship was enmeshed with war and put forward a political order in which Assyria and its gods were in the center and all other kingdoms, and their gods, were subordinates. The Assyrian political order was maintained not just by the brute force of its military, but probably more so through more clever methods which included a combination of loyalty oaths, despoliation of non-Assyrian cult objects, and resettlement of rebellious foreign peoples.

The resettlement of conquered peoples by the Assyrians was a common practice, the most famous of which was the conquest and resettlement of Samaria/Israel which will be briefly covered below, but since the population of Egypt was never forcibly resettled by the Assyrians the use of loyalty oaths and despoliation of cult objects as a means of control will be given more emphasis in the current study. The Assyrian use of loyalty oaths was an interesting and usually effective political tool that clearly established the relationship between the ruler and subject within the Assyrian empire. Although these oaths usually were one-sided in favor of the Assyrians, they sometimes were also beneficial to the militarily weaker party.

> As ruler of a superpower, the Assyrian king was in a position to dictate the terms of most agreements he concluded and to obtain unilateral concessions from the other contracting party. However, it is important to realise that this was not always the case. Situations arose in which the Assyrian ruler too was forced (or saw it as advantageous) to make concessions in order to obtain an agreement he desired. The extent of the concessions he was ready to make was of course directly related to the bargaining power of the other contracting party.[60]

---

[59] Ibid.

[60] Simo Parpola and Kazuko Watanabe, trans. and eds., *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*, vol. 2 of *State Archives of Assyria* (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988), xvi.

One such concession involved the Assyrian king Assurbanipal and the Egyptian Delta prince Nekau I. The political arrangement between the two leaders and how it ultimately led to the sack of Thebes will be discussed below.[61] The importance of oaths – more specifically the breaking of oaths and the results thereof – in the Assyrian empire cannot be understated as it was an effective political tactic utilized by the Assyrian kings to keep control over their vast empire.

Perhaps the most calculated political affect – and truly unique to the ancient world – practiced by the Assyrians was the despoliation of their enemies' cult objects. This method was done by the Assyrians to their enemies over thirty times[62] with Egypt falling victim to this method when Assurbanipal attacked and sacked Thebes – this will be covered more in-depth later in this chapter but for now the general concept and purpose of despoliation will be discussed. The despoliation of cult statues involved the victorious Assyrian army capturing a particular object from the vanquished with "the treatment of each god and statue accorded with the importance attached to them by the Assyrian conqueror."[63] The items most revered by the vanquished were than repatriated to Nineveh or another important Assyrian city.[64] Despite the physical loss of cult statues, the particular religious cults affected continued and refashioned new cult statues. Cogan

[61] The nuance of the oath between the Assyrian king and Nekau I will be discussed later in this chapter but also see Chapter V of this dissertation for more about the complexities of the oath, such as how Nekau I was spared for breaking it, and ultimately how he became the victim of regicide at the hands of Tantamani.

[62] Morton Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974).

[63] Ibid., 25.

[64] Ibid., 29.

argued that it was not the physical statue that was important, but the symbolism or what the statue itself represented:

> Did the Assyrians object to the replacement of deported statues? Apparently not; the transfer of the divine images to Assyria was but the formal aspect of submission and did not imply the abrogation of native cults.[65]

Therefore the true power associated with cult statue despoliation was not so much in the physical sense, but more of a metaphysical one that placed the Assyrians in a position of spiritual/religious dominance over the vanquished in a historical period when religion was inexorably intertwined with politics.

Assyria's invasions of Egypt did not come on a whim, but were the result of a long process of growing intervention by the Nubian Twenty Fifth Dynasty. In fact Spalinger has argued that in the wars between Assyria and Egypt in the seventh century BC, Egypt was not initially targeted by the Assyrians:

> We hope to have shown that contrary to what is usually claimed, the Assyrians did not find Egypt an easy land to rule. Moreover, it was not even Egypt who was the real enemy. Kush was the culprit. The Assyrians never failed to make this distinction.[66]

The seed of conflict between Assyria and Egypt, which would lead to the later invasions, can be traced to the Assyrian invasion and conquest of Samaria in 722/721 BC. The events detailed here took place after Piankhy's invasion of Egypt but before Shabaqa's invasion that established the Twenty Fifth Dynasty. The Assyrian capture of Samaria presents the modern scholar with problems of dating based on the available primary source materials. The Assyrian primary source material consists of annals and prisms,

---

[65] Ibid., 34.

[66] Anthony Spalinger, "Assurbanipal and Egypt: A Source Study," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94 (1974): 325.

but the "order in the Annals of Khorsabad is inconsistent with that in the fragmentary Prisms of Nineveh."[67] Perhaps the biggest problem concerning the decipherment of the facts concerning the fall of Samaria lay with the identity of the Assyrian king who led the siege and subsequent sack. Sargon II claims victory over Samaria in the Khorsabad Annals in his first year[68] while the Old Testament of the Bible claims Shalmaneser (V), Sargon II's predecessor, was the Assyrian king.[69] Tadmor noted that although modern scholars originally followed the biblical account, many began to believe in the veracity of the Khorsabad Annals:

> While some scholars preferred the Biblical statement in II Kings 18:9-10 that Shalmaneser V fought against Samaria conquering it in 722 'after 3 years of siege', the majority of twentieth century scholars, beginning with Winckler, accepted Sargon's account in the Annals, that Samaria fell in his *rē[š šarrūti* in the first *palû*], and placed the event in 721.[70]

Tadmor discovered that the inconsistencies lie in the dating method performed by Assyrian scribes; he noted that "with Tiglath-Pileser III the method of counting by *palû* was revived with the difference, that the *palû* was counted now not from 'Year 1' but rather from the accession year."[71] The fall of Samaria was the first historical account of

---

[67] Tadmor, "Sargon II," 22.

[68] For an English translation of the annals see Daniel David Luckenbill, *Historical Records of Assyria from Sargon to the End*, vol. 2 of *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (London: Histories and Mysteries of Man Ltd., 1989), 51. For another English translation see A. Leo Oppenheim, trans., "Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. with supplement., ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969), 285.

[69] 2 Kings 17-18:10.

[70] Tadmor, "Sargon II," 33.

[71] Ibid., 30. Kitchen adds that Shalmaneser V was usurped by Sargon II and that the inscriptions concerning the capture of Samaria – which he believes took place entirely under Shalmaneser V's reign – were "a propaganda exercise, to cover the gap in military successes that would otherwise disfigure the accounts of his reign." Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan:Williams B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2003), 39.

Sargon II's reign – whether through a change in chronology methods or blatant propaganda – and it was also the beginning of Egypt's intrigues with the Assyrian empire.

Egypt's first contact with Assyria occurred in 720 BC[72] near the Levantine city of Rafiah. The Khorsabad texts state:

> I besieged and conquered Samaria (*Sa-me-ri-na*), led away as booty 27,290 inhabitants of it. I formed from among them a contingent of 50 chariots and made remaining (inhabitants) assume their (social) positions. I installed over them an officer of mine and imposed upon them the tribute of the former king. Hanno, king of Gaza and also Sib'e, the *turtan* of Egypt (*Mu-ṣu-ri*), set out from Rapihu against me to deliver a decisive battle. I defeated them; Sib'e ran away, afraid when he (only) heard the noise of my (approaching) army, and has not been seen again. Hanno, I captured personally. I received tribute from Pir'u of Musuru, from Samsi, queen of Arabia (and) It'amar the Sabaen, gold in dust-form, horses (and) camels.[73]

The second part of the inscription – when Piru of Egypt sent tribute to Sargon II – took place in 716 BC.[74] Egypt's growing influence in the Levant was demonstrated less than five years later when in 712 BC[75] the potentate of the Levantine city of Ashdod, Iamani, rebelled unsuccessfully against Assyrian rule which forced him into exile in Egypt. The Khorsabad annals further relate:

> Iamani from Ashdod, afraid of my armed force (lit.: weapons), left his wife and children and fled to the frontier of M[usru] which belongs to Meluhha (i.e. Ethiopia) and hid (lit.: stayed) there like a thief. I installed an officer of mine as governor over his entire large country and its prosperous inhabitants, (thus) aggrandizing (again) the territory belonging to Ashur, the king of the gods. The terror (-inspiring) glamor of Ashur, my lord, overpowered (however) the king of Meluhha and he threw him (i.e. Iamani) in fetters on hands and feet, and sent him to me, to Assyria. I conquered and sacked the towns Shinuhtu (and) Samaria,

---

[72] Tadmor, "Sargon II," 35.

[73] Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 284-5; Luckenbill, *Assyria*, 26-27.

[74] Tadmor, "Sargon II," 35.

[75] Ibid., 79.

> and all Israel (lit: 'Omri-Land' *Bit Ḫu-um-ri-ia*). I caught, like a fish, the Greek (Ionians) who live (on islands) amidst the Western Sea.[76]

This text, along with the previous one cited from Khorsabad, relate many interesting aspects of Egyptian society during the late eighth century BC such as the still fragmented political state of affairs despite Piankhy's conquest. The Khorsabad texts also appear to validate Spalinger's argument that the Assyrians viewed the Nubians as a distinct people from the Egyptians,[77] as the Nubians are indicated to be from Meluhha and not Musru (Egypt). In the eyes of the Assyrians, the Nubians were not "regarded as native Egyptians but as interlopers from the south."[78] One may think that the perception that the Assyrians held of the Nubians in regard to their rule of Egypt is not as historically important as the other aspects of the Assyrian invasions of Egypt, but as noted above the Assyrians – and as argued in this dissertation generally all people of the ancient Near East – were much more politically savvy than modern scholars often give them credit. Possibly by designating the Nubian rulers of Egypt as foreign, the Assyrian kings hoped to curry favor with the Egyptian priests and nobles if they decided to invade – in 712 BC the Nubian political intrigues in the Assyrian empire had not yet reached a crescendo as will be seen below – and therefore cast themselves as liberators driving out a foreign occupier.

In terms of modern historiography, the Khorsabad texts present interesting problems to the modern scholar, particularly the identity of the Egyptian king Piru. Also, the identity of the Old Testament, "So, king of Egypt," creates identification problems

---

[76] Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 285; Luckenbill, *Assyria*, 40-41.

[77] See above in this chapter.

[78] Spalinger, "Assurbanipal," 318n.

and must be briefly considered here. So is mentioned in a reference in the Old Testament pertaining to the capture of Samaria by Shalmaneser V/Sargon II in 722/721 BC. "The king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea: for he had sent messengers to So king of Egypt, and brought no present to the king of Assyria."[79] Unfortunately there are no corroborating primary sources, Assyrian or Egyptian, which mention any king with a similar name. Donald Redford believes that So was simply a Hebrew transcription of the Egyptian name of Sais, *sꜣw*,[80] while Kitchen takes exception with this identification for a number of reasons. Kitchen argues:

> Secondly, the reading of 'So' as Sais in 2 Kings 17:4 requires a gratuitous emendation to the text after it, quite needless if So is a personal, not a place, name. Thirdly, there was a long-standing alliance (from Osorokon II and Takeloth II onwards) with the 22nd Dynasty kings and Israel – and no kingdom of Sais was hitherto known to the Hebrew court. Fourthly, the Hebrew prophets of the day inveigh against envoys going not to distant Sais, but to the *East Delta*: Isaiah denounced 'the priests of Zoan' (Tanis) as 'utterly foolish' . . . Fifthly, there is a far better candidate who fits the part of So perfectly – Osorkon IV, king in Tanis and Bubastis.[81]

More recently, Kitchen has further argued that "So is a perfectly feasible abbreviation for (O) so (rkon)"[82] and points to other abbreviated Egyptian kings' names in the Old Testament, such as Shosh for Shoshenq and Hophra for Apries as further examples.[83] Although at first glance Kitchen's argument appears to be the more articulate and

---

[79] 2 Kings 17:4.

[80] Donald Redford, "Sais and the Kushite Invasions of the Eighth Century B.C." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 22 (1985); 15.

[81] Kitchen, *Third*, 373-4.

[82] Kitchen, *Reliability*, 16.

[83] Ibid.

therefore most plausible of the two, the lack of details in the biblical record means this argument may never be solved.[84] The Old Testament also mentions an Egyptian city named Zoan,[85] identified by Kitchen as Tanis, as a place where the Hebrew envoys to Egypt were stationed. This is hardly a strong case to rule Sais out as the identity of the name in 2 Kings 19:4. It should also be added in defense of Redford's argument that just because Sais or Sau is never mentioned in the Old Testament it should not be taken as evidence that the Hebrews were unaware of that city or that it was not important. As shown above in this chapter, the city of Sais had become an important political and cultural center in Egypt by the time of Piankhy's invasion and despite Shabaqa's reconquest of Egypt and subsequent regicide of Bakenrenef[86] would continue to be so as evidenced by the emergence of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty which will be discussed below in this chapter.

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the Khorsabad texts in terms of modern Egyptology is the mention of the mysterious king "Piru" of Egypt.[87] If one accepts 712 BC as the date of the events in the Khorsabad texts then the identity of Piru can only be either Bankenranef or Shabaqa. Since Imani fled to Piru of Egypt but then for whatever

---

[84] An alternative explanation is taken by Alberto Greene who believes that the biblical So was actually Piankhy. He wrote: "In 726, the year after Piankhy's victorious campaign, it was clear where the real power lay. It was not in Tanis, Bubastis, or Sais but rather at Napata in Nubia, and it was held by Piankhy." The Identity of King So of Egypt – An Alternate Interpretation," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 52 (1993): 103.

[85] Isaiah 19:11, 19:13, 30:4.

[86] See Chapter V of this dissertation for textual details and historiographical arguments concerning this.

[87] Tadmor dated Imanani's failed rebellion in Ashdod, subsequent flight to Piru of Egypt and later return to the Assyrians by the Nubians to 712 BC, Tadmor, "Sargon II," 83. Spalinger also dates Imanani's flight to Egypt to 712 BC, "712." Imani's rebellion and request to Piru of Egypt is also mentioned in the fragmentary "Prism A" from Nineveh. Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 286; Luckenbill, *Assyria*, 105.

reason was then captured by the king of Meluhha (Nubia) and then turned back over to Sargon II, then one must assume that Piru was not Shabaqa and was more than likely Bakenrenef. Helene von Zeissl was the first scholar to argue for the identification of Piru as Bakenrenef[88] while the scholars Spalinger,[89] Tadmor,[90] and Redford[91] all later concurred that the mysterious Piru must have been Bakenrenef, with Kitchen being the sole scholar who advocates that Piru was Shabaqa,[92] but none speculate on how or why the events took place as they did. Spalinger believes the reason why the Nubian king, presumably Shabaqa, returned Imani in chains to the Assyrians was that he was "in no mood to incur the wrath of the Assyrian king"[93] but does not elaborate on why he ended up with the Nubian king and not Piru/Bakenrenef in the first place. The answer may simply be that when Imani first contacted Piru/Bakenrenef, as stated on the Nineveh "Prism A,"[94] Bakenrenef was still alive, but by the time he actually arrived in Egypt Shabaqa had assassinated him.

---

[88] Helen von Zeissl, *Äthiopen und Assyrer in Ägypten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Spätzeit* (J.J. Augustin: Glückstadt, 1955), 83-87. As already noted in Chapter II of this dissertation, von Zeissl wrote "sondern Piru=Pharao nennt, so ist doch mit Sicherheit anzunehmen, dass es sich hier um Bokchoris handelt."

[89] Spalinger, "712," 97.

[90] Tadmor, "Sargon II," 84.

[91] Redford, "Invasions," 6n.

[92] Kitchen, *Third*, 380. He writes, "This reference to Egypt and Nubia under *one* ruler, a pharaoh, rules out automatically *any* ruler of this period other than a king of the 25th Dynasty." 380n. Kitchen is correct in his statement that Shabaqa was the only ruler of a unified Egypt at the time in question, but he ignores the fact that the Khorsabad text clearly differentiates, as Spalinger correctly pointed out, between Egypt (Mursu) and Nubia (Meluhha) with Piru being designated as the king of Egypt and Nubia's king being unnamed.

[93] Spalinger, "712," 97.

[94] "To Pir'u, king of Egypt, a prince who could not save them, they sent their presents (bribes) and attempted to gain him as an ally." Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 105; Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 287.

An Assyrian text from year seven of Sargon II's rule helps to further solidify the argument that Piru and Bakenrenef were one and the same, but it also works against Kitchen's thesis that Sais was of little importance internationally in this period and that the So mentioned in 2 Kings 17:4 *was not* Sais. The text states:

> From Pir'u, the king of Musru, Samsi, the queen of Arabia, It'amra, the Sabaen, - the(se) are the kings of the seashore, and from the desert – I received as their presents, gold in the form of dust, precious stones, ivory, ebony seeds, all kinds of aromatic substances, horses (and) camels.[95]

Although Egypt was geographically far from Arabia and Sabea, the leaders of those lands are all listed by the author of the text as "kings of the seashore." Although Sais was not located directly on the Mediterranean Sea, it was on the Rosetta branch of the Nile River near the sea,[96] and was the base of power for the Twenty Fourth Dynasty. The identification of Piru as Bakenrenef instead of Shabaqa – who was considered a Nubian by the Assyrians and therefore would have been identified with Meluhha (Nubia) and not Musru (Egypt) – partly on the basis of Sais being near the sea appears be more solid at this point. If Sais is the city mentioned, albeit indirectly, in this text then Kitchen's assumption that Sais was of little importance during the fall of Samaria may also be unfounded. Tefnakht would have been the king of Sais during the fall of Samaria (722/21)[97] mentioned in 2 Kings 17:4 and one can assume that Sais did not suddenly rise to international prominence in a mere ten years from an Egyptian backwater as Kitchen

---

[95] Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 7; Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 286.

[96] Jaromir Málek, "Sais," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, ed. Eberhard Otto and Wolfgang Helck (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975), 5:355.

[97] The only known existing text that dates Bakenrenef's reign is a stela from the Serapeum that gives a year six for that king. Shabaqa killed Bakenrenef in 712 BC, which means that before 718 BC Tefnakht was the king of Sais. For the stela see M. Malinine, Georges Posener, and Jean Vercoutter, *Catalogue des stèles du Sérapeum de Memphis* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1968), numbers 91-107, 75-82.

described it to its involvement in the Imani affair. This is not to say that Sais was So of 2 Kings 17:4, only that Redford's assertion has merit and that the possibility should not be discounted.

The final event in Nubian-Egyptian/Assyrian relations that ultimately led to the repeated invasions of Egypt by the Assyrians was Shebitqu's support of Hezekiah of Judah's rebellion against the Assyrian king Sennacherib in 702/701 BC.[98] There are a number of primary sources that detail this military engagement, known as the battle of Eltekeh, which include primarily Assyrian prisms but also the Old Testament and somewhat peripherally a stela from the Nubian city of Kawa. The battle happened as a result of the death of Sargon II and the subsequent quest by Sennacherib "to get control of his inheritance led to disquiet and revolt in his wide empire."[99] In the Old Testament both 2 Kings[100] and Isaiah[101] state that "Tirhakah king of Ethiopia" led a force to help support Hezekiah against the Assyrian siege. The annals of Sennacherib also describe Taharqa as lending military aid to Hezakiah:

> The officials, nobles and people of Ekron, who had thrown Padî, their king, bound by (treaty to) Assyria, into fetters of iron and had given him over to Hezekiah, the jew (*Iaudai*), – he kept him in confinement like an enemy, – they (*lit.,* their heart) became afraid and called upon the Egyptian kings, the bowmen, chariots and horses of the king of Meluhha (Ethiopia), a countless host, and these came to their aid. In the neighborhood of the city of Altakû (Eltekeh), their ranks being drawn up before me, they offered battle. (Trusting) in the aid of Assur, my lord, I fought with them and brought about their defeat. The Egyptian charioteers and princes, together with the charioteers of the Ethiopian king, my hands took alive in the midst of the battle.[102]

---

[98] Kitchen, *Third*, 385; Kuhrt, *Ancient*, 2:499.

[99] Kitchen, *Reliability*, 41.

[100] 2 Kings 19:9.

[101] Isaiah 37:1.

[102] Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 119-20; Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 287-88.

The Assyrian account is obviously much more detailed than the biblical, but following Liverani's approach to ancient historiography, one should not read too much into the details. The size of the Egypto-Nubian army and the number Sennacherib claims to have taken alive appears to follow a formula that can be seen in the Khorsabad texts discussed above. In this formula the numbers of the Assyrian army are never given, only that Assur has given it greatness, but the enemies of Assyria are well enumerated. In other words, the greater the number of enemies and the size of the enemies' armies, the greater the victory for the Assyrian king and glory for Assur.

The only Egyptian text that can corroborate Taharqa's presence at the battle of Eltekeh, at least partially, is a stela from the Nubian city of Kawa.[103] In the stela, known as Kawa IV, *prince* Taharqa is summoned by his brother Shebitqu, the new Egyptian king, to travel with a military force from Nubia into Egypt. Lines seven through eleven states:

> *ỉr.n.f m ḫt r wꜣst m ḳꜣb ḥwn nfr hbỉ ḥm.f nswt šbꜣtꜣkꜣ mꜣʿ-ḫrw m-sꜣ.sn r tꜣ-sty wn.n.f in ḥnʿ.f mr.n.f sw r snw.f nb swʿ.f spʿt nt ỉmn gm-pꜣ-ỉtn snsy.f r-r sbꜣ ḥwt-nṯr ḥnʿ mšʿ n ḥm.f ḫdỉ r ḥnʿ.f gm.n.f hwt-nṯr tn ḳd.tw m ḏbt pḥ.n ḳꜣyt ỉry tp ḥwt.s ỉʿ ʿw m ꜣḫt r tr n rnpt snḏ.n ḫpr ḥwyt*; which is translated: "He (Taharqa) came Upstream to Thebes, in the midst of fine youths, his majesty, king Shebitqu, justified, went after them to Nubia, he was with him. He loved him more than all his brothers. He passed by the nome of Amen Gempaaten and he worshiped before the door of the temple with the army of his majesty, sailing north together with him. He found this temple that one built in brick, it reached the high ground filled with earth at a time of year that one fears the overflow of the Nile."

---

[103] The stela is published in M. F. Macadam, *The Temples of Kawa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949), 1:14-21 (text and commentary), 2:plates 7-8. The stela is currently housed in the Meröe Museum, Sudan #52. The stela is comprised of grey granite and measures 2.08x81x.35 meters. Its provenance was Temple T of the Kawa Temple in Nubia. For further bibliography see Kitchen, *Third,* 383-6; Török, *Kush*, 140, 170; Török, T. Eide, T. Hägg, and R. H. Pierce eds. and trans, *From the Eighth to the Mid-Fifth Century BC*, vol. 1 of Fontes *Historiae Nubioram: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region Between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD* (Bergen: University of Bergen, 1994), 135-45.

There is no mention in Kawa IV of the Levant, Taharqa's mission, or any possible foreign enemies of the Nubian dynasty, but it does demonstrate that a military force possibly *led by* Taharqa was on the move. This may help corroborate both the biblical and Assyrian accounts that Taharqa was present at Eltekeh in 701 BC, but as stated above Taharqa was prince while Shebitqu was king at this time which raises the question: why was he referred to as the Egyptian king in the biblical and Assyrian texts? Taharqa was king of Egypt from 690-664 BC, which means that he was obviously not the king of Egypt in 701 BC and that he was also a young man of twenty years.[104] Kitchen solves the apparent confusion of the biblical sources by stating that since the biblical accounts were written after the events of Eltekeh, "the existing narrations were drawn up at a date after 690 B.C., when it was one of the current facts of life that Taharqa was king of Egypt and Nubia."[105] Kitchen's argument helps to explain why the biblical account lists Taharqa as the Egyptian king in 701 BC, but does not explain why the Assyrian annals also report him as a king. It should be noted though that in the Assyrian text, Taharqa is referred to as the king of Meluhha (Nubia) and not Egypt, which again points to Spalinger's idea that the Assyrians saw the two as very different, but may also demonstrate that they knew he was not yet king of Egypt.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the battle of Eltekeh in Egyptian history is that it represents a fundamental change in perspective that the Nubians took towards international affairs. Before Eltekeh, the Nubians were content to stay out of the affairs of the Levant and the Assyrian empire, even returning the rebellious Imani back to the Assyrians, but for some reason in the ten plus years between the fall of Ashdod and the

[104] Kitchen, *Third*, 161.

[105] Ibid., 159-60.

battle of Eltekeh the Nubians decided to intervene in the Levant. The most obvious reason may be that when Imani attempted to hide in Egypt in 712 BC, the political situation was quite unstable, with Shabaqa's recent re-invasion of the Delta and execution of Bakenrenef, the new king had to consolidate his power in Egypt and was simply in no position to get involved in Levantine intrigues. Once the political situation in Egypt stabilized later under Shabaqa and into Shebitqu's reign the Nubians may have felt strong enough to pursue policies of foreign intervention, but why? It is unknown what benefit the Nubians hoped to receive from their Levantine involvement, nor what was their ultimate goal in that region. Perhaps the Nubians were looking to the Egyptian past for inspiration in the political realm as they did with literature and art[106] – they were attempting a "political archaization" based on the great warrior kings of the New Kingdom such as Thuthmose III and Ramesses II.[107]

Whatever the reason was for Nubian involvement in the Levant during the early seventh century BC, it led to a series of campaigns by the Assyrian kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal that ultimately resulted in the sack of Thebes and demise of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty. Esarhaddon was the first Assyrian king to attack Egypt, although his first invasion attempt in 674 BC was unsuccessful, but he was finally able to conquer

[106] For more on this see the conclusion.

[107] The influence of the warrior kings of the New Kingdom on the Nubian kings of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty is well documented, especially with regard to royal epithets and titulary. Piankhy, the first Nubian king to conquer Egypt, was particularly fond of the Eighteenth Dynasty king Thutmose III. Kitchen notes, "Doubtless inspired by the high deeds and style of Tuthmosis III on his Gebel Barkal (Napata) stela, Piankhy adopted the Horus-name 'Strong Bull, appearing in Napata', Nebty, 'Enduring of kingship like Re in heaven', and Golden Horus, 'Holy of epiphanies, powerful of might', plus the epithets 'by seeing him everyone lives, like (Har)akhte'." *Third*, 359. Gozzoli effectively demonstrates the New Kingdom influence on the Nubian ruler by comparing the grammatical and stylistic parallels between Gebel Barkal stela of Thutmose III and Piankhy's Victory Stela, *History*, 59-67.

Egyptian territory on the edge of the eastern Delta in 671BC.[108] Spalinger contends that even at the beginning of Esarhaddon's reign, the Assyrians maintained "a 'hands off' policy if only Egypt would do the same for Assyria."[109] Esarhaddon first made a "show of strength at the border of Egypt"[110] by conquering Phoenicia before setting his sights on Egypt. Assyria's successful invasion of Egypt was commemorated on an alabaster tablet from Assur. It reads:

> I cut down with the sword and conquered . . . I caught like a fish (and) cut off his head. I trod up [on Arzâ at] the 'Brook of Eg[ypt].' I put Asuhili, its king, in fetters and took [him to Assyria]. I conquered the town of Bazu in a district which is far away. Upon Qanaia, king of Tilmun. I imposed tribute due to me as (his) lord. I conquered the country of Shupria in its full extent and slew with (my own) weapon Ik(!)Teshup, its king who did not listen to my personal orders. I conquered Tyre which is (an island) amidst the sea. I took away all the towns and the possessions of Ba'lu its king, who had put his trust on Tirhakah (*Tarqû*), king of Nubia (*Kûsu*). I conquered Egypt (*Musur*), Paturi[si] and Nubia. Its king, Tirhakah, I wounded five times with arrowshots and ruled over his entire country; I car[ried much booty away]. All the kings from (the islands) amidst the sea – from the country Iadanna (Cyprus), as far as Tarsisi, bowed to my feet and I received heavy tribute (from them).[111]

The inscription follows the standard formula of the other Assyrian texts discussed in this chapter; the Assyrian king leads – with little mention of his army and nothing about its numbers – a successful assault of divine retribution against a rebellious king. The details in this particular inscription are historically important because they not only place Taharqa, the ruling Egyptian king, at the scene of the battle, but also claim that he was

---

[108] Kuhrt, *Ancient*, 2:634.

[109] Anthony Spalinger, "Esarhaddon and Egypt; An Analysis of the First Invasion of Egypt," *Orientalia* 43 (1974): 298.

[110] Ibid.

[111] Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 290; Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 273-4.

wounded. Another Assyrian text, known as the *Senjiril stela*, offers even more interesting details about the battle:

> I led siege to Memphis, his royal residence, and conquered it in half a day by means of mines, breaches, and assault ladders; I destroyed (it), tore down (its walls) and burnt it down. His 'queen,' the women of his palace, Ushanahuru, his 'heir apparent,' his other children, his possessions, horses, large and small cattle beyond counting, I carried away as booty to Assyria. All Ethiopians I deported from Egypt – leaving not even one to do homage (to me). Everywhere in Egypt, I appointed new (local) kings, governors, officers (*saknu*), harbor overseers, officials and administrative personnel. I installed regular sacrificial dues for Ashur and the (other) great gods, my lords, for all times. I imposed upon them tribute due to me (as their) overlord, (to be paid) annually without ceasing.[112]

Two important historical issues are raised in this inscription. First, it describes the imperial administration that was briefly imposed on Egypt during Assyrian rule, the importance of which will be discussed below in this chapter in relation to the expulsion of the Assyrians and the rise of the Saite Twenty Sixth Dynasty. The second – although the first explored in this chapter – is the obvious differentiation that the Assyrians made between the Egyptians and Nubians. This idea, which was proposed by Spalinger and discussed above, appears to be further substantiated by this text. Also, it is interesting that Esarhaddon claims that he deported "all Nubians from Egypt." This statement cannot be taken as historical fact but the modern historian can glean important information about Late Period Egypt when attention is not centered on the events of the text, but on how they are narrated.[113] When the text is viewed from this perspective, the conspicuous mention of the Nubian deportation appears to once more corroborate Spalinger's theory that the Assyrians viewed the Nubians and not the Egyptians as their

[112] Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 293; Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 227.

[113] Liverani, "Historiographical", 179.

true enemies and a possible threat to their hegemony in the region. Therefore it was the Nubians – not the Egyptians – who had to be punished with deportation.

Egypt experienced the final invasions at the hands of the Assyrians during the reign of the Assyrian empire's final king – Assurbanipal. Modern scholarly knowledge of the two invasions initiated by Assurbanipal comes from seven Assyrian historical texts, but unfortunately they "lack a proper chronological arrangement."[114] The so-called Rassam Cylinder, written between 644 and 636 BC,[115] provides modern scholarship with the best recreation of both invasions. Analysis of the Assyrian texts reveals that Assurbanipal's first invasion was the result of Taharqa's attempts to recapture the throne of Egypt, while the second invasion was precipitated by rebellious Egyptian vassals who tried to take advantage of the power vacuum caused by the war between the Nubians and Assyrians. Assurbanipal's first Egyptian campaign, conducted in 669/8 BC,[116] is related in the first part of the Rassam Cylinder. It states:

> In my first campaign I marched against Magan and Meluhha. Tarkû (Tirhakah), king of Egypt and Ethiopia (Kush), whom Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, the father who begot me, had defeated . . . Against the kings, the governors, whom my father had installed in Egypt, he marched, (intent) on slaying, plundering and seizing Egypt. He broke in upon them and established himself in Memphis, the city which my father had captured and added to the territory of Assyria . . . I defeated his army in a battle on the open plain. Tarkû heard of the defeat of his armies, while in Memphis . . . He forsook Memphis and fled to save his life to Ni' (Thebes). This town (too) I seized and led my army into it to repose (there).[117]

---

[114] Spalinger, "Assurbanipal," 316.

[115] Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 290.

[116] Spalinger, "Assurbanipal," 317.

[117] Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 293-3; Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 294.

Von Zeissl believed that the battle actually took place near the Delta city of Canopus, "Das marschierte bis Karbanite, wo ihm ein ägyptisches Heer entgegentrat, das von Taharka auf geboten worden war."[118] Von Zeissl's research also revealed that despite the bluster Assurbanipal gave to this successful campaign, based on other inscriptions known as K 228 and K 2675, he did not lead the Assyrian army personally:

> In den auf den Zylinden erhaltenen Annalen beansprucht der König, selbst die Expedition nach Ägypten geleitet zu haben, aber aus der älteren Darstellung K 228+K2675 geht hervor, dass Assurbanipal sein Heer nicht selbst befehligte, sondern in Assyrien blieb.[119]

Egypt would prove to be an especially unstable province in the Assyrian empire and Assurbanipal would have to invade the country once more in order to reestablish his dynasty's rule, which had the unintended effect of establishing the Saite dynasty.

The Rassam Cylinder then goes on to describe the internal situation in Egypt that led to Assurbanipal's second invasion of Egypt and the sack of Thebes. This is also the first time that Nekau I, progenitor of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, enters the historical record. Nekau, "king of Memphis and Sais," along with numerous other princes and potentates, the most notable being Mantimanhe (Montuemhat)[120] "king of Thebes" are listed as being rebellious and breaking their allegiance oaths of dependence to the Assyrian empire. The text states:

> Thereupon, these kings, as many as I had (re)instated, sinned against (i.e. violated) the oath (they had sworn) by the great gods, forgot the good I had done them, and their hearts planned evil. They plotted insurrection, following their own counsel – counsel not resting upon an oracle (?), saying: "They are driving Tarkû out of Egypt, how can we remain?" To Tarkû, king of Ethiopia, they sent

---

[118] von Zeissl, *Äthiopen*, 42.

[119] Ibid.

[120] On Montuemhat and his power in Thebes see Jean Leclant, *Montouemhat: Quatrième prophète d'Amon prince de la ville* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Oreintale, 1961).

> their couriers for the purpose of swearing fealty, saying: "Let a treaty be established between us, let us be of help to one another, let us divide the land into two parts, let no other be lord among us . . . The curse of Assur, king of the gods, overtook them, because they sinned against (i.e. violated) the oath (they had sworn) by the great gods. I required at their hands the good which I had done them in kindness. And the people of Sais, Pintiti, Si'nu and the rest of the cities, as many as had joined with them in plotting evil, they struck down with the sword, both great and small, - not a man among them escaped. Their corpses they hung on stakes, they stripped off their skins and covered the city wall(s) with them.[121]

This text again follows the standard formula of the other Assyrian texts discussed in this chapter; the logistics of the Assyrian army are unimportant because it is Assur's power and the retribution that he invokes for broken oaths that is the central theme. The importance of Assyrian oaths as a means of control over their vassals has been discussed above in this chapter in a general sense,[122] but the Rassam Cylinder is very specific about Assurbanipal's treatment towards those who broke the sacred oath.

Despite the importance of oaths in the Assyrian empire, the Rassam Cylinder states that Nekau was the only rebel forgiven and his son, Psamtek I, was given control of the Delta city of Arthribis. The cylinder reads:

> From all of them, I had mercy upon Necho and granted him life. I made a (treaty) with him (protected by) oaths which greatly surpassed (those of the former treaty). I clad him in a garment with multicolored trimmings, placed a golden chain on him (as the) insigne of his kingship, put golden rings on his hands . . . I returned him to Sais as residence (the place) where my own father had appointed him king. Nabushezibanni, his son, I appointed for Arthribis (thus) treating him with more friendliness and favor than my own father did. The terror of the (sacred) weapon of Assur, my lord, overcame Tirhakah where he had taken refuge and he was never heard from again.[123]

---

[121] Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 294-5; Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 294-5.

[122] See above Parpola and Wantanabe, *Oaths*.

[123] Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 295; Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 295. Other Assyrian inscriptions also relate that Nekau was the only Egyptian prince/king who was given clemency for his rebellion against the Assyrians, Spalinger, "Assurbanipal," 321.

Despite breaking his oath of fidelity to the Assyrian empire, not only was Nekau's life spared, but it appears he was also rewarded to a certain extent. There is no explanation in this or any other Assyrian text for this, although one may assume that the power of Nekau and his home of Sais had grown – never completely obliterated despite the Nubians' best efforts – during the Twenty Fifth Dynasty and with the Nubians out of the way Assurbanipal was best served allowing Nekau to survive as an ally instead of letting Egypt devolve once more into chaos. Unfortunately the lack of textual evidence will continue to leave the reasons open to conjecture and in fact Nekau's genealogy continues to be enigmatic. According to Manetho, the Twenty Sixth Dynasty consisted of two kings who ruled before Nekau I, Stephinates and Nechespos.[124] Whatever Nekau's genealogy, it appears he kept the second oath he made with Assurbanipal as he stood against Tantamani when that Nubian king invaded Egypt in 664 BC in a bid to reestablish the Twenty Fifth Dynasty, but it was in that battle that Nekau "probably lost his life."[125]

The emerging anarchy and attempted reassertion of Nubian hegemony over Egypt by Tantamani, led Assurbanipal to invade Upper Egypt in 664 BC. The Rassam Cylinder is also the ancient source for Assurbanipal's second campaign against Egypt. According to this text, Tantamani was not much of a match for Assurbanipal and quickly fled from Memphis to Thebes:

> In my second campaign I made straight for Egypt and Ethiopia. Tandamanê heard of the advance of my army and that I was invading the territory of Egypt. He forsook Memphis and fled to Ni', to save his life.[126]

---

[124] Manetho *Aegyptiaca*, Fragments 68-69.

[125] Spalinger, "Assurbanipal," 323; von Zeissl, *Äthiopen*, 46. For a detailed discussion of Tantamani's possible regicide of Nekau I see Chapter V of this dissertation.

[126] Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 295; Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 295.

Spalinger believes that Assurbanipal's second invasion of Egypt was the consequence of "his treaty obligation to" Nekau I,[127] but one would err in believing that the Assyrian king was solely or even primarily motivated by an allegiance to a vassal who recently conspired with the Nubians against the Assyrians. Assurbanipal's primary interests in his second Egyptian campaign were to preserve the ever weakening Assyrian empire[128] and to finally destroy the Nubian influence in the Near East, which had been a thorn in the side of the Assyrians since the reign of Sennacherib and the battle of Eltekeh. The Rassam Cylinder goes on to describe that Assurbanipal pursued Tantamani up to Thebes and then sacked the holy city. It reads:

> I took the road after Tandamanê, marched as far as Ni', his stronghold. He saw the approach of my terrible battle (array), forsook Ni', fled to the city of Kipkipi. That city (i.e. Ni') my hands captured in its entirety, - with the aid of Assur and Ishtar. Silver, gold, precious stones, the goods of his palace, all there was, brightly colored and linen garments, great horses, two tall obelisks, made of shining electrum, whose weight was 2,500 talents, (and) which stood by the gate of the temple, I removed from their positions and carried them off to Assyria.[129]

Although this part of the text follows the standard formula discussed above – there is no mention of the size of either force and it is Assur that essentially gives the Assyrian king his victory – the destruction of Thebes follows the actual pattern of Assyrian warfare discussed above. One would also think that the statue and bark of Amen were also "despoiled" by the victorious Assyrian army and brought back to Assyria.[130]

---

[127] Spalinger, "Assurbanipal," 324.

[128] Kuhrt, *Ancient*, 2:540-46.

[129] Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 296; Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 295.

[130] See the discussion about despoliation of cult objects by the Assyrians above in this chapter. Examples of the Assyrians despoiling statues of major gods before the sack of Thebes included: Sargon II's seizure of the Musair's god Haldi in 714 BC, the capture of the Babylonian god Marduk in 689 BC, and the removal of Arab gods during the reign of Sennacherib. Kuhrt, *Ancient*, 2:513. Kim Ryholt argued that "the looting of temples and the removal of deities during periods of foreign invasion or occupation

Assurbanipal's second Egyptian invasion had the desired effect of vanquishing the Nubians from Egypt, but its unintended consequence was the emergence of Saite power over a united Egypt and the installation of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty under Nekau I's son, Psamtek I.[131] Egypt enjoyed stability and cultural renewal in the early part of the of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty,[132] but first foreign intrigue and then civil war in the later decades of the dynasty opened the door for a new attack from the outside. First Nekau II, the second king of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, ironically following in the footsteps of his Nubian rivals, attempted to insert himself into the political situation of the Levant as an ally to the ailing Assyrians, much to the chagrin of the Chaldeans who were the new rulers of Babylon and inheritors of the Assyrian empire.[133] Nekau II's actions were apparently unsuccessful and only served to set the new Babylonian dynasty against their

---

caused a severe trauma to the Egyptians, and the retrieval of exiled divine images is a well-attested topos in literature and propaganda during the Greco-Roman period." "The Assyrian Invasion of Egypt in Literary Tradition: A Survey of the Narrative Source Material," in *Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*, ed. J.G. Dercksen (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2004), 500-1. The *topos* of foreign invasion in Egyptian literature and its relation to a Twenty Seventh Dynasty text will be analyzed below in this chapter.

[131] As stated above, the Saites were able to come to power as a result of the general weakening and eventual demise of the Assyrian empire. Psamtek I was able to consolidate his power over a united Egypt through acts of internal political policy such as sending his daughter, Nitoqris, to be installed as a God's Wife of Amen in Thebes and his patronage of the Apis cult and additions to the Memphite Serapeum. These acts of political legitimization are discussed in Chapter VI of this dissertation. Although Psamtek I did not need to invade any part of Egypt to install his dynasty, he did rely on a military that was comprised of foreigners. Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 1996), Book II, 154 stated "To the Ionians and Carians who helped him to gain the throne Psammetichus granted two pieces of land." The Rassam Cylinder also briefly mentioned Psamtek I's rise to power, "Tushamilki, king of Egypt, who had thrown off the yoke of my sovereignty." Luckenbill, *Assyrian*, 298. Apparently a modern fighting force and at least the *threat* of violence was needed by Psamtek I in order to consolidate power. For details on the foreign mercenaries introduced into Egypt by the Saites and the their effect on Egyptian culture in the Late Period see Chapter VII of this dissertation.

[132] See Chapter VI of this dissertation for detailed listing and discussion of the major monuments erected during the Twenty Sixth Dynasty and how those monuments helped to legitimize the new dynasty.

[133] Donald B. Redford and K. S. Freedy, "The Dates in Ezekiel in Relation to Biblical, Babylonian and Egyptian Sources." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 475

Egyptian counterparts.[134] Nekau II's successor, Psamtek II, invaded Nubia possibly in part to stave off any further Chaldean aggression in a display of Egyptian strength,[135] which apparently worked but a civil war between king Apries and Amasis,[136] who usurped the throne, possibly opened the door for a Babylonian invasion of Egypt.

Unfortunately, there is a dearth of primary sources concerning the Chaldean/Neo-Babylonian invasion of Egypt and the sources that do exist are disparate and difficult to corroborate. Three later sources, *The Coptic Story of Cambyses' Invasion of Egypt,*[137] the Ethiopic *Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*[138] and Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*[139] all relate versions that garble events in an anachronistic fashion. Josephus' account appears to follow the Old Testament somewhat[140] as he wrote that Nekau (II) was the king who opposed Nebuchadnezzar (II) – the two kings were contemporaries.[141] *The Coptic Story*

---

[134] Ibid.

[135] Anthony Spalinger in, "The Concept of the Monarchy During the Saite Epoch – An Essay in Synthesis." *Orientalia* 47 (1978): 22; argues that Psamtek II's Nubian campaign was done for this reason. Although this author sees the validity in Spalinger's thesis, the primary motive for Psamtek II's Nubian campaign was to eliminate any chance the Nubians had to retake the Egyptian throne. Chapter V of this dissertation discusses the large amount of documented erasures of Twenty Fifth Dynasty cartouches that took place during this campaign and the probable regicide of a Nubian prince during the campaign.

[136] For more on the conflict between Apries and Amasis and the subsequent regicide of the former by the later see Chapter V of this dissertation.

[137] R. H. Charles, *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu: Translated from Zotenberg's Ethiopic Text* (Merchantville, New Jersey: Evolution Publishing, 2007).

[138] H. Ludin Jansen ed. and trans., *The Coptic Story of Cambyses' Invasion of Egypt: A Critical Analysis of its Literary Form and its Historical Purpose* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1950).

[139] William Whiston ed., *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*, New Updated ed., (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers).

[140] See discussion below concerning Ezekiel.

[141] In particular chapter six of the *Antiquities of the Jews* states "And when Neco understood the intention of the king of Babylon, and that this expedition was made against him, he did not despise his attempt, but made haste with a great band of men to Euphrates to defend himself from Nebuchadnezzar; and when they had joined in battle, he was beaten, and lost many ten thousands [of his soldiers] in the battle. But on the third year, upon hearing that the king of the Babylonians made an expedition against the

of Cambyses' Invasion of Egypt and the chapters from the *Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu* are more confusing as the names of Nebuchadnezzar II and Cambyses are used interchangeably,[142] which may have less to do with any historical reality but more with a *topos* in Egyptian literature that combines all of the foreign invaders into one entity.[143] Despite this, Spalinger believes that the later historical/literary traditions are "basically correct."[144] Spalinger further mitigates the historical discrepancies of the above later historical traditions – namely that Nebuchadnezzar II is the king credited with killing Apries unlike the Greek sources which state that Amasis was the perpetrator – by stating that "confusion by later authors was an inevitable result of the troubled situation in Egypt at this time."[145] Spalinger's assertion may very well be correct, but he also fails to entertain the possibility that these traditions, especially the first two, were written simply using Nebuchadnezzar II as the archetypal foreign enemy. This would explain why his name and not Amasis, who the author of this dissertation believes was the true killer of Apries, was used in the texts since the act of Egyptian on Egyptian regicide was abhorrent.[146]

Egyptians, he did not pay his tribute; yet was he disappointed of his hope, for the Egyptians durst not fight at this time." 272. This would also follow the Babylonian Chronicle which relates a war between Babylon and Egypt in year four (600 BC) of Nebuchadnezzar II. For an English translation and commentary see A. Kirk Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 2000), 19-20 (commentary), 99 (text translation).

[142] Jansen, *Coptic*, 68, column X, line18; Charles, *Chronicle*, 38, chapter L.

[143] For a discussion on this idea see below in this chapter.

[144] Anthony Spalinger, "The Civil War Between Amasis and Apries and the Babylonian Attack against Egypt," in *First International Congress of Egyptologists*, ed. W.F. Reineke (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1979), 597.

[145] Ibid.

[146] For the metaphysical and historical implications of regicide in ancient Egypt see Chapter V of this dissertation.

Besides the latter "historical traditions" discussed here, there are other sources more contemporary with the period that may relate a possible invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar II. The lone hieroglyphic source for the possible invasion of Egypt by the Chaldeans/Neo-Babylonians is the badly damaged *Elephantine stela* of Amasis[147] which relates the events of the civil war that took place between Apries and Amasis. Columns 14-18 state that Asiatics invaded Egypt, but little more information is given.[148] Despite being vague, the stela does relate the possibility of an invasion. Finally, the Old Testament book of Ezekiel and a fragmentary cuneiform inscription also testify to a Chaldean/Neo-Babylonian attack on Egypt. The most specific passage that pertains to the Chaldean attack upon Egypt in Ezekiel is 29:18-19 in which it states that Nebuchadnezzar first attacked the Levantine coastal city of Tyre before invading Egypt.[149] The only cuneiform text that mentions a possible attack on Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar II is in the British Museum (BM 33041). Translations have identified the name of the Egyptian king as Amasis:

> . . . the 37th year, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Bab[ylon] mar[ched against] Egypt to deliver battle. [Ama]sis, of Egypt, [called up his a]rm[y] . . .[150]

---

[147] Georges Darresy, "Stèle de l'an III D'Amasis." *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs a la l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* 22 (1900): 1-9.

[148] Ibid., 4.

[149] In particular, "Behold, I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon; and he shall take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey; and it shall be the wages for the army." Ezekiel 29:19

[150] Oppenheim, "Assyrian," 308. Spalinger concurs that the named Egyptian king can "be none other than Amasis." Spalinger, "Civil," 597. Spalinger further puts the date of the attack/invasion in the "opening months" of 569 BC, 597. Daniel Kahn in his more recent article argues for the possibility of three possible attacks by Nebuchadnezzar in 601/600, 582, and 567 BC. Kahn, "Egypt," 35-6. Spalinger's compressing of the various primary sources pertaining to the attack into one date seems to be more valid.

Examination of these disparate primary sources reveals that an *attempted* invasion by the Chaldean/Neo-Babylonian king *probably* took place, but that its impact on Egypt was minimal compared to the Nubian and Assyrian invasions before or the Persian invasions after it. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this possible invasion was what precipitated it – the intrigues by the Saite king Nekau II in the political affairs of the Levant. Nekau II followed a geo-political policy similar to his Nubian predecessors of "political archaizing" which involved an attempt at empire or at least influence in the Levant, but it was this policy that ultimately led to the demise of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty at the hands of the Assyrians and may have contributed to a weakened Egyptian army that was unable to resist the Achaemenid Persian juggernaut.

After the quickly expanding Achaemenid Persian Empire engulfed the ancient city of Babylon in 539 BC under Cyrus, his successor, Cambyses, turned his eyes towards the west. Cambyses' motives in expanding the Achaemenid empire should not be viewed as an irrational act but rather as an extension of his father's wishes to annex the trans-Euphrates region which would extend to the Nile river and include Egypt.[151] Egypt proved to be no match for the Persians in the military conflict that ensued in 525 BC, which was recorded in two classical Greek histories and one Egyptian hieroglyphic inscription. Herodotus was the first ancient historian to write an account of the first Persian invasion and conquest of Egypt; he described the last Saite king, Psamtek III, as being present personally at the battle against Cambyses. He wrote:

[151] Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire,* trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 51.

> Psammenitus, Amasis' son, took up a position on the Pelusian mouth of the Nile, to await the attack of Cambyses. Amasis had died before the invasion actually began, after a reign of forty-four years, during which he had suffered no serious disaster. . . The Persians crossed the desert, took up a position near the Egyptian army, and prepared for an engagement. . . After a hard struggle and heavy casualties on both sides, the Egyptians were routed.[152]

Herodotus then goes on to describe how Cambyses had the corpse of Amasis desecrated by "lashing with whips, pricking with goads, and the plucking of its hairs" and maybe more importantly "ordered it burnt."[153] Herodotus' account of military aspects of the first Persian conquest of Egypt appears credible – there is no reason not to believe it since his main source material was probably accounts taken from Egyptian priests[154] – but the story of Cambyses' desecration of Amasis' body conflicts with Persian cultural practices. As a follower of the Zoroastrian or at least a type of proto-Zoroastrian religion,[155] Cambyses would not have desecrated a fire, seen as holy in the Zoroastrian religion, with human flesh.[156] This anecdote probably has more to do with the negative image of Cambyses in the historical memory of the Egyptian priests which was then related to Herodotus, than any real event, similar to the account of his murder of the Apis bull

---

[152] Herodotus, *The Histories,* trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 1996), Book III, 10-11.

[153] Ibid., Book III, 16.

[154] See Chapter III of this dissertation for a discussion of Herodotus' Egyptian sources and how the Egyptian philosophy of history/historiography influenced early Greek historiography.

[155] R. Zaehner wrote concerning the religion of the early Achaemenid king: "Darius' religion, then, agrees with that of Zoroaster in that it recognizes Ahura Mazda as the supreme Lord, 'great, the greatest of the gods', but does not deny the existence of other gods." *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism* (New York: G.P. Puntnam's Sons,1961), 165. More recently, Peter Clark concurs that the Achaemenid kings practiced an early form of Zoroastrianism, *Zoroastrianism: An Introduction to an Ancient Faith* (Brighton, United Kingdom: Sussex Academic Press, 2001), 56.

[156] Clark, *Zoroastrianism*, 92-96. Also see Chapter VII of this dissertation for a discussion about Zoroastrian/Persian burial practices.

which when viewed with the Egyptian sources cannot be believed.[157] The other ancient historical account of the first Persian conquest of Egypt was written by Polyaenus in the second century AD.[158] Polyaenus' account adds to that of Herodotus with slightly bizarre details. He related:

> When Cambyses invested Pelusium, as being the entrance into Egypt, the Egyptians with great resolution defended it: advancing formidable machines against the besiegers; and from their catapults throwing darts, stones, and fire. Against the destructive showers thus discharged upon him Cambyses ranged before his front line, dogs, sheep, cats, ibises, and whatever animals the Egyptians hold sacred. The fear of hurting the animals, which they regard with veneration, instantly checked their operations: Cambyses took Pelusium; and thus opened himself a passage into Egypt.[159]

The details of the account are amusing if not somewhat disturbing to modern sentiments of animal rights, but again should be viewed with skepticism. The two accounts combined paint a picture of Cambyses as a person anathema to everything the Egyptians viewed as sacred; first he successfully invades by using sacred animals as weapons, then disturbs the tomb and desecrates the body of an Egyptian king, and that was just in the course of the invasion! In order to truly understand the first Persian invasion of Egypt, one must also examine the sole Egyptian primary source in addition to the Greek historians.

The only other primary source of the Persian invasion of Egypt in 525 BC is the hieroglyphic inscription on the naophorous statue of the Egyptian navy admiral and

---

[157] Herodotus, *Histories*, Book III, 29. For a historiographical discussion of this account and the author's conclusion that it never occurred see Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[158] Polyaenus, *Stratagems of War,* trans. R. Shepard (Chicago: Ares Publishers Incorporated, 1974).

[159] Polyaenus, *Stratagems*, Book VII, Chapter X.

doctor, Udjahorresnet.[160] The Udjahorresnet statue is the focus of numerous scholarly articles, such as Alan Lloyd's 1982 study of the complexities of Udjahorresnet's collaboration with the Persians.[161] Perhaps the most important aspect of Lloyd's analysis of Udjahorresnet's statue is his division of the statue's text into two distinct formats or genres of "what actually happened to him, and what were the intellectual constructs which determined the psychological processing."[162] The first layer of the text to consider, of what actually happened, concerns the tactical aspects of the war and its aftermath. According to the text, Udjahorresnet served in the Egyptian military before and during the Persian invasion as:

> *imi-r nswt n kbnwt ḫr nswt biti ḥnm-ib-rˁ imi-r nswt n kbnwt ḫr nswt biti ˁnḫ-kȝ-rˁ;* which is translated: "commander of the navy under Amasis, commander of the navy under Psamtek III."[163]

The text goes on to[164] describe that after the Persian conquest, Udjahorresnet was made Cambyses' chief doctor and advisor. It states:

---

[160] The naophorous statue of Udjahorresnet is currently housed in the Vatican City Museum, Vatican City #158. The statue is comprised of green basalt and stands 71 cm. Its provenance is unknown, but it was probably Sais. For publications of the statue see, Giuseppe Botti and Pietro Romanelli, *Le Sculture del Museo Gregoriano Egizio* (Vatican City: Vatican City Press, 1951); Miriam Lichtheim, *The Late Period*, vol 3. of *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1980), 36-44; Eberhard Otto, *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit: Ihr Geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Bedeutung* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954), 169-73.

[161] Alan Lloyd, "The Inscriptions of Udjahorresnet: A Collaborator's Testament," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68 (1982): 166-180.

[162] Ibid., 167.

[163] For the hieroglyphic transcription of the text used by the author of this dissertation and a French translation see Georges Posener, *La première domination Perse en Égypte: Recueil d'Inscriptions Hiéroglyphs* (Cairo: *L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 1936), 7, line 9. For a detailed discussion of Udjahorresnet's position as a navy admiral see Eugene Cruz-Uribe, "The Invasion of Egypt by Cambyses," *Transeuphratène* 25 (2003): 9-60.

[164] The precise order of the texts is open to conjecture. The author's line numbering follows Posener's but John Baines proposed that the order of the text should be reevaluated in, "On the Composition and Inscriptions of the Vatican Statue of Udjahorresne," in *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson,* ed. Peter Der Manuelian (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1996), 83-92. Baines argued that

ỉr.sn snḏm sn ỉm wn.f m ḥqȝ ꜥȝ n kmt srỉ ꜥȝ ḫȝs(w)t nb swḏ n.ỉ ḥm.f wr swnw rdỉt.n.f ḫprỉ.ỉ r gs.f m smr ḫrp ꜥȝ ỉr nḫb m rn.f n nswt bỉtỉ ms-w-ti-rꜥ ỉw rdỉt n sỉȝ ḥm.f wr n sȝw; which is translated: "After they (the Achaemenid Persians) occupied the country he was made the great ruler of Egypt and ruler of the world. His majesty made me the chief doctor. He made me live at his side as companion and administrator of the palace making the titulary in his name for the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Mesutira, (I) caused his majesty to know the greatness of Sais."[165]

The final details of the text that concern "what actually happened" deal with the destruction wrought on Egypt in general and Sais in particular as a result of the invasion. Although these details cover the layer of actuality, they begin to bleed with the second genre that Lloyd described as "intellectual constructs."

There are several lines on the statue that relate the destruction of the Persian invasion, in particular lines 31-36 where Udjahorresnet describes the events and his role in the post-invasion order:

nṯrw sȝw spȝt ỉmȝḫw ḫr wr smnw wḏḥrrsnt ḏd.f ỉw smn.n.(*ỉ*) *nṯr ḥtp n ntt wrt mwt nṯr m wḏ.n ḥm.f m-ȝw ḏt ỉr.n mnw n Ntt nb*(*t*) *sȝw m ḫt nfr mỉ ỉr.n bȝk mnḫt n nb.f ỉnk sỉ nfr m nỉwt.f nhn.ỉ rmṯ.s m nšny wr ꜥȝ ḫpr.f m tȝ ḏr.f ỉw nn ḫpr mỉtt.f m tȝ pn nḏ.ỉ wỉȝwỉȝ m-ꜥ wsr nḥm.n.ỉ snḏ sp.f ḫpr ỉr.n n.sn ȝḫw nb ỉw tr pw n ỉr n.sn*; which is translated: The honored one who is near the gods of the Saite nome. The chief doctor, Udjahorresnet, he said: "I established the divine offering of the great Neith, divine mother as his majesty commanded to the extent of eternity. (I) made a monument for Neith, the mistress of Sais, with every good thing like a servant who made excellence for his lord. I am a good man from his town (because) I saved her people from a very great apocalypse. When it happened (took place) to all of Egypt. Nothing like it had ever happened in this land. I defended the weak against the strong and I saved the fearful when his happened. I made all excellent things for them. I did these things for them at this time."[166]

Udjahorresnet's dedications to the goddess Neith should be read first: "Despite the large amount of historical information in the texts, the statue should be read first as a dedicatory piece in the temple of Neith in Sais, which is the major single subject of the narratives, and only thereafter in more general historical terms." 92.

[165] Posener, *Perse*, 7, lines 12-13.

[166] Ibid., 19, lines 31-36.

The destruction described by Udjahorresnet may very well have been as extensive as he describes but closer examination reveals these lines to be as formulaic and fitting a *topos* as much as they are accurate historical accounts. Eberhard Otto first stated this in his seminal work on Late Period biographical inscriptions. "Uns interessiert hier weniger der historische Teil dieser Inschrift als die Stellen, wo er von seiner Fürsorge für das Land spricht."[167] Line 35, where Udjahorresnet describes what he did for the land – defending the weak from the strong and the fearful from misfortune – echoes the much earlier Middle Kingdom literary work, *The Admonitions of Ipuwer*.[168] In *The Admonitions*, Egypt has suffered a calamity where everything is upside down and backward; the "timid is not distinguished from the violent"[169] and "men stir up strife unopposed."[170] Otto also saw similarities between Udjahorresnet's inscriptions and the Middle Kingdom *Story of Sinuhe*,[171] in particular the idea of the banished/exiled protagonist returning to his beloved Egypt. Lines 43 and 44 on the back of the Udjahorresnet statue describe how he was ordered to return to Egypt from Elam by Darius I – he was apparently in the Great King's travelling retinue – in order to establish the House of Life in Sais. The inscription reads:

---

[167] Otto, *Biographischen*, 90-1.

[168] For an English translation of this text see Miriam Lichtheim ed. and trans., *The Old and Middle Kingdoms,* vol. 1 of *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2006), 149-63.

[169] Ibid., 159.

[170] Ibid., 156.

[171] For an English translation of this text and further bibliographical information see Lichtheim, *Middle*, 222-35.

> *ḥm n nswt biti ndrwiwt ꜥnḫ ḏt ii.i r kmt is ḥm.f m dirmi is sw m sr ꜥ3 n ḫ3swt nb ḥḳ3 ꜥ3 n kmt r smn ḫ3 n pr-ꜥnḫ* [*s3w*] *m-ḫt w3si f3y.n wi ḫ3styw m ḫ3swt r ḫ3st swḏ wi r kmt wḏ.n nb t3wy ir.n.i m wḏ n.i ḥm.f grg.n.i sn m mḏ3wt.sn nb m s3 nn s3 hwwr im rdit.n.i sn ḫry-ꜥ n rḫ nb*; which is translated: The majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Darius, who lives forever, ordered me to return to Egypt, while his majesty was in Elam as he is the great prince of all foreign lands the great ruler of Egypt, in order to establish the office of Temple of Life (of Sais) throughout the ruins. The foreigners from foreign lands took me to the land, delivering me to Egypt as the lord of the Two Lands commanded. I did as his majesty commanded to me. I organized them with all of their scrolls from sons of men, no low class sons were there. I placed them in charge of all knowledge.[172]

Otto saw a connection in the return of both men to Egypt,[173] but the situations that led to both men leaving Egypt also share similarities. Sinuhe left Egypt because he was implicated in the regicide of Amenemhat I, while Udjahorresnet was ordered away from Egypt by a foreign king whose people wrought destruction on Egypt; the situations are slightly different but both involve a calamity in Egypt and the loss of *Maat*. The *topos* of a great destruction in Egypt, possibly influencing the inscriptions on the Udjahorresnet statue, can also be seen in a quasi-historical text from a period much closer to the Twenty Seventh Dynasty.

Inscriptions on the Bubastite portal in the Karnak Temple at Thebes, which date from the reigns of the Libyan kings Takelot II and Shoshenq I, known as *The Chronicle of Prince Osorokon*[174] relate the story of a lawless time in Egypt's Third Intermediate Period. The *Chronicle* states that the rebellion began in Thebes, spread throughout

---

[172] Posener, *Perse*, 22, lines 43-44.

[173] In particular he noted, " Im Auftrag des Königs reist er von Elam, wo er mit dem Perserkönig zusammengetroffen war, nach Ägypten und sagt über die Reise. . . Erinnert das nicht an die Worte im Sinuhe: 'Land gab mich zu Land, die er von seiner Heimreise nach Ägypten gebraucht?" Otto, *Biographischen*, 91.

[174] For an English translation, bibliographical information, and grammatical commentary see Ricardo A. Caminos, *The Chronicle of Prince Osorokon* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1958).

Egypt, and threatened to throw the entire land into a state of anarchy. Line seven of the section that pertains to Takelot II's year 12 to Shoshenk's year 29 stated:

> Thereafter, in the regnal year 15, fourth month of Shomu, day 25, under the Majesty of his august father, the god who rules Thebes, (although) the sky did not swallow up the moon, a great (?) convulsion broke out in this land like . . . children of rebellion, they stirred up civil strife amongst southerners and northerners . . . he [did not] weary of fighting in their midst even as Horus following his father. Year elapsed in which one preyed upon his fellow unimpeded.[175]

This section of the text illuminates two important formulaic aspects that can also be seen in the Udjahorresnet inscriptions. First there is the "topsy turvy" world discussed above from lines 31 through 36 of Udjahorresnet, but particularly line 35, and also in *Ipuwer*, but there is also the *topos* of great destruction or "apocalypse" present. Caminos translated "convulsion"[176] in line seven from the Egyptian word *nšny*. The Egyptian word *nšny* is translated in different dictionaries as "rage," "disaster,"[177] "storm,"[178] "reserei," "Unwetter," and "Unheil."[179] All translations of this word point to a great disaster, which is accentuated by the Seth determinative and the reason why the author of this dissertation has decided to translate this word, at least in the Udjahorresnet inscriptions, as "apocalypse."

The word "apocalypse" may seem a bit loaded with Abrahamic religious overtones, but it is also used to refer to a legitimate form of historical literature from the

---

[175] Ibid., 88.

[176] Ibid.

[177] Raymond O. Faulkner, *A Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford, Griffith Institute, 1999), 140.

[178] Leonard Lesko, *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian* (Fall River, Massachusetts: Fall River Modern Printing Company, 2002), 1:250.

[179] Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow, *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1971), 340-41.

ancient Near East. Apocalyptic literature is perhaps most apparent in the Old Testament of the Bible where it has received the most scholarly attention since the early nineteenth century.[180] The study of apocalyptic literature in ancient Egypt began in earnest in the early twentieth century with Eduard Meyer being one of the more prominent scholars to first explore this genre.[181] The early ideas of apocalyptic literature in ancient Egypt were still drawn heavily and seen from the perspective of the Old Testament,[182] but more recently scholars such as Jan Assmann have approached the subject from a uniquely Egyptian perspective.[183] Georges Posener identified the first ancient Egyptian text that at least *tended* towards apocalypticism as the Middle Kingdom story *The Prophecy of Neferti*.[184] In *Neferti*, Egypt is overcome with strife and civil war but the priest Neferti prophesizes about the coming of a great king, named Ameny, who will return order to Egypt. As stated above, *The Prophecy of Neferti* is not considered to be true apocalyptic literature, because although no doubt providing an impetuous for the genre, other factors were needed for its complete development. Jonathan Smith provides an excellent definition of true apocalyptic literature:

---

[180] Andreas Blausis, and Bernd Ulrich Schipper "Die 'Apokalyptischen' Texte aus Ägypten: Ein Forschungsüberblick," in *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritsche Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem greichish-römischen Ägypten,* eds. Blausis and Schipper (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2002), 7.

[181] Ibid., 9.

[182] Ibid., 10.

[183] Ibid., 14-15.

[184] Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 80. For an English translation of this text and further bibliographical information see Lichtheim, *Middle*, 139-45.

> While such texts 'tend towards' apocalypticism, one does not find a full blown apocalypse until the prophecies and propaganda are disassociated from a specific king. This becomes possible for Egypt (as well as for Babylonia and, perhaps Judea) only in the Greco-Roman period when native kingship ceases.[185]

Gozzoli concurs for the most part with this definition as he states that the chronological period of the genre, "spans the period from the early third century BC until the third century AD."[186] Smith also asserts that the key component of apocalyptic literature is essentially wisdom literature that lacks a native king as patron:

> Apocalypticism is Wisdom lacking a royal court and patron and therefore it surfaces during the period of Late Antiquity not as a response to religious persecution but as an expression of the trauma of the cessation of native kingship . . . It is widely distributed throughout the Mediterranean world and is best understood as part of the inner history of the tradition within which it occurs rather than as a syncretism with foreign (most usually held to be Iranian) influences.[187]

Although the immediate focus of the current study – the naophorous statue of Udjahorresnet and more exactly its hieroglyphic inscriptions – originated in a period before what is generally thought of as encompassing true Egyptian apocalyptic literature, an examination of apocalyptic texts from the Greco-Roman period will help modern scholars understand the inscriptions better and place them in their proper context as a piece in a literary tradition that began in the Middle Kingdom but fully matured in the Greco-Roman period.

In order to understand the Udjahorresnet inscriptions and their relations to Greco-Roman texts such as *The Demotic Chronicle* and *The Oracle of the Potter*, one must examine or rather dissect these texts into *topoi*. The first *topos* to explore here is

---

[185] Smith, *Map*, 81.

[186] Gozzoli, *History*, 283.

[187] Smith, *Map*, 86.

that of foreign invasion brought to Egypt. In the invasion *topos*, which Gozzoli believes originated in the New Kingdom "as a consequence of the Hyksos invasion,"[188] Egypt is being punished for its transgressions against the gods.[189] In the Greek text known as the *Potter's Oracle*[190] Egypt is conquered by a people identified as "Typhonians" after which the temples fall into ruin[191] and proper funerary traditions are no longer kept.[192] Interestingly, a fragment of Manetho,[193] relates a similarly worded story concerning the Hyksos invasion and occupation of Egypt. Fragment 42, from Josephus, states:

> Invaders of obscure race marched in confidence of victory against our land. By main force they easily seized it without striking a blow; and having overpowered the rulers of the land, they burned our cities ruthlessly, razed to the ground the temples of the gods, and treated all the natives with a cruel hostility, massacring some and leading into slavery the wives and children of others.[194]

Finally, the Ptolemaic period apocalyptic text, *The Demotic Chronicle*,[195] also provides an example from later Egyptian literature of the *topos* invasion. In columns IV-V of the

---

[188] Gozzoli, *History*, 303.

[189] Ibid., 288.

[190] The text is preserved in Greek on three papyri, which are dated to the second and third centuries AD. For a translation see Allen Kerkeslager, "The Apology of the Potter: A Translation of the Potter's Wheel," in *Jerusalem Studies in Egyptology*, ed. I. Grumach (Wiesbaden: Harrosswitz Verlag, 1998), 67-79.

[191] Ibid., Papyrus 3, 5-6.

[192] Ibid., Papyrus 3 6-7.

[193] See Chapter III of this dissertation for a discussion concerning Greek and Egyptian historiographical influences on Manetho's work.

[194] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, Fragment 42, 78-79.

[195] For a complete German translation and demotic transcription of this text see Wilhelm Spiegelberg trans. and ed., *Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris nebst den auf der Rückseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914). For a more contemporary German translation and commentary see Heinz Felber, "Die Demotische Chronik," in *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritsche Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem greichish-römischen Ägypten,* eds. Blausis and Schipper (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2002), 65-111.

Chronicle, the Achaemenid Persians, referred to as "Medes," bring disaster to Egypt,[196] but this disaster, like the ones in the *Potter's Wheel* and Manetho, will be reversed by the coming of a redeeming pharaoh.

The redeeming pharaoh who restores order to the maligned Egypt is the final *topos* to be considered here in relation to the Udjahorresnet inscriptions. Udjahorresnet claims in the inscriptions that he petitioned the pharaoh, Cambyses, to restore the Temple of Neith in Sais, which had apparently become the home of squatters and had fallen into misuse. The text states:

> *wr smnw wḏ3ḥrrsnt ms n ỉtm-ỉr-dis ḏd.f ỉw spr.n.ỉ r gs ḥm n nsw bỉtỉ kmbỉt ḥr ḫ3swt nb ntt snḏm m ḥwt nṯr nt Ntt r dr.sn ỉm r rdỉt wn ḥwt nṯr Ntt m 3ḫw.s nb mỉ ỉm.s m-b3ḥ wḏ ḥm.f dr ḫ3swt nb* [*ntt*] *snḏm m ḥwt nṯr nt Ntt ḫm prw.sn nb šdb nb ntt m ḥwt nṯr tn f3y.n.sn* [*ḫt.sn nb*] *ḏs.sn r rwty ỉnb n ḥwt nṯr tn wḏ ḥm.f swʿb ḥwt nṯr n Ntt rdỉt rmṯ.s nb r.s . . . . wnwt ḥwt nṯr wḏ ḥm.f rdỉt ḥtpw nṯr n Ntt wr nṯr mwt nṯrw wrw ỉm s3w mỉ ỉm.f m-b3ḥ wḏ ḥm.f* [*ỉrt*] *ḥʿb.sn nb ḫʿw nb mỉ ỉr m-b3ḥ ỉr ḥm.f nn ḥr rdỉt n.ỉ sỉ3 ḥm.f wr n s3w nỉwt pw nt nṯrw nb mn ḥr nst.sn ỉm.f ḏt*; which is translated: The chief doctor Udjahorresnet, born from Atumirdis, he said: "I petitioned to the majesty of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Cambyses, concerning all the foreigners who are seated in the Temple of Neith to banish them therein, making the Neith Temple for all its greatness like it was before. His majesty ordered the expulsion of all foreigners who were seated in the Temple of Neith, demolishing their houses and all their impurities that were in this temple. They carried [all of their things] themselves to the gateway at the wall of this temple. His majesty ordered the purification of the Temple of Neith, giving all of her people to it (and allowing the devotees back) . . . To make all their feasts and all their appearances like what was done before. His majesty did this giving for me (His majesty did this for me). His majesty recognized the greatness of Sais, it is the city of all the gods who are firm on their throne forever."[197]

These lines of the Udjahorresnet inscription relate both the invasion/disaster *topos* discussed above and also introduce the *topos* of the pharaoh who restores order, although it is ironically the same person who brought destruction to Egypt. In *The Oracle of the*

---

[196] Spiegelberg, *Demotische*, 19, column IV, line 22 – column V, line 4; Felber, "Demotische," 84

[197] Posener, *Perse*, 15-16, lines 17-23.

Potter, a pharaoh is described who will return Egypt to its greatness after the disaster of foreign occupation:

> And then Egypt will grow, when the kindly one who originates from Helios has arrived to be king for fifty five years, a giver of good things, who is appointed by the greatest goddess Isis.[198]

The return of Egypt to native rule after the Greeks is also a central theme in *The Demotic Chronicle*[199] and Fragment 42 of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* states a pharaoh named Misphragmuthôsis defeated the Hyksos and returned order to Egypt.[200]

Liverani has pointed out that the *topos* of the king/ruler as restorer was active well before the apocalyptic literature of Egypt's Greco-Roman period and extended beyond the borders of Egypt itself in ancient times. He wrote:

> There is another pattern, as widespread and as famous as that of the 'righteous sufferer,' which could be at face value viewed in terms of a 'rotation' of the characteristic qualities of time: it is the pattern of the 'restorer of order', as found in the reforms of Urukagina, the edict of Telipinu, or that of Horemheb, just to give a few examples. In this pattern the sequence of the qualities of time is the usual one (good→bad→good).[201]

Although the inscriptions on the Udjahorresnet statue do not fit into the genre of true "Apocalyptic literature" an examination reveals that they do anticipate that genre and fit into an established Egyptian tradition where the concepts of foreign invasion and national redemption "were formulated in terms of traditional stereotypes."[202] These concepts, or

---

[198] Kerkeslager, "Oracle," 77.

[199] Spiegleberg, *Demotische*, 15-16, column II, 19, column III; Felber "Demotische," 78-79.

[200] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, Fragment 42, 86-87.

[201] Liverani, "Memorandum," 187. For a complete translation and commentary of Horemheb's restoration edict see Jean-Marie Krutchen, *Le décret d'Horemheb: Traduction, commentaire épigraphique, Philogique et institutionnel* (Brussels: L'Univesite de Bruxelles, 1981).

[202] Lloyd, "Udjahorresnet," 180.

topoi, were a way for Egyptians to cope with the instability of the first millennium BC by assigning blame to the misconduct of a pharaoh for the country's problems[203] while at the same time holding out hope that another pharaoh would return and restore the old order.[204] The true value of the Udjahorresnet inscriptions then is not the historicity of any tactical details that a military historian may glean from them, but how the first Persian invasion affected the psyche of Egypt during the Twenty Seventh Dynasty and how the Egyptian reaction then resulted in the creation of a historical text that, although commissioned by a Persian king, was entirely Egyptian in character.

Despite the violent invasion that the Achaemenid Persians subjected Egypt to, the reigns of Cambyses and Darius I, the first two kings of Egypt's Twenty Seventh Dynasty, were relatively stable and a number of monuments were built and royal patronage of native cults took place.[205] Beginning during the reign of Artaxerxes I and continuing for the rest of the duration of the dynasty, rebellion and Greek intervention in Egyptian political affairs would become the norm. In 463/2 BC rebellion broke out in Egypt, led by a man named Inaros[206], described as Libyan, against Achaemenid rule. Thucydides wrote in his history of the Peloponnesian war:

---

[203] Gozzoli, *History*, 303.

[204] Ibid.

[205] For Twenty Seventh dynasty monuments and royal patronage of native cults see Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[206] For a recent study of the chronology of Inaros' rebellion see, Dan'el Kahn, "Inaros' Rebellion against Artaxerxes I and the Athenian Disaster in Egypt," *Classical Quarterly* 58/2 (2008): 424-40.

> Inaros son of Psammetichos, a Libyan and king of the Libyans bordering Egypt, set out from Mareia, the city above Pharos, and brought about the revolt of most of Egypt from King Artaxerxes, and after making himself its leader he invited the Athenians in as helpers.[207]

The genealogy of Inaros is interesting; the name of his father "Psammetichos," is of course the Greek version of the Egyptian name Psamtek that was used by three different kings in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty and may suggest a Saite origin for the rebel leader, but Alan Lloyd has reservations about this assumption. He states that the name was "common in the Late Period – it is found even in Greece"[208] and that therefore it "cannot be used as an index even of probable ethnic or genealogical connections."[209] According to Thucydides the Persians first tried to bribe the Greeks to relinquish their support for Inaros, but to no avail, so an expedition was then sent that ultimately defeated the rebel and his allies in 455 BC. Thucydides stated:

> The king sent Megabazos, a Persian, to Lacedaemon with money to draw the Athenians out of Egypt by inducing the Peloponnesians to invade Attica. Since he made no progress and the money was being spent uselessly, he recalled Megabazos to Asia with what was left and sent Megabyzos son of Zopyros, a Persian, with a large army. Arriving by land, he defeated the Egyptians and their allies in battle, drove the Hellenes out of Memphis, and finally shut them up on the island of Prosopitis.[210]

Thucydides further wrote that Inaros was captured and executed and Persian rule was established once more.[211] Unfortunately there are no Egyptian texts that corroborate any of this, or better yet give a sense of the national mood similar to the Udjahorresnet

---

[207] Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War*, trans Steven Lattimore (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1998) Book I, 104.

[208] Alan Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 1:43n.

[209] Ibid.

[210] Thucydides, *Peloponnesian*, Book I, 108-10.

[211] Ibid., Book I, 110. Also see Herodotus, *Histories*, Book VII, 7-8.

inscriptions, but Lloyd believes that the period between the outbreak of Inaros' revolt of 463/2 and its suppression by the Persians in 455 BC was one of anarchy "rife with marauding bands of soldiers – Greek, Persian and Egyptian."[212] No doubt this period of anarchy/disaster or to use the Egyptian word, *nšny*, imprinted itself on the psyche of Egypt and was another piece that contributed to the later genre of Apocalyptic literature.

After the disastrous middle fifth century BC, the Egyptians, once more with Greek assistance, were able to throw off the yoke of Persian rule and establish the final native dynasties – the Twenty Eighth through Thirtieth. The Egyptians rebelled once more after the death of the Achaemenid Persian king, Darius II, in 404, and established the Twenty Eighth Dynasty under its sole king Amyrtaeus.[213] The primary sources regarding Amyrtaeus' assumption of the throne, Herodotus and Thucydides, are a little confusing, but the reasons for the rebellion and Amyrtaeus' connection to Inaros can possibly be elucidated. Amyrtaeus, who *may* have been directly descended from Inaros,[214] was able to lead his successful rebellion from the Delta. Thucydides wrote:

> Egypt came back under the control of the king except for Amyrtaios the king of the marshland; they were unable to capture him because of the size of the marshland, and besides the marsh-dwellers are the best fighters among the Egyptians.[215]

---

[212] Lloyd, *Herodotus*, 1:62.

[213] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 76.

[214] Herodotus, *Histories*, Book III, 175.

[215] Thucydides, *Peloponnesian*, Book I, 110.

Despite the apparent tenuous grip that Amyrtaeus held over Egypt –he probably did not even hold all of the country – he was able to do so long enough for another native Egyptian dynasty, the Twenty Ninth Dynasty, to assume power over Egypt.[216]

Under Hakor, the second king of the Twenty Ninth Dynasty, Egypt became active once more in geo-politics, this time in the Greek world,[217] which ultimately resulted in his son and successor, Neferites II, gathering an army, led by Greeks against the Persians. Diodorus wrote:

> Acoris, the king of the Egyptians, being on unfriendly terms with the Persian King, collected a large mercenary force; for by offering high pay to those who enrolled and doing favours to many of them, he quickly induced many of the Greeks to take service with him for the campaign. But having no capable general, he sent for Chabrias the Athenian, a man distinguished both for his prudence as general and his shrewdness in the art of war, who had also won great repute for personal prowess.[218]

Although Diodorus names the Egyptian king as "Acoris" (Hakor), Hakor died in the summer of 380 BC[219] and the campaign was delayed due to the Athenian general, Chabrias, being recalled back to Greece at the behest of the Persians and a new round of fighting began in the Peloponnesian War.[220] The delay in the campaign, or probably more accurately the new war between the Persians and Egyptians would extend past Neferites II's short reign and into the reign of the first king of the Thirtieth Dynasty, Nectanebo I.

---

[216] Manetho lists Amyrtaeus as the sole king of the Twenty Eighth Dynasty, *Aegyptiaca*, Fragment 72, 178-79. The *Demotic Chronicle* lists him as the father of Neferites I, Speigleberg, *Demotische*, 17, column III, 18-column IV, 2.

[217] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 81.

[218] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of* History, trans. C.H. Oldfather (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004), Book XV, 29.

[219] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 88.

[220] Diodorus, *Library*, Book XV, 29-40.

Diodorus recounts that king Artaxerxes III sent an expedition to Egypt in 373 BC[221] because they had "revolted" against Persia, which was led by Pharnabazus and an Athenian named Iphicrates.[222] Nectanebo I, who faced this Persian invasion, is described as "emboldened, chiefly by the strength of the country, for Egypt is extremely difficult of approach."[223] Egypt's geography and the fortifications built by Nectanebo I were enough to repel the Persian invasion[224] in the fall of 373.[225] Nectanebo I's victory over the Persians, his subsequent building activities,[226] and Egypt's nominal reemergence to international geo-political relevancy under native rule would prove to be ephemeral because "unter König Nektanebis hat Ägypten den Höhenpunkt seiner Macht erreicht."[227]

Artaxerxes III would not be done with Egypt, for he invaded the country once more, during the reign of Nectanebo II in 351 BC[228] and the second time proved to be a charm as he was successful. Diodorus wrote that Artaxerxes III first recaptured Sidon before moving his army to the Delta at Pelusium.[229] Despite being prepared with excellent fortifications in the Delta, as they had done in the previous invasion, the Egyptians were routed and Nectanebo II fled to Memphis.[230] After Artaxerxes III had

---

[221] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 90.

[222] Diodorus, Library, Book XV, 40.

[223] Ibid., Book XV, 42.

[224] Ibid., Book XV, 43.

[225] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 92.

[226] See Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[227] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 92.

[228] Ibid., 100.

[229] Diodorus, *Library*, Book XVI, 46.

[230] Ibid., Book XVI, 48.

spies spread a rumor among the Egyptian forces that any soldiers who surrendered would be granted amnesty, quarrels between the Greek mercenaries and the native Egyptian troops first led to the fall of Bubastis and then all Lower Egyptian cities.[231] Nectanebo II apparently did not want to face Artaxerxes III's wrath as he fled to Nubia. Diodorus wrote:

> At the time under consideration, after the surrender of Bubastus, the remaining cities, terror stricken, were delivered to the Persians by capitulation. But King Nectanebôs, while still tarrying in Memphis and perceiving the trend of the cities toward betrayal, did not dare risk battles for his dominion. So giving up hope of his kingship and taking with him the greater part of his possessions, he fled into Aethiopia.[232]

Nectanebo II continued to rule in Upper Egypt until 343 BC before he disappeared from the historical record.[233]

This was the final invasion of Egypt in the period examined in this dissertation and Nectanebo II would prove to be the last native ruler[234] of Egypt until the modern period. The later invasions of Egypt would at first appear to be quite different than the others examined in this chapter, but closer inspection shows that the patterns of invasion were quite similar, despite the different peoples and countries involved. In the eighth and seventh centuries, the Nubians and Saites inserted themselves in the political intrigues of the Levant and the Assyrian empire taking sides with whomever they believed would

---

[231] Ibid., 49-50.

[232] Ibid, 51.

[233] Herman D. Meulenaere, "Nektanebos II," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, ed. Eberhard Otto and Wolfgang Helck (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975), 4:452.

[234] Some believe that an enigmatic ruler named Chabbash ruled for a brief period – Spalinger believes it was from 343 to 338 BC – but this is not key to the current study so will not be discussed here, see Anthony Spalinger, "The Reign of Chabbash: An Interpretation," *Zeitschrift für ägyptisches Sprache und Altertumskunde* 105 (1978): 142-154.

help them yield more power in the region, while in the fifth and fourth centuries, native Egyptian dynasties involved themselves in the affairs of the warring Greek city-states in order to secure independence in the face of the immense Persian empire.

Invasion played a critical role in the development of Egyptian culture during the Late Period. A survey of the various invasions of Egypt during the Late Period shows that a pattern was often followed – although usually not consciously but possibly sometimes so – that involved dynasts taking advantage of internal weakness in order to conquer the Nile Valley. Piankhy and then Shabaqa took advantage of an Egypt fragmented by contemporaneously ruling Libyan dynasts to install and solidify the Twenty Fifth Dynasty. Similarly, Psamtek I took advantage of a weakened Assyria and a divided Egypt to establish the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, although he did so from within unlike his Nubian predecessors. Later, the Chaldeans, under Nebuchadnezzar II, possibly tried to take advantage of a Saite civil war by invading Egypt, albeit unsuccessfully, while Cambyses was able to use the Egyptian chaos to his advantage and establish the Twenty Seventh Dynasty.

An examination of the various primary sources relating to invasion and foreign policy also reveals that the different Late Period dynasts also followed a similar geo-political pattern that demonstrates that those ancient peoples were much more politically savvy than many have thought. In the late eighth and early seventh centuries BC the Nubians of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty began to play a game of political duplicity with the Assyrian Empire that ultimately resulted in their active political role in the Levant, which recalled the ghost of the New Kingdom in what can be termed "political archaism." The

Saites would also attempt to pursue a similar policy and even in the Twenty Ninth and Thirtieth Dynasties attempts at geo-political archaism can also be seen.

Finally, a historiographical examination of the texts which pertain to invasions of Egypt can illuminate much for modern scholarship about how the conquerors and conquered saw themselves and each other. Piankhy's stela at first glance appears to be a standard military text complete with details about tactics and logistics, but a closer examination reveals much more about the conqueror and possibly how he wanted to be perceived. The emphasis on religious pilgrimages and the following of proper ritual reveals that either he was an extremely pious leader or he had the text commissioned in such a way as to be accepted and viewed as a true Egyptian ruler. The reality is probably somewhere in between. The Udjahorresnet statue on the other hand tells the story of Egypt's conquest from the perspective of a high ranking official who had much to lose when the Saites were vanquished and much to gain by collaborating with the Persians. The texts reveal much more than a standard biography, but a general anxiety of the tumultuous political situation Egypt found herself in during the Late Period. The anxiety of the period was transferred and translated into the Udjahorresnet texts as *topoi* that were part of a long line in an established literary genre which anticipated the later apocalyptic texts. Truly, the patterns of invasion influenced Egypt in the Late Period in many ways and set the stage for the other phases of dynastic transition that are examined in subsequent chapters of this dissertation.

Chapter V: Regicide in the Late Period

An examination of the methods used by competing dynasts to obtain and hold power in the Late Period reveals that regicide, the murder of a king, became a political tool that was used fairly frequently. A survey of the period reveals that at least six kings and/or princes were possibly killed by another king who oftentimes usurped the throne. Usually this act came immediately after the invasion by the foreign group – or *putsch* by native dynasties – and preceded monument building and any other propaganda efforts done to legitimize the new dynasty. Although regicide became more widely used in the Late Period, it was an extremely rare occurrence throughout earlier periods in pharaonic history. In the approximately two thousand year period from the inception of the Egyptian state in ca. 3100 BC to the end of the New Kingdom in 1075 BC there are only three *possible* documented occurrences of regicide known to modern scholarship, which is in stark contrast to the many more incidents of regicide in the Late Period. This chapter will examine why regicide became more prevalent in the Late Period, particularly how it abruptly changed from a religious taboo rarely broken in earlier periods – or at least never discussed officially in texts –to a calculated political tool utilized by competing foreign dynasts to maintain power.

The reason there are so few cases of regicide documented in the first two thousand years of ancient Egyptian history stems from the political stability of the pharaonic state, which was enmeshed with the concept that pharaoh himself was a god.[1]

[1] This is not to say that the political stability of the pharaonic state was never compromised of course. The breakdown of the central state in the First Intermediate Period and subsequent civil war, the Hyksos invasion and occupation of Lower Egypt in the Second Intermediate Period, and the breakdown again of the central state in the Third Intermediate Period all represent points when the pharaonic state was unstable and weak, but these were relatively rare periods when compared to the extremely long lifespan of pharaonic Egypt. Periods of political and social instability – like regicide before the Late Period – were the exception to the rule in ancient Egypt.

The divine status of the Egyptian king was first articulated in writing during the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties (2465-2300 BC ca.) in *The Pyramid Texts. The Pyramid Texts* were a collection of hundreds of spells, known as Utterances, inscribed on the walls of the tomb chamber of a particular king's pyramid. The purpose of these texts was "to assert the king's supremacy as a god, after rebirth, in a many-sided afterlife."[2] In the multi-faceted afterlife the king was associated with Atum, the creator god, as his "entire flesh is that of Atum"[3] and also Osiris, the god of the dead, "who causes to restore him so he shall live."[4] The king was also associated with Horus, the god of kingship, as is evidenced from the Old Kingdom onwards in the king's "Horus name,"[5] which was just one of the many names the king had when he ascended the throne. The Egyptian king's connection to Horus is most aptly visibly demonstrated in the seated statue of Kafra from the Fifth Dynasty, which depicts the king fused "with the falcon Horus in a singular unity. In this sculpture the 'Horus aspect' of the king is more convincingly rendered than is possible in words."[6] Understanding the theological importance of ancient Egyptian kingship is therefore vital to understanding the nature of regicide in ancient Egypt.

It should be pointed out here that prominent Egyptologist Georges Posener took a more pragmatic view towards the divine concept of kingship in ancient Egypt. Posener

---

[2] Barry J. Kemp, "Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom, and Second Intermediate Period c. 2685-1552 BC," in *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*, eds. Barry J. Kemp, David O'Connor, Alan B. Lloyd, and Bruce G. Trigger (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 72.

[3] Raymond O. Faulkner, trans., *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts* (Stilwell, Kansas: Digireads.com Publishing, 2007.), 205, Utterance 537.

[4] Ibid., Utterance 219.

[5] James Allen, *Ancient Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 64-6.

[6] Sigfried Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, trans. Ann E. Kemp (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1973), 34..

argued that the Egyptians could view the king as both human and divine[7] and that modern philology does not consider that the king was viewed as divine in *degrees*. He wrote:

> L'arguement tiré du vocabulaire présente un intérêt considérable pur l'étude de l'idéoligie pharaonique; mais il ne permet pas à lui seul de déterminer le degré de divinité reconnu par les Égyptiens à leur roi.[8]

Posener pointed to New Kingdom textual examples from the reign of Amenhotep III and Thutmose III which state that the gods live in heaven and shine on the king who is on the earth.[9] Although offering a different perspective on kingship, Posener's arguments do not necessarily refute the earlier textual examples from the *Pyramid Texts*. Perhaps the idea that royal divinity was viewed by degrees is the most interesting and one could argue most appropriate to the Late Period; as Egyptian history became more unstable and the people cynical, the king was seen as less divine. This is similar to the argument Anthony Spalinger makes about the idea of kingship in the Saite period.[10] Despite these cogent arguments, it appears more viable that the Egyptians viewed their kings as an at least *semi* divine being who was charged with keeping order in the temporal world.

Based on evidence from the primary sources, it becomes clear that the ancient Egyptians believed "the creator himself had assumed kingly office"[11] and that the temporal king was therefore "his descendent and his successor."[12] The ancient Egyptian

---

[7] Georges Posener, *De la divnité du pharon* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1960), 15.

[8] Ibid., 16.

[9] Ibid., 18.

[10] Anthony Spalinger, "The Concept of the Monarchy During the Saite Epoch – An Essay in Synthesis," *Orientalia* 47 (1978): 12-36.

[11] Henri Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion: An Interpretation* (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 1975), 30.

[12] Ibid., 31.

king "ruled in the strictest sense by divine right"[13] and his primary function was to maintain order or *Maat* in the world that the gods created. "The king lives under the obligation to maintain *Maat*, which is usually translated 'truth, but which really means the 'right order'"[14] against the forces of chaos or *Isfet*. Jan Assmann further clarified the difference between the concepts of *Maat and Isfet*:

> The principle of plentitude that made the world a flourishing paradise was *Maat*, the 'Right.' Its opposite devastated the world, because the gods renounced their dwelling, not only in the temples of the local dimension, but also in the life-giving powers of nature in the cosmic dimension.[15]

It is precisely these ideas – the Egyptian king was not only divine, but was also the earthly representative of the forces of order against chaos – that made the act of regicide repugnant in ancient Egypt. To the ancient Egyptians killing a king was not only regicide, it was also deicide.

In order to understand the magnitude of regicide in the Late Period, one must first examine all *possible* incidences of regicide in earlier periods of ancient Egyptian history. Teti, the first king of the Sixth Dynasty in the Old Kingdom (ca. 2345-2345 BC), was the first possible victim of regicide in ancient Egypt. Unfortunately, the only primary source that relates Teti's murder comes from the transmissions of the third century BC Egyptian priest Manetho.[16] The inherent problem with Manetho as a primary source rests with the

---

[13] Ibid.

[14] Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 51.

[15] Jan Assmann, *The Search for God in Ancient* Egypt, trans. David Lorton (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2001), 73. For a further discussion of the Egyptian concepts of *Maat* and *Isfet* compared to the Persian concepts of *Asha* and *Drug* see Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[16] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca,* trans. W.G. Waddell (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004).

fact that all of his "writings" that have survived until modern times are in fact second and third hand "transmissions" from later scholars,[17] many who were Jewish and Christian writers that may have omitted and added certain parts in accordance with their religious tastes.[18] Thus, the transmissions of Manetho should be viewed skeptically and with corroboration whenever possible.[19] Teti's assassination is mentioned in three different transmissions of Manetho[20] all of which state that he was murdered either by his bodyguards or attendants.[21] Unfortunately there is no other text that can corroborate the assassination of Teti, although excavations in the Old Kingdom necropolis of Saqqara by Naguib Kanawati may help.[22]

Kanawati has discovered that in the tombs of several officials who lived during the time of Teti, their names and figures were chiseled out – a traditional act performed in ancient Egypt to erase the memory and therefore existence of odious individuals who were perceived to violate *maat* – which he argued may have been a sign of a death penalty for the conspirators, that was carried out by Teti's son, Pepy I.[23] Kanawati argues that although there is no contemporary literary evidence for a palace conspiracy against Teti "the archaeological evidence from Teti's time suggests a rough accession to the

---

[17] Waddell, "Introduction," in *Aegyptiaca*, xv-vi.

[18] Donald B. Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study Of the Egyptian Sense of History* (Mississauga, Canada: Benben Publications, 1986), 229.

[19] See Chapter III of this dissertation for further discussion of Manetho.

[20] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca,*51-3, Fragments 19a,b; 20.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Naguib Kanawati, "Saqqara Excavations Shed New Light on Old Kingdom History." *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 1 (1990): 55-67.

[23] Ibid., 65.

throne, unusual security precautions throughout the reign and a major crime at its end."[24] The royal accession also provides evidence for a plot since the enigmatic Userkara succeeded Teti, and was in turn then succeeded by Teti's son and presumed heir apparent Pepy I. Kanawati sees the rule of Userkara as an aberration of the dynastic line but is unsure whether it represented a challenge to succession or a more organized reversion to the cult of Ra that was influential during the Fifth Dynasty.[25] He also believes that the general instability of the early Sixth Dynasty continued after Userkara's reign as there were possibly two conspiracies on the life of Pepy I.[26] All of this paints the picture of political situation that was very tenuous in the early Sixth Dynasty and gives further credence to Manetho's account of Teti's assassination.

It would be hundreds of more years until Egypt possibly witnessed another regicide, this time in the Middle Kingdom. Two different primary sources report the regicide of Amenemhat I, the first king of the Twelfth Dynasty (ca. 1985-1955 BC). All existing transmissions of Manetho state that "Ammanemês," like Teti before him, was killed by his attendants.[27] Unlike the murder of Teti, there is an Egyptian hieroglyphic text, known as the *Papyrus Millingen*, which may corroborate this regicide. The papyrus is described as a "skillful combination of a teaching in the tradition of the earlier didactic

[24] Naguib Kanwati, *Conspiracies in the Egyptian Palace: Unis to Pepy I* (London: Routledge, 2003), 169.

[25] Ibid., 170.

[26] Ibid., 170-82.

[27] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca,* 67-71, Fragments 34-6.

works, an autobiography, and a prose narrative."[28] The pertinent section of the papyrus also described the assassination, like the Manetho fragments, as a palace conspiracy.[29]

The historical reliability of the *Papyrus Millingen* as a testament to the regicide of Amenemhat I has been questioned and so must be considered here. The beginning of the second column in the text that refers to the possible regicide reads:

> Weapons for my protection were turned against me, while I was like a snake in the desert. I awoke at the fighting, [alert], and found it was a combat of the guard. Had I quickly seized weapons in my hand, I would have made the cowards retreat [in haste]. But no one is strong at night; no one can fight alone; no success is achieved without a helper.[30]

William Murnane questioned the validity of this account – or more so if Amenemhat I actually died – based on the extensive evidence of a Amenemhat I/Senuseret I co-regency. Murnane points to the stela of Antef – which gives a year thirty regnal year for Amenemhat I and a year ten for Senuseret I[31] – as proof. He argued that one line in particular refers to the co-regency and therefore the assassination plot was unsuccessful.[32] The papyrus states:

> Thus bloodshed occurred while I was without you; before the courtiers had heard I would hand over to you; before I had sat with you so as to advise you.[33]

---

[28] Ronald J. Williams, "Literature as a Medium of Political Propaganda in Ancient Egypt," in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Hounour of T.J. Meek*, ed. W.S. McCullough (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 22.

[29] Mariam Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *The Old and Middle Kingdoms,* vol. 1 of *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1976), 137. For another English translation see James Henry Breasted ed. and trans., *The First through the Seventeenth Dynasties*, vol. 1 of *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 228-233.

[30] Ibid.

[31] William J. Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1977), 2.

[32] Ibid., 249.

[33] Lichtheim, *Middle*, 137, column II, line 5.

Although Murnane believed that the plot was unsuccessful he thought one did exist none the less and in fact argued that combined with the plot against Senuseret I in *The Story of Sinuhe*[34] there were actually two assassination plots early in the dynasty: He wrote:

> It appears also that there were two quite distinct plots: the earlier one, aiming at the death or captivity of Amenemmes I, was frustrated and resulted in the appointment of the coregent ("Nothing successful can come to pass without a protector"); the second took place after the old king's death and was directed solely against Sesostris I.[35]

The obvious question then is; with a topic such as regicide viewed as odious by the Egyptians and with doubts to its historical validity, what was the purpose of the *Papyrus Millingen*?

Hans Geodicke wrote that the "the account, however, does not focus on the moral aspects of the act."[36] He further argued that to view the papyrus as propaganda or stating a political position of any kind is spurious because "the notion of literature as political propaganda in a modern sense is a fantasy without a basis in reality."[37] Essentially, the text was meant as a didactic piece to teach "about the dangers of political office."[38] Posener also argued that the text functioned in a didactic context, but that the situation represented "est beaucoup moins bonne que dans le cas de la Prophétie de Néferty."[39] Ultimately, it still remains open to conjecture if Amenemhat I was actually killed or if the

---

[34] For an English translation of this story see Lichtheim, *Middle*, 222-35.

[35] Murnane, *Coregencies*, 249.

[36] Hans Goedicke, *Studies in 'The Instruction of King Amenemhet I for his Son'* (San Antonio, Van Siclen, 1988), 3.

[37] Ibid., 4.

[38] Ibid., 55.

[39] Georges Posener, *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe dynasties* (Paris: Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes, 1956), 63.

Papyrus Millingen twists factual events to teach Senuseret I about the pitfalls of political intrigue in the Middle Kingdom

The final case of possible regicide in the first two thousand years of pharaonic history comes from the New Kingdom. Ramesses III (ca. 1184-1153 BC), the second king of the Twentieth Dynasty, spent much of his rule protecting Egypt from numerous attacks by the Libyans and Sea Peoples.[40] Beyond the stress of these attacks, albeit unsuccessful ones, by foreign enemies, Ramesses III like Teti and Amenemhat I before him, apparently also fell victim to a regicidal plot from within his own court. The *Judicial Papyrus of Turin*[41] is a court record of the charges brought against the conspirators of Ramesses III. Based on her analysis of the papyrus, Susan Redford believes that the conspiracy against the king was a twofold plan that first involved an assassination and then a palace *putsch* intended to displace Ramesses III's heir.[42] Redford points out that none of the texts that concern the plot against Ramesses III state if the assassination was successful and in fact his mummy, which is excellently preserved, does not show any signs of trauma.[43] Of course the *Papyrus Millingen*, although coming much closer to describing the assassination of a king, still does not

---

[40] James Henry Breasted ed. and trans., *The Twentieth Dynasty through the Twenty-sixth Dynasties*, vol. 4 of *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 18-80.

[41] For an English translation of the *Judicial Papyrus of Turin* and the *Papyrus Harris* see Breasted, *Twentieth*, 87-221. The court proceedings in the *Judicial Papyrus of Turin* are supplemented with several other fragmentary papyri known as: *Paypurs Rollin*, *Papyrus Varzy*, *Papyrus Lee*, *Papyrus Rifaud,* and *Papyrus Rifaud*. For the most recent and complete study of all these papyri and how they relate to the plot against Ramesses III's life see Susan Redford, *The Harem Conspiracy: The Murder of Ramesses III* (Dekalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002).

[42] Redford, *Conspiracy*, 9.

[43] Ibid., 109.

mention any details and the state of Ramesses III's mummy only proves that he was not stabbed, strangled, or beaten to death, but does not leave out poisoning.

Besides the court conspiracy, the plots against Ramesses III and Amenemhat I shares another interesting similarity in that both the *Papyrus Millingen* and *Papyrus Harris* the king actually commissioned the report post-mortem! This should not be taken literally as both can be viewed as "an example of apologetics"[44] which were "formulated as a literary testament assigned to the murdered king."[45] Goedicke argued that the assassination of Ramesses III did in fact take place and that copies of the *Papyrus Millingen* in circulation during the Ramesside Period testify that "the act of regicide seems displayed for them not as a hideous crime, but rather as a political possibility."[46] This conclusion assumes, that by the late New Kingdom, Egyptians, at least those close to the king, had become more cynical about their political system and perhaps even their way of life. Ramesses III's assassination appears to still be open to argument, but that there was at least an attempt on his life appears to be fact and perhaps anticipates the growing cynicism that engulfed many aspects of life in Egypt during the Late Period. Unfortunately, unlike the assassinations of Teti and Amenemhat I, there are no transmissions of Manetho to corroborate the regicide of Ramesses III.

According to Manetho, the sole king of the Twenty Fourth Dynasty, Bakenrenef, was burned alive by Shabaqa, the first king of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty.[47] Although this

---

[44] Pascal Vernus, *Affairs and Scandals in Ancient Egypt,* trans. by David Lorton (Ithaca, New York: Cornel University Press, 2003), 116.

[45] Goedicke, *Amenemhet*, 61.

[46] Ibid., 3.

[47] Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, 167-69, Fragments 66-7.

act cannot be corroborated by any other primary sources, this regicide is quite believable when placed in the context of the struggle for the Egyptian crown. Bakenrenef hailed from the Lower Egyptian city of Sais whose inhabitants were "cultural, if not blood, heirs"[48] of the Libyans while Shabaqa was from the Nubian city of Napata to the south of Egypt. Both men were also heirs of kings who held nominal power in Egypt – Bakenrenef's predecessor, Tefnakht, was the mayor of Sais and chief of the Ma while Shabaqa's predecessor, Piankhy, was the king of Nubia who defeated Tefnakht and all the other Libo-Egyptian potentates – and naturally opposed to each other as a result of the dynastic blood feud that they were part of. Neither the Saites nor the Nubians had any direct connection to the throne of Egypt so it became politically expedient for the incoming dynasty to eliminate any living vestige of the previous dynasty. This is exactly what Shabaqa did by burning Bakenrenef.

Many modern scholars have discussed the validity of the Manetho transmissions concerning Bakenrenef's assassination. Most notably, Kenneth Kitchen has argued that the assassination probably took place,[49] but further added that the burning of his body would have "militated against the acceptance of Shabako by Egyptians."[50] Well this may be true if Shabaqa and/or the Egyptians considered Bakenrenef to be the rightful king of Egypt, but it seems more likely that he was considered a pretender or even a rebel. If he was considered a pretender or rebel than death by fire would "have been regarded as

---

[48] Donald Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992), 330.

[49] Kenneth Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: (1100 to 650 BC)*, 2nd ed. (Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris and Phillips, 1995), 142.

[50] Ibid., 377n.

particularly appropriate to treason."[51] The use of fire to punish rebels is documented in the Third Intermediate Period text *The Chronicle of Prince Osorokon* where it describes how the transgressors were placed in braziers and "everyone was burned with fire."[52] The reason for the extreme punishment meted out against rebels in ancient Egypt has a theological background since rebels were anathema to the idea of *Maat* or order that comprised the world the Egyptians lived in. Frankfort noted:

> The rebel and the criminal who acted against Pharaoh, be it openly or by faithlessness in Pharaoh's service, headed inevitably for destruction because they moved against the order upon which society, like all that exists, was forever founded.[53]

Therefore if Shabaqa viewed Bakenrenef as a rebel "the punishment by fire thus represents a response to the most heinous of crimes which is perfectly consistent with the mythological background to Egyptian politics."[54]

The theological and historical importance of the destruction of Bakenrenef's body should not be overlooked. The annihilation of the human body was a postmortem

---

[51] Anthony Leahy, "Death by Fire in Ancient Egypt," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 22 (1984): 200. Leahy cites "The Instruction of Ankhsheshonq" and a demotic inscription from Philae as two examples of death by fire in ancient Egypt. For a translation of the "The Instruction of Ankhsheshonq" see Miriam Lichtheim, ed. and trans., *The Late Period,* vol. 3 of *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1976), 159-84. Although "Ankhsheshonq" is an example of a didactic text, and not historical, the first half of the text tells the story of a regicidal plot against an unnamed pharaoh. After the plot is discovered the unnamed pharaoh decides to execute the conspirators and confine the unwitting Ankhsheshonq to prison for failing to inform on one of the conspirators who was his friend. Lines 3-8 of the second page are translated: "As soon as he had said this, Pharaoh had an altar of earth built at the door of the palace. He had Harsiese son of Ramose placed in the fire together with all his people and every man who had conspired in Pharaoh's doom. Pharaoh had Ankhsheshonq son of Tjainufi taken to the houses of detention of Daphnae. A personal servant, a staff-bearer, a man of Pharaoh's household, was assigned to him, and his food was brought from the palace daily."

[52] Ricardo A. Caminos, *The Chronicle of Prince Osorokon* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1958), 48.

[53] Frankfort, *Religion*, 55-6.

[54] Leahy, "Fire," 201.

punishment that was applied throughout Egyptian history for a variety of different offenders, but above all towards tomb robbers. A brief survey of the punishment of these criminals may help to understand the significance of Late Period regicide and corroborate the Manetho transmissions concerning the regicide of Bakenrenef. Investigation of the Twentieth Dynasty Tomb Robber Papyri reveals that death by impalement was reserved for the worst offenders. The *Abbot Papyrus* describes the oath taken by a defendant accused of tomb robbery as, "he made an oath to the lord concerning being beaten, having his nose and ears cut off and put upon the stick (impaled)."[55] Ultimately, both the tomb robbers of the Twentieth Dynasty and Bakenrenef suffered the same fates *after* their deaths – at least in a theological/spiritual sense – no existence in the after-life. A funerary stela from the Middle Kingdom states that, "there is no tomb for one who commits a crime against his majesty," stressing the disposal of the body in the river in which the most severe punishment is the denial of burial and no after-life.[56] Without the body, offerings could not be made to the deceased nor could a mummy be prepared, both of which were needed to for the *Ka o*f the deceased.[57]

After Shabaqa's regicide of Bakenrenef, Egypt would experience over fifty years of relative internal stability, which was finally ended by the repeated invasions of the Assyrians.[58] The last king of the Nubian Twenty Fifth Dynasty, Tantamani, like his

---

[55] Eric Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies of the Twentieth Dynasty; Being a Critical Study, with Translations and Commentaries, of the Papyri in which these are Recorded* (Oxford, United Kingdom: The Clarendon Press, 1930), plate 3, lines 6-7.

[56] Breasted, *First*, 327.

[57] Frankfort, *Religion*, 91.

[58] Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East: c. 3000-330 BC* (London: Routledge, 1995), 2:499-500; 634-6. Also see Chapter IV of this dissertation for the specific ancient sources that detail the invasions.

ancestor Shabaqa, also assassinated an upstart ruler from Sais. Tantamani's victim was Nekau I who "is counted conventionally as the first king of the dynasty, although his area of control was very circumscribed."[59] Nekau I is described in the Assyrian annals from the time of Ashurbanipal (668-633 BC) as the "king of Memphis and Sais"[60] appointed by the Assyrians but who would later conspire with the Nubian king, Taharqa, against Ashurbanipal. The text goes on to explain that after the Nubian plot to retake Egypt from the Assyrians failed, Ashurbanipal "had only mercy upon" Nekau I and "granted him his life."[61] Why was Nekau I spared from death by Ashurbanipal when he committed the grave crime, in the Assyrian culture, of oath breaking? The answer may be impossible to obtain, but the Assyrians may have viewed the Saites as the lesser of two evils; they were easier to control considering Psamtek I lived in Ashur temporarily.[62] Although the Assyrian texts help to illuminate the political duplicity that took place between the Saites and Nubians in the seventh century BC and the importance of oaths in the Assyrian empire, they do not mention Nekau I's death; for that one must turn to the Greek historian, Herodotus.

Nekau I's assassination is described by Herodotus in a somewhat anachronistic account as he stated that "Psammeticus," Nekau I's heir, "fled the country to escape

---

[59] Ibid., 637.

[60] A. Leo Oppenheim, trans., "Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. with supplement., ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969), 294.

[61] Ibid., 295. On the importance of Assyrian oaths with their vassals and the grave nature of breaking these oaths see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[62] Ibid.

Sabacos, the Ethiopian, who had killed Necos his father."[63] The Sabacos Herodotus described is the above mentioned Shabaqa and Necos is Nekau I, the problem being that the two men never lived at the same time. Since Nekau I was the father of Psamtek I, Psammetichus in Greek, it is likely that Herodotus simply substituted the name of the little known Nubian king, Tantamani, for the better known Shabaqa. Unfortunately, there are no Egyptian texts that can corroborate the details of this regicide and Manetho makes no mention of it, but the so called *Dream Stela* of Tantumani indicates that there was a major disturbance between the Nubian king and an army of rebels. According to the stela, Tantamani sailed north from Napata shortly after his coronation there (663 BC) to Lower Egyptian to quell a rebellion. The text states:

> *spr <pw> ir.n ḥm.f r M-nfr pr pw ir.n nˁ msw bdšt wn ḥm.f irt ḫȝyt ˁȝ im.sn nnrḫ tnw.sn wn ḥm.f iṯ Mn-nfr ˁḳ r ḥwt-nṯr nt Ptḥ rsy-inb.f ir.f ˁȝbt n <it>.f Ptḥ-skr;* which is translated: There arrived His Majesty at Memphis. Out came the children of rebellion to fight His Majesty. His Majesty made a great blood bath among them, their number being unknown. After his majesty seized Memphis, he entered the temple-compound of Ptah South-of-his-wall, made an offering to his father Ptah-Sokar, and propitiated Sakhmet according to what she desires.[64]

Tantamani then sailed into the Delta to suppress a rebellion there:

> *ir-ḥr-sȝ-nn ḫd pw ir.n ḥm.f r ˁḥȝ ḥnˁ wrw nw ṯȝ-mḥw ˁḥˁ.n.sn ˁḳ r inb.sn mi* [. . .] *(r)n* [. . .] *rb(ȝ)b(ȝw).sn wn.in ḥm.f ir hrw ˁšȝw ḥr.sn nn pr wˁ n-(i)m.sn r ˁḥˁ ḥnˁ ḥm.f ḫnty pw ir.n ḥm.f r ʾInb-ḥḏ*; which is translated: Thereafter north sailed His Majesty to fight the chiefs of North-land. Then they went inside their walls [like . . .] into their holes. So His Majesty spent many days on them,

---

[63] Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 1996), 158, Book II, 152. Alan Lloyd states that Nekau I's death "probably took place in Memphis in 664 for several reasons," which he enumerates as Tantamani's victory over his enemies as related in the *Dream Stela* (see below), Nekau I's position as governor/prince of Memphis, and the fact that Psamtek I succeeded him in 664 BC. Alan Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 3:132. Lloyd apparently also believes the veracity of this account because he does not question it.

[64] Török, T. Eide, T. Hägg, and R. H. Pierce eds. and trans, *From the Eighth to the Mid-Fifth Century BC*, vol. 1 of Fontes *Historiae Nubioram: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region Between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD* (Bergen: University of Bergen, 1994), 200-1; Breasted, *Twentieth*, 471.

> without a single one of them coming out to fight His Majesty. Southwards s ailed His Majesty to White-wall (Memphis).[65]

The name of Nekau is conspicuous by its absence, but that should not be understood as a negation of Herodotus' account. By referring only to a group of anonymous rebels, and not mentioning the specific name of Nekau I, Tantamani effectively negated the eternal existence, on a metaphysical level, of him and any other rebels.

After the Saites came to power they would get their chance to kill a Nubian king. The third king of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, Psamtek II, conducted a military campaign into Nubia in year three of his reign (592 BC) that was commemorated in Egyptian hieroglyphs on three different stelae[66] and written about by Herodotus.[67] The *Shellal stelae* tells of a fairly large and ultimately successful campaign that was initially led by the pharaoh himself[68] and ended in the capture of 4200 prisoners.[69] The more damaged *Tanis stela* also depicts a campaign led by Psamtek II but adds that a regicide took place:

> *ḫnw pw n kwꜣr nty im ḥnꜥ dmi tꜣ-dhn rn.s ꜥḥꜥ.n smꜣsn mšꜥ nw ḥm.f ir ḫꜣ*[*yt*] [. . .] *ꜥꜣ im.st ꜥḥꜥ.n* [*ꜣšr.sn*] *p*(*ꜣ*) *kwꜣr nty m* […] *ib.st m*-[ꜥ]*.f ḫnw.f irwꜣ iw pw ir.n.f ḥn*(ꜥ)*.f*; which is translated: It was the capital of the Nubian king, along with the town named Tadehen. Then the army of his majesty smote them so that a great (carnage) was made from them. Then (they burned) the Nubian king who was in . . . their midst with him, at his residence of Iruwa.[70]

---

[65] Török, *Eighth*, 202; Breasted, *Twentieth*, 471.

[66] For Egyptian hieroglyphic transcriptions, transliterations, English translations, and brief commentary of these texts see Peter D. Manuelian, *Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty* (London: Keegan Paul International, 1994), 333-72. For a full transliteration, translation, and bibliographical information on the Shellal and Tanis stelae see numbers four and five of the appendix.

[67] Herodotus, *Histories*, 162, Book II, 161. Lloyd believes this was a "preemptive strike." *Book II*, 3:167.

[68] Manuelian, *Archaism*, 339, line 8.

[69] Ibid., 340, line 10.

[70] Ibid., 367, lines 6-8.

Determining the identity of the Nubian king (*kw3r*),[71] based on the known chronology of the Napatan kings poses some problems. According to Reisner's original chronology of the Napatan kings[72] and other subsequent chronologies[73] the reigning Nubian king would have been Aspelta (593-568). The obvious problem is that Aspelta ruled after Psamtek II's Nubian campaign, which leads to the question – was a Nubian "king" killed by Psamtek II and if so who was he? Roberto Gozzoli believes that the intent of the stelae was propagandistic in nature, "la stele di Tanis come quella integra di Shellal parlano di 'ribelli' che si schierano contro il faraone, second la tipica tradizione della propaganda militare egiziana."[74] Even if the scope of the campaign was exaggerated[75] it is doubtful

---

[71] Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow, *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1971), 117. Manuelian adds the designation of "the Kushite king, to be compared to the nearly identical word in Meroitic, and the demotic *p3 kwr* in the second tale of Setne Khaemwas." Maneulian, *Archaism,* 370n.

[72] George A. Reisner, "The Meroitic Kingdom of Ethiopia: A Chronological Outline." *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 9 (1923): 75.

[73] Derek A. Welsby, *The Kingdom of Kush: The Napatan and Meroitic Empires* (Princeton, New Jersey: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1998), 207-9; László Török is not convinced that "Aspelta's reign can not be dated with certainty as being concurrent with Psamtik II's early reign", *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 366.

[74] Roberto B. Gozzoli,"La Campagna Nubiana di Psammetico II e i testi di Frontiera Saitici." *Discussions in Egyptology* 38 (1997): 6. The theory that Psamtek II's Nubian campaign was a propaganda effort designed to influence Egypt's Levantine allies was first proposed by Anthony Spalinger in, "The Concept of the Monarchy During the Saite Epoch – An Essay in Synthesis," *Orientalia* 47 (1978): 22-3.

[75] Early scholars studying the expedition believed its scope was limited, "qu'une operation géographiquement limitée et sans aucune portée politque." Serge Sauneron and Jean Yoyotte, "Le campagne Nubienne de Psammétique II et sa signification historique," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 50 (1952): 158. Despite the limited scope of Psamtek II's Nubian campaign, Sauneron and Yoyotte believed that the Shellal and Tanis stelae represent a critical phase in the Saite-Nubian conflict, "De fait, en examinant les documents relatifs à ces derniers . . . ils représentent très probalement une phase critique des conflits qui, depuis le milieu du VIIIe siècle, opposaient la monarchie de Napata à celle de Saïs." 160. Of course the first act in the Saite-Nubian conflict was Shabaqa's burning of Bakenrenef, followed by Tantamani's assassination of Nekau I, then the burning of this unnamed Nubian "king," and the defacement and removal of Nubian cartouches from several monuments being the final act in the conflict. Yoyotte compiled the most comprehensive collection of erasures done by the Saites to the cartouches on monuments of Nubian kings, most of which he believed took place during this campaign, see "Le martelage des noms Éthopiens par Psammétique II," *Revue de Egyptologie* 8 (1951): 215-239. For a collection of Greek inscriptions left by mercenaries in Psamtek II's army during the year three campaign

that the burning of the Nubian king was entirely fabricated. There is the possibility that the unnamed Nubian king burned was actually a crown prince or other high official, but until another text that reveals more this is all speculation. Although this account of regicide cannot be corroborated by other Egyptian texts or Greek accounts, it appears plausible when considered in the broader context of the Saite-Nubian conflict. Also, if one considers the transmissions of Manetho concerning the assassination of Bakenrenef, namely the method of burning, then Psamtek II's regicide of the unnamed Nubian king appears even more believable – a final act of revenge for the assassinations of the Saite kings Bakenrenef and Nekau I.

Psamtek II's Nubian campaign would be the end of the Saite-Nubian conflict, but it would not be the last act of regicide in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty. The next act of regicide in the Late Period was the result of an internal act, perpetrated by the general, Amasis, against Apries, the fifth king of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty. According to Herodotus, Amasis captured Apries and "strangled him, and buried his body in the family tomb"[76] in 571 BC. A similar account of this regicide was repeated hundreds of years later by the Greek historian, Diodorus as he stated, "Apries fell alive into the hands of the enemy and was strangled to death, and Amasis, arranging the affairs of the kingdom in whatever manner seemed to him best."[77] Notably, both accounts relate that strangulation

---

see André Bernard and Oliver Masson, "Les inscriptions Grecques d'Abou-Simbel," *Revue des etudes Grecques* 70 (1957): 1-46.

[76] Herodotus, *Histories*, 164, Book II, 169. On this Lloyd writes that, "It's similarity to H.'s account of the captivity and death of Psammetichus III (see below in this chapter) indicates that, even if the tradition had its beginnings early in the reign of Amasis, it may have been contaminated by elements from subsequent historical tradition." *Book II*, 3:202.

[77] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, trans. C.H. Oldfather (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004), 237.

– not burning – and then a proper Egyptian burial in a tomb was the manner of death inflicted on Apries which contrasts starkly with the burnings of Bakenrenef and the unnamed Nubian "king" discussed above. Without corroborating sources it is impossible to say for sure how Apries was executed, but the *Elephantine stela* does testify to the civil war between Amasis and Apries.[78] The last king of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty would also be the victim of regicide, but this time the perpetrator was not from within the dynasty or even from nearby Nubia, but from thousands of miles away in the land of Persia.

In 525 BC the Achaemenid Persian king, Cambyses, conquered Egypt[79] which continued the expansion of the empire begun by his father, Cyrus, who conquered Babylon in 539 BC.[80] Cambyses did not take long to eliminate his political opposition in Egypt. According to Herodotus, Psamtek III, the last king of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, was brought alive to Cambyses and allowed to live, as the Achaemenids were "in the habit of treating kings with honour."[81] Apparently Psamtek III was not content to "live in honor" and fomented a rebellion that was discovered by Cambyses. Herodotus wrote that, "He was caught trying to raise a revolt amongst the Egyptians, and as soon as his guilt was known by Cambyses, he drank bull's blood and died on the spot."[82]

---

[78] Georges Darresy, "Stèle de l'an III D'Amasis." *Recueil de Travaux Relatifs a la l'Archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* 22 (1900): 1-9. Also see Chapter IV of this dissertation for a discussion of this and other later sources that indicate a possible or attempted Chaldean invasion of Egypt at this time.

[79] See Chapter IV of this dissertation for a complete analysis of the Achaemenid Persian invasion of Egypt.

[80] For a complete history of the Achaemenid Persian Empire see Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. by Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002).

[81] Herodotus, *Histories*, 176, Book III, 15.

[82] Ibid.

The method of execution has to be called into question again here. John Marr believes that execution by bull's blood was possibly a metaphor used by classical historians to depict a heroic death. In his study of the death of the Athenian soldier, Themistocles, Marr notes that bull's blood is not fatal to humans if swallowed:

> Themistocles cannot have killed himself in this fashion, since bull's blood is not poisonous; though not exactly pleasant, it is apparently harmless to drink. Nevertheless there was a fairly widespread belief in the ancient world that it was instantaneously 'poisonous', based on the observable fact that bull's blood congeals very rapidly. It was thus though to produce a lethal choking effect in the stomach and throat if swallowed.[83]

Marr further connects the account of Themistocles' death with the Herodotean account of Psamtek III's death by bull's blood where he argues that it fits a *topos* that "was probably intended to recall the defiant anti-Persian suicide of the Egyptian king, Psammenitus"[84] and that "Athenian public opinion at the time was doubtless both familiar with Psammenitus' name, and susceptible to an appeal to his memory and example."[85] Despite Herodotus' account of the method of execution/suicide of Psamtek III being doubtful, the fact remains that it was written about and the fact that the last Saite king disappeared from the historical record after which means that he was killed in some manner by his Persian predecessor more likely. To Herodotus, the last Saite king heroically and ceremoniously killing himself made better literature than reality – whatever that was. So ended the Saite Twenty Sixth Dynasty, but within three years the succession of the Achaemenid throne was challenged with a confusing act of regicide that ultimately resulted in Darius I becoming the next king of the Achaemenid Empire.

---

[83] John Marr, "The Death of Themistocles," *Greece and Rome* 42 (1995): 159.

[84] Ibid., 163.

[85] Ibid., 167n.

The historical sources for this act of regicide are the cuneiform inscriptions from Behistun[86] and Herodotus Book III.[87] According to both sources, Cambyses had his brother Bardiya/Smerdis, murdered in an attempt to prevent him from coming to the throne, but was fooled when a "false" Smerdis was placed on the throne by politically ambitious magi. The Old Persian Behistan text states:

> Saith Darius the King: This is what was done by me after that I became King. A son of Cyrus, Cambyses by name, of our family – he was king here. Of that Cambyses there was a brother, Smerdis by name, having the same mother and the same father as Cambyses. Afterwards, Cambyses slew that Smerdis. When Cambyses slew Smerdis, it did not become known to the people that Smerdis had been slain. Afterwards, Cambyses went to Egypt. When Cambyses had gone off to Egypt, after that the people became evil. After that the Lie waxed great in the country, both in Persia and Media and in the other provinces. Saith Darius the King: Afterwards, there was one man, a Magian, Gaumata by name; he rose up from Paishiyauvada. A mountain by name Arakadri – from there XIV days of the month Viyakhna were past when he rose up. He lied to the people thus: 'I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus, brother of Cambyses.' After that, all the people became rebellious from Cambyses, (and) went over to him, both Persia and Media and the other provinces. He seized the kingdom; of the month Garmapada IX days were past, then he seized the kingdom. After that, Cambyses died by his own hand.[88]

Herodouts related a similar account of this incident:

> The brother, whom I have already mentioned as his confederate, bore a close resemblance to Cyrus' son Smerdis, the brother Cambyses murdered. Besides the physical likeness, it also happened that he bore the same name. Patizeithes having persuaded this brother of his that he would successfully carry the business through, made him take his seat upon the royal throne, and then sent out a proclamation to the troops, not only throughout Persia but also in Egypt, that they should take their orders in future not from Cambyses but from Smerdis.[89]

---

[86] Roland Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1953).

[87] Herodotus, *Histories*, 197-207, Book III, 61-80.

[88] Kent, *Persian*, 119-20, lines 10-11.

[89] Herodotus, *Histories*, 197, Book III, 61.

Examination of both accounts reveals that they are in agreement on many points including that "the rebel was a *magus* who had assumed the identity of Bardiya/Smerdis, brother of Cambyses; that Cambyses was responsible for the death of his brother; and that the death of Bardiya was kept secret."[90] Despite the agreement of the ancient sources on the usurpation of the throne by the magi, the veracity of the details may be lacking. Jack Balcer wrote that the Behistan texts were actually written in the style of a proto-typical Indo-European heroic epic:

> Analysis of the Bardiya exposition, phrase by phrase, leads us to proceed cautiously and to question Darius' claim that Gaumata played the role of the royal imposter and regal usurper. We begin to suspect the historical veracity of the Bisitun narratives, not only because we detect that Darius' character of Gaumata lacks depth and reality, but also because we detect that the exposition (sects. 10-14) and the entire text as well possess numerous qualities of epic narrative and theme development.[91]

Both Herodotus and the Behistan inscriptions also relate the eventual victory of Darius over Smerdis/Bardiya,[92] but ultimately, as argued by Balcer, these texts served to legitimize the illegitimate assumption of the Achaemenid throne by Darius I. This would also help explain "why Darius was motivated to date Bardiya's official assumption of power before the death of Cambyses: it was to transform into a usurper a king who could legitimize his authority."[93] Since Darius was from a collateral branch of the Achaemenid

---

[90] Briant, *Cyrus*, 99.

[91] Jack M. Balcer, *Herodotus and Bisitun: Problems in Ancient Persian Historiography* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1987), 61.

[92] Herodotus, *Histories*, 205-6, Book III, 79; Kent, *Persian*, 120, line 13.

[93] Brian, *Cyrus*, 102.

dynasty,[94] he was forced "to discredit Cambyses" through "the story that Cambyses had killed his brother, Bardiya."[95]

After Darius I had killed Smerdis/Bardiya – whether the real or fake one – he then proceeded to quell numerous rebellions that had erupted throughout the Achaemenid Empire.[96] In the process of squashing these rebellions, he then committed regicide on Nidintu-Bel, the would-be king of Babylon:

> Saith Darius the King: After that, Nidintu-Bel with a few horsemen fled; he went off to Babylon. Thereupon I went to Babylon. By the favor of Ahuramazda both I seized Babylon and I took that Nidintu-Bel prisoner. After that, I slew that Nidintu-Bel at Babylon.[97]

Although this last act of regicide committed by Darius I probably would not have been considered as such by the king – to him Nidintu-Bel was a rebel and follower of the lie or *drugh* – it provides yet another example for this study of how regicide was utilized as a political tool. The Persians were probably the most politically sophisticated rulers of Egypt in the Late Period but were not above using regicide to preserve their rule. In fact, one could argue that the act of regicide employed not just by the Persians here but by all of the dynasts analyzed in this chapter was done in a well thought out and therefore sophisticated fashion. The assassinations carried out in the Late Period were not done for personal reasons – with the possible exception of the Saite-Nubian conflict – but to ensure that old dynastic line could never resurface. But Persian rule in Egypt, like the

---

[94] This was another problem that he solved by connecting himself and his family with Cambyses and his predecessors in the Behistan text, but as Balcer pointed out, "what is never mentioned is that the ensuing rebellions originated in that switch from the Anshan branch of the family to the Yautiya branch, a transferal that by-passed Arsames and Hystaspes." *Historiography,* 50.

[95] Ibid., 69.

[96] Kent, *Persian*, 120-8, lines 19-50.

[97] Ibid., 123, line 21.

Nubians before them, would prove to be ephemeral and native rule was restored once more.

After the Achaemenid Persians were expelled from Egypt in 404 BC, two weak dynasties – the Twenty Eighth and Twenty Ninth – and one relatively stable dynasty, the Thirtieth, came to power.[98] The last possible acts of regicide in Late Period ancient Egypt took place in 380 BC amid the turmoil that marked the end of the Twenty Ninth Dynasty and the beginning of the Thirtieth Dynasty. The eventual beneficiary of this turbulent time, Nectanebo I, the son of the general Djedhor, "un descendant du roi Neferites I, le fondateur de la 29e" dynasty,"[99] took advantage of "troublèrent dans la fin du règne d'Hakoris"[100] by ultimately gaining the crown of Egypt. The turbulent end to the Twenty Ninth Dynasty and beginning of the Thirtieth Dynasty even saw the reigns of Nectanebo I and Neferites II overlap:

> Dazu sind zwischen Hakoris' und Nektanebis' (I.) Regierungszeit noch die 4 Monate Nepherites' II., des Sohnes des Hakoris, unterzubringen, die aber mit Sicherheit wenigstens teilweise mit den ersten Monaten des Usurpators Nektanebis identisch waren.[101]

Nectanebo I's usurpation of the throne is documented on a stela from Hermopolis that was first published by Gunther Roeder in 1952.[102] The pertinent part of this inscription

---

[98] On the chronology of these three dynasties see Friedrich Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundet vor der Zeitwende* (Berlin: Akademieverlag, 1953), 166-80.

[99] Herman de Meulenaere, "Nektanebos I," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, ed. Eberhard Otto and Wolfgang Helck (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975), 4:450.

[100] Ibid.

[101] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 174.

[102] Gunther Roeder, "Zwei hieroglyphische Inschriften aus Hermpolis (Ober-Ägypten)," *Annales du Service des anitquite's de l'Egypte* 52 (1952): 315-412.

concerning the coup and possible regicide.[103]

> *ḫpr.f m ḥḳꜥ* [*m*] *ḏr* [. . .] *ḳꜳ m tꜳ n ỉmy-r niwt wn.n.f m sby nḥm n kꜳt srỉ niwt šꜥnḫ.n.f šry m nšny nty nswt wn ḥr ḥꜳt.f sꜳ rꜥ nbt nḫt-nb.f ꜥnḫ rꜥ mỉ*; which is translated: He became ruler . . . in the land of the mayor. He delivered the rebel to the work (monument) of the town officials and he caused to make the children live in the rage of the king who were before him. Son of Ra, lord, Nectanebo I, who lives like Ra.[104]

Roeder contended that the majesty mentioned in the first line – line seven of the complete text – was not Nectanebo. "Das 'seine Majestat' das nicht auf den damals, nimmt für Nacht-nebôf einen Titel vorans."[105] The king who Nectanebo I opposed in this inscription is still unknown and although one would be inclined to believe it was Neferites II, since he was the king who was *ultimately* usurped, the troubles began during the reign of Hakoris. As Herman de Meulenaere noted, "L'identité de ce souverain demeure malheureusement incertaine mais peut croire qu'il s'agit d'Hakôris dont la fin du règne a dû être trouble par de graves révoltes."[106] The turbulent end of the Twenty Ninth Dynasty is further documented in the *Demotic Chronicle.*

The pseudo-historical *Demotic Chronicle*, which due to the nature of this source, creates many problems for scholars,[107] can be used here, similar to the transmissions of Manetho, to corroborate the political situation in the early fifth/late fourth centuries BC.

---

[103] Ibid., 389.

[104] Ibid.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Herman de Meulenaere, "La famille royale des Nectanebo." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 90 (1965): 90.

[107] See Chapter II of this dissertation for a historiographical discussion of some published articles concering the *Demotic Chronicle*.

The *Chronicle* was written sometime during the Ptolemaic Dynasty[108] and although considered by some scholars to be historically "more accurate than the versions of Manetho which have survived"[109] it still poses problems to modern scholars because its "main purpose was to predict the coming of another native Egyptian ruler."[110] Column four – which describes the end of the Twenty Ninth and beginning of the Thirtieth Dynasties – indicates that Neferites II may have usurped the rule of Hakoris to gain the throne. Spiegleberg translated lines two and three as, "Sondern man beseitigte ihn vor ihm auf seinem . . . während er lebte."[111] The text goes on to name "Nepferites" as the next ruler of Egypt followed by "Nektanebos" with no mention of conflict between them.[112] This presents an interesting question – if both Hakoris and Neferites II were ovethrown by their successors, were they in turn both killed? Neither text described above mentions the act of regicide itself, but this may have more to do with Egyptian religion than historical facts. Despite a certain amount of political pragmatism that existed in the Late Period, the native Egyptian kings were still probably reticent to speak of regicide, especially ones they perpetrated, in official texts. Given what is known from the texts, one can extrapolate that given the turbulent time period and the violent methods used by previous kings in this period to depose of the previous king of a different

---

[108] Wilhelm Spiegelberg trans. and ed., *Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris nebst den auf der Rückseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914), 4.

[109] Janet Johnson, "The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source," *Enchoria* 4 (1974): 6.

[110] Ibid., 5.

[111] Spiegelberg, *Demotische*, 17, column 4, line 2.

[112] Ibid., lines 4-5.

dynasty, it would have been a logical and politically expedient, move by Nectanebo I to kill Neferites II which was the result of the usurpation and possible regicide of Hakoris.

It is apparent that regicide became much more common in Late Period ancient Egypt, but does it mean that there was a fundamental change in the idea of kingship? Egyptologist Anthony Spalinger believes that the idea of kingship changed in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, from one that advocated the concept that the king was divine to one that viewed the king in a more pragmatic way. He states that it "is clear from the political and military tenor of this age, the kingship in no way reflected the glories of the New or Middle Kingdoms, much less the Old."[113] He further writes that Amasis – the king who assassinated his predecessor Apries – "maintained a *Realpolitik* attitude towards all comers."[114] This *weltanschauung*, or political outlook, of the Saites can be extended back to the Twenty Fifth Dynasty and forward to the Thirtieth Dynasty to help understand the general political milieu of the Late Period. Politics in Late Period Egypt were driven less by a belief in the divinity of the king and more by the desire of a king to attain and hold power for himself and his dynasty. Regicide was therefore no longer the taboo it was in earlier periods, but had become a tool to be used by the victors in order to ensure the vanquished could not return to power.

An examination of the sources shows some key differences between regicide in the Late Period and in the early periods of Egyptian history. In the three acts of regicide from the pre-Late Period, regicide came from within; it was the product of conspiracies hatched in the royal court. Regicide in the Late Period usually came from the rival king's foreign adversaries who were oftentimes a different ethnic group. The outside group was

[113] Spalinger, "Concept," 28.

[114] Ibid., 26.

forced to eliminate any vestige of the previous dynasty, which it had no connection with, in order to politically legitimize its own new ruling dynasty. This sometimes had the effect of an increased animosity between two groups as can be seen with the three kings assassinated in the Saite-Nubian conflict. Ultimately, the idea of divine kingship that was originally articulated in writing during the Old Kingdom gave way to a more pragmatic vision of kingship which meant that in the Late Period killing a king was no longer viewed as killing a god, but as a politically expedient tool used to gain and hold power over Egypt. Most, if not all, cases of regicide in the Late Period were not haphazard acts of rage, but well calculated expressions of political power.

Chapter VI: Methods of Political Legitimization

After the political methods of conquest and regicide had been carried out by the victorious dynasty, it was then paramount to properly legitimize and in so doing "Egyptianize" the new dynasty, especially if the dynasty in question was foreign. The legitimization of a dynasty was probably the most important phase in the acquisition and holding of power in the Late Period because the dynasties of this period were often foreign and as such had few if any links to Egypt's past, with the possible exception of the Nubians, although they never held power over a united Egypt until the period in question here. Ultimately, the efforts of political legitimization in the Late Period had the effect of legitimizing not just one ruler but an entire dynasty. As such, the dynasts of the Late Period were forced to portray themselves not as conquering foreigners or native usurpers but as legitimate Egyptian kings carrying out the proper religious and secular duties that ensured the continuance of Egyptian culture, both physically and spiritually. The intent of this chapter is to demonstrate that the various dynasts of the Late Period made conscious efforts to legitimize their rule through monument building and adding to existing structures that would connect them to previous dynasties and periods in pharaonic history that were more stable. It is not the intent of this work to present an exhaustive catalog of Late Period monuments, but rather to discuss some of the more important ones and how they fit into a particular king or dynasty's program of political legitimization. Each dynasty is given consideration chronologically with the monuments that seem to speak to conscious legitimization efforts given the most attention.

Another important aspect of political legitimization in the Late Period was the patronage of religious cults and institutions that became particularly important during this

period. The two most important of these institutions – the Apis cult and the office of the God's Wife of Amen – became of such important spiritual and political focal points during the Late Period that the successive dynasts were compelled to carry on these established traditions. The exception was the Persian abolition of the office of the God's Wife of Amen, although their discontinuance of that institution was also politically motivated. Again, like the monuments mentioned above, the intent here is not to catalog every chapel, stelae, and sarcophagus related to these institutions but rather to use the existing sources in order to capture an image of how these institutions were used for political legitimization.

Before a survey of these monuments and activity at these religious cults was conducted, a brief definition/explanation of the word "propaganda" must be arrived at and how it pertains to ancient Egyptian history. Modern and ancient definitions of the word propaganda will help this study better arrive at conclusions concerning why certain kings and dynasties chose to build where they did and patronize certain cults, while their avoidance of certain geographic areas and cults may also help explain certain aspects of a king or dynasty's rule.

The word "propaganda" has often attained a more pejorative status in the modern lexicon; one that evokes images of blatantly false information and is often associated with repressive regimes.[1] Propaganda does not need to be so insidious and in fact has been utilized by many governments throughout history to elicit support for more benign

[1] *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* defines propaganda as, "The spreading of ideas, information, or rumor for the purpose of helping or injuring an institution, a cause, or a person." Obviously this definition means that propaganda can be, and is, used by a variety of groups in the modern world from corporations trying to sell a product to opposing political parties attempting to assume power in their respective governments. The pejorative status of the word comes from the latter which often conjures up images of Josef Goebbels and Nazi propaganda before and during World War II or of the Soviet propaganda during the Cold War.

particular programs. John MacKenzie offered an excellent definition of the term propaganda in his study of that subject during the British Empire:

> Propaganda can be defined as the transmission of ideas and values from one person, or group of persons, to another, with the specific intention of influencing the recipients' attitudes in such a way that the interests of its authors will be enhanced. Although it may be veiled, seeking to influence thoughts, beliefs and actions by suggestion, it must be conscious and deliberate.[2]

Although the British Empire is a modern example that had a multitude of propaganda media at its disposal, and comprised a much larger geographic range than any dynasty discussed in this dissertation, it provides a working reference for this study. The modern definition of propaganda can be compared with definitions of the word in relation to Egyptology. William Kelly Simpson defined propaganda in ancient Egypt as "maintenance" meaning "the concept of maintaining the status quo, the political, religious situation and not changing it,"[3] while Lotty Spycher proposed that "politische, weltanschauliche und religiöse Ideen wurden seit frühester Zeit im Dienste des Königtums verbreitet."[4] More importantly, Spycher stated that this was more apparent at the beginning of a reign:

> Besonders deutlich wird dies zu Beginn einer Regierung. Der König als Wiederholer der Schöpfung beendet den chaotisch-gesetzlosen Zustand der Welt, triumphiert über äussere wie innere Feinde (Krieg, Opposition) und bringt damit den Menschen den ersehnten Frieden."[5]

---

[2] John Mackenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 3.

[3] William Kelly Simpson, "*Belles Lettres* and Propaganda," in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms,* ed. Antonio Loprieno (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 436.

[4] Lotty Spycher, "Propaganda," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, ed. Eberhard Otto and Wolfgang Helck (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975), 4:1120.

[5] Ibid.

Spycher's explanation of the importance of propaganda at the beginning of a reign is especially applicable in the Late Period, when the new king had to not only establish his role as the upholder of order, but also the legitimate ruler of a dynasty that was often foreign and almost always which came to power through usurpation or invasion. The standard medium covered in this chapter, in which most Egyptian kings carried out their propaganda programs, was through the building of monuments because "the mere erection of a monument dedicated to god was the most prominent proof of that legitimacy to posterity,"[6] but literary texts commissioned by a king and other written media in ancient Egypt can also be considered as such.[7]

The people of the ancient Near East, particularly the Assyrians, were also adept at propagandizing their rule. J.E. Curtis argued that the creation of the city of Nimrud was itself a boldly calculated propaganda ploy as were the "magnificent public works" that went along with the city.[8] Later, the Assyrian king Sennacherib would conquer Babylon and attempt to elevate the Assyrian god, Ashur, as the supreme deity of the empire. Curtis argued that this too was a move that was influenced by propagandistic motives. He writes:

---

[6] Christopher J. Eyre, "Is Egyptian Historical Literature 'Historical' or 'Literary'," in *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, 419.

[7] The use of propaganda in ancient Egyptian literature was first studied by Georges Posener in *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe dynasties* (Paris: Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes, 1956). See especially Chapter II, 61-86, where Posener analyzed the "Instructions of Amenemhat I" in the context of political crisis and the legitimization of his son's rule; also see Chapter V of this dissertation for a historiographical discussion about that text, including Posener's ideas. For a study of textual uses of propaganda in the late New Kingdom and Late Period see Nicholas Grimal, *Les termes de la propaganda royale égyptienne: De la XIXe dynastie à la conquête d'Alexandre* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1986). Grimal's work is a thematic approach within the framework of the chronology set forth.

[8] J. E. Curtis and J. E. Reade eds., *Art and Empire: Treasures from Assyria in the British Museum* (London: British Museum Press, 1995), 27.

> Sennacherib was creating what was effectively a new imperial cult, one to which Babylonians too would perhaps subscribe. With Ashur as supreme god and Nineveh as cosmopolitan metropolis, with the provinces consolidated and peaceful, the Assyrian empire could be viewed as the natural and proper World Order, something with which all subject peoples could identify.[9]

The Assyrians would briefly rule Egypt[10] but their rule was so ephemeral that they erected no major monuments, but the Achaemenid Persians lasted much longer in Egypt and left their mark physically using legitimization methods that they appear to have acquired from both the Near East and Egypt.

The Persians appear to have followed a legitimization program similar to the Assyrians because after they conquered Babylon the new rulers preserved the Marduk cult and even took credit for its care in the *Cyrus Cylinder*.[11] Apparently Cyrus' claims in the *Cyrus Cylinder* were not hyperbole and can be verified to some extent by archeological evidence. Michael Jursa writes:

> Unbiased archival sources support the cylinder's claim to a certain extent. Brick inscriptions from Uruk prove that Cyrus in fact undertook repairs of cultic buildings there. One text dating to the fourth year of his reign refers to attempts to reorganize cultic practices in Eshnunna and Akkad.[12]

In the turbulent and often politically unstable world of the Near East in the First Millennium BC, empires rose by utilizing overwhelming armies, but they maintained order by methods that included monument building.

---

[9] Ibid., 29.

[10] See Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[11] For an English translation of the cylinder see, A. Leo Oppenheim, trans., "Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. with supplement., ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969), 315-16.

[12] Michael Jursa, "The Transition of Babylonia from the Neo-Babylonian Empire to Achaemenid Rule," in *Regime Change in the Ancient Near East and Egypt: From Sargon of Agade to Saddam Hussein*, ed. Harriet Crawford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 77-78.

Now that the definition of propaganda has been established and how it pertained to political legitimization in ancient Egypt and the Near East, a detailed survey of its uses in each Late Period dynasty must be conducted. The definition of what is considered a monument worthy of being examined in this chapter must also be established. Essentially, almost any type of monument "from a renewal of a temple or the sinking of wells on a caravan route"[13] may have had a propagandistic or legitimizing intent since "the king is always shown as instigator."[14] In other words the genre of ancient Egyptian propaganda was as wide ranging as the utility of the monuments it accompanied. Like with most aspects of ancient Egyptian culture, the lines of religion and politics were often blurred in the messages put forth on these monuments. For instance, some Late Period monuments depict the foreign king carrying out the proper priestly rituals of a king while others show the king in the traditional pose of smiting foreign enemies, among which are ironically his own people.[15] Geographic placement of monuments will also be considered, with such questions being raised as who was the intended audience of said monument and why? This last point is especially of interest concerning the building programs of the Nubians and Saites and why the building projects of the Nubians "were

[13] Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 55.

[14] Ibid.

[15] The foreign king as priest will be discussed below concerning both the Nubian and Persian kings, while the smiting scenes from Medinet Habu are an example of the latter type which will be examined below.

limited to Upper Egypt, however, and there especially to Thebes. For unknown reasons, outside Thebes only modest buildings were erected."[16]

When Piankhy invaded Egypt in 728 BC[17] he was the first of many Late Period kings to patronize Egyptian cults and portray the foreign Nubian rulers as legitimate Egyptian kings, but evidence from Nubia shows that the Nubian kings were already using traditional titles and titulary before they entered Egypt.[18] The reasons for the Nubians doing this may be related to their acculturation to Egyptian culture as a result of New Kingdom colonization, more specifically "its contemporary or historical resonance."[19] Eyre was more emphatic in his assertion that "later kings reused elements from the name of Ramesses II in their titularies as manifesto and propaganda statement."[20] The use of traditional royal Egyptian titulary by the Nubian kings represents only a small portion of their program to legitimize the Twenty Fifth Dynasty. Most of what the Nubians did to

---

[16] Dieter Arnold, *Temples of the Last Pharaohs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 43. Of course one must consider that the monuments in Thebes were the only ones to *survive* until the modern period. The water table and heavy population density of the Delta may hide Twenty Fifth Dynasty monuments yet unknown to modern scholars.

[17] See Chapter IV of this dissertation for a detailed analysis of the invasion.

[18] The use of traditional Egyptian epithets by Nubian kings has been examined by numerous scholars. For Piankhy's use of traditional Egyptian epithets see Kenneth Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: (1100 to 650 BC)*, 2nd ed. (Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris and Phillips, 1995), 359. For specific examples in comparison see Jürgen Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1984); László Török, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 198-215. Robert Morkot stated that a stela of the Nubian king Ary, excavated from Kawa may be the first example of this as the king used the common epithet employed by Ramesses II, *Usermaatra-Setep-en-Ra*. See his article "Tradition, Innovation, and Researching the Past in Libyan, Kushite and Saïte Egypt," in *Regime Change in the Ancient Near East and Egypt: From Sargon of Agade to Saddam Hussein*, ed. Harriet Crawford (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007), 150. For the hieroglyphic inscriptions from Kawa with English translations see M. F. Macadam, *The Temples of Kawa*, two vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949). For the Ary stela see plates 32-3. Morkot noted that his dating of the Ary stela is at odds with Macadam's who placed the monument's creation between 320 and 280 BC.

[19] Morkot, "Tradition," 150.

[20] Eyre, "Historical," 423.

legitimize their dynasty in Egypt revolved around building projects, many of them temples and other religious edifices. In order to understand the scope of Nubian propagandizing in this respect, a brief examination of Nubian religion must first be conducted.

Nubian religion before 728 BC – the year of Piankhy's successful conquest of Egypt – shared some qualities with Egyptian religion, although there were numerous distinct ritual and theological aspects, among the most apparent being the worship of the Nubian god Apedemak who was not known in Egypt.[21] Welsby argues that the Nubians only accepted aspects of Egyptian religion that they could consciously use to forward their own political program. He writes:

> A large part of the attraction of the northern religious ideology was conditioned by political considerations. This is well illustrated by the way the Kushite rulers only accepted certain features of Egyptian religion, particularly those which could be used to legitimize their right to rule.[22]

One of the aspects of Egyptian religion – and probably the most important – that the Nubians incorporated into their political-religious program was the cult of Amen.[23] The Nubians were no strangers to Amen as this god was introduced to them centuries earlier[24] and the patronage of his cult was extensive in the lands south of the First Cataract:

---

[21] Derek A. Welsby, *The Kingdom of Kush: The Napatan and Meroitic Empires* (Princeton, New Jersey: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1998), 73.

[22] Ibid., 74.

[23] Ibid; Török, *Kush*, 144, 271-3.

[24] Ibid., 73.

> It is well-known that the Theban Amun played an extraordinary role in the religious and political affairs of Twenty-Fifth Dynasty pharaohs. As the dynastic god of the Kushites, he was worshipped in four great temples – at Napata, Sanam (Tore), Kawa, and Pnubs (Tabo on the island of Argo).[25]

It was this conscious acceptance of Amen that that led to Piankhy's pilgrimage to Thebes and observance of the *Opet* festival.[26]

The most visible and enduring manner in which the Nubians established their legitimacy to rule Egypt was the temples they built, and the many more they were responsible for refurbishing .[27] Despite not creating many new temples in Egypt, the Nubians were innovative in their additions to existing temples. Arnold has noted that additions to temples in the Twenty Fifth Dynasty can be placed into three categories. He wrote:

> Three types of additions catch the eye. One is the kiosk standing free in the forecourt or some distance from the main temple. The second type is a kiosk adjoining the temple façade with its back wall. The third building type is a porch of several parallel rows of columns, also leaning against the temple but with a fully open court.[28]

---

[25] L. V. Žabkar, *Apedemak Lion God of Meroe: A Study in Egyptian-Meroitic Syncretism* (Warminster, U.K.: Aris and Phillips, 1975), 81.

[26] For the Egyptian hieroglyphic text and French translation of Piankhy's pilgrimage see Nicholas Grimal, *Le stèle tromphale de Pi(ankh)* (Cairo: *L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 1981), particularly lines 25-7. For an English translation see Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 4:426. For another English translation see Miriam Lichtheim ed. and trans, *The Late Period*, vol. 1 of *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1976), 71. Before Piankhy embarked on his Egyptian expedition he erected a stela at the Temple of Gebel Barkal in Napata in which he gave praise to Amen; Kitchen, *Third*, 359. For an analysis of the stela in its historiographical context – particularly how Piankhy appealed to Egyptian religious sentiments – see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[27] Arnold, *Temples*, 44.

[28] Ibid. The Nubians continued to incorporate the kiosk into the temples in their native land long after they were driven south by the Saites. Žabkar, *Apedemak*, 1.

It was during the reign of the fourth king of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty, Taharqa, with the Saite threat temporarily suppressed,[29] that the "temple building at Thebes reached the level of his royal predecessors of the New Kingdom."[30]

The most extensive building/remodeling during the Twenty Fifth Dynasty took place at Karnak Temple. Taharqa was the most prominent builder at Thebes, most of which was carried under the direction of the illustrious mayor of Thebes, Montuemhat.[31] One of the more notable early additions made by the Nubians was the chapel of Osiris Heqa-Djet, located just east of the main temple.[32] This chapel was originally constructed in the Twenty Third Dynasty, but a new façade and atrium were added during the reign of Shabaqa. Leclant noted:

> Le souverain éthiopien Chabataka et les Divines Adoratrices, Chepenoupet I et Aménirdis I, on littéralement "habillé" l'édifice primitive en avançant dans la cour une nouvelle façade, avec murs de retour, qui englobent l'ancienne façade restée sans modifications.[33]

---

[29] This is of course due to the assassination of Bakenrenef. See Chapter V in this dissertation for details of this and all regicides during the Late Period.

[30] Arnold, *Temples*, 43. Although Taharqa's building programs were more extensive than his Nubian predecessors – which was likely connected to the relative internal stability he enjoyed during his reign – it was the programs of Shabaqa that were written about most by Herodotus. Herodotus described Shabaqa as a just ruler who used criminals convicted of serious crimes for *corvee* labor instead of death. "But instead of the death-penalty he compelled the offender, according to the seriousness of the offence, to raise the level of the soil in the neighborhood of his native town." Herodotus, *The Histories,* trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (New York: Penguin Books, 1996), 151, Book II, 137.

[31] Arnold, *Temples*, 51. For a complete catalog of monuments attributed to Montuemhat see Jean Leclant, *Montouemhat: Quatrième prophète d'Amon prince de la ville* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1961).

[32] Jean Leclant, *Recherches sur les monuments Thébains de la XXVe Dynastie dite Ethiopienne* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Oreintale, 1965), 47. Bertha Porter and Rosalind L.B. Moss, *Theban Temples*, vol 2 of *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1934), 204-6.

[33] Leclant, *Thébains,*50.

Mariam Ayad points out that this "enlargement was only possible after a definite military success"[34] but even more important, concerning the legitimization of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty, was what Amenirdis did to the chapel:

> Remarkably, Amenirdis did not appropriate any of the scenes depicting Shepenwepet, nor did she erase any of her predecessor's cartouches. . . Instead of erasing or appropriating any of Shepenwepet's scenes, Amenirdis sought to incorporate the entire Twenty-third dynasty façade, with its legitimating scenes, into the decorative program of the newly added chamber. In doing so, Amenirdis was claiming for herself the very same legitimacy that was bestowed on Shepenwepet in those striking scenes.[35]

The chapel of Osiris Heqa-Djet was not only important for the legitimization of Amenirdis individually as the God's Wife of Amen, but even more so for the Twenty Fifth Dynasty as a whole because this monument connected the Nubians to one of the most important religious institutions in Late Period Egypt, particularly in the Theban region, which gave the Nubians both a symbolic connection to Egypt's recent past but also political ties.

The Nubians saw the institution of the God's Wife of Amen as central to their rule in Egypt so much so that Piankhy probably appointed Amenirdis to the powerful position before his invasion of Egypt.[36] The office of the God's Wife of Amen as a *political*

---

[34] Mariam Ayad, *God's Wife, God's Servant: The God's Wife of Amun (c. 740-525 BC)* (London: Routledge, 2009), 129. See Chapter IV of this dissertation for the details of Shabaqa's invasion of Egypt in 712. Ayad's assertion fits the pattern explored in this dissertation that a decisive military victory and regicide of the previous king is followed closely by legitimization of the dynasty, often in the form of monument building.

[35] Ibid., 130.

[36] Kitchen states, "That Amenirdis I was at Thebes before Piankhy's great Egyptian campaign is most likely – but that gives us 20 years of Piankhy's reign in which he could install her in Thebes." *Third*, 151n. Concurring is Ayad, *God's Wife*, 16. Angelika Lohwasser concurs in the belief that Amenirdis was installed before Piankhy's invasion, but believes it was her father, Kashta, not her brother, Piankhy, who had her installed, see; "Queenship in Kush: Status, Role, and Ideology of Royal Women." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 38 (2001): 69. Unfortunately there is a dearth of primary sources which could help put this question to rest. Kitchen believes that a graffito from near the Red Sea which

institution had been established firmly when the Twenty Third Dynasty king, Osorokon III, appointed his daughter, Shepenwepet I, as the God's Wife of Amen, which was the first time any woman held this title since Ramesses VI's daughter, Isis. But it was in the Twenty Third Dynasty that "the full political potential of the office was realized."[37] The appointment of Amenirdis to the position of God's Wife of Amen by Piankhy also coincided "with a fifty-year gap during which the office of the High Priest of Amun remained vacant,"[38] which meant that the Nubians were able to establish their power base in Upper Egypt for the long term as the prominence of the Nubian God's Wives eclipsed "the earliest attested Nubian High Priest of Amun."[39] Although the Nubian kings' patronage of the office of the God's Wife of Amen may not present the modern scholar with as dramatic visual presentations of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty's imprint in pharaonic Egypt as a pylon or another massive edifice, the connections made with the office were probably more important on a practical level. The monuments erected by the Nubians, and the other dynasties in this period, provided a visible link with previous more stable periods of pharaonic history, but the political currency gained from these attempts at political legitimization are difficult to gauge. Patronage of the office of the God's Wife of Amen on the other hand provided tangible political benefits to the Nubians as they were able to turn an already existing presence in the Theban region into a political-religious headquarters while at the same time providing continuity with the recent past.

---

reads, "Year 12 – adoritrice of the God, Amenirdis" and "Year 19 – God's Wife Shepenupet " refer to the dates of the reigns of both Piankhy and Takelot III in 736 BC. ca. *Third,* 175-76; 359-60.

[37] Ayad, *God's Wife*, 15.

[38] Ibid., 118.

[39] Ibid. The importance of the God's Wife of Amen will also be considered in the other dynasties of the Late Period throughout this chapter.

The Nubian building program at Karnak also included many additions to the north group. Taharqa was active here as he built a temple to Montu complete with a colonnade.[40] The New Kingdom Temple of Mut was also "restructured"[41] by Taharqa during his reign. The restructuring included a "34m wide section, containing a hypostyle hall with eight columns and some side rooms."[42] Six chapels were also built by the God's Wives of Amen in the north Karnak Temple group during the Twenty Fifth Dynasty.[43] These included the chapel of Osiris Pededankh, which was dedicated by the God's Wives Shepenwepet II and Amenirdis II, that is now destroyed and its present location is unknown,[44] and a chapel where several statues of the God's Wife of Amen, Amenirdis, were found.[45] Another important contribution by the Nubians at Karnak was the enlargement of the Sacred Lake.[46] On the north side of the Sacred Lake, Taharqa built a new temple, possibly from the blocks of a previous temple built by his predecessor, Shabaqa.[47] Shebitqu – not known for any significant building projects – is credited with a chapel on the south side of the Sacred Lake.[48]

Perhaps the most impressive building program, in terms of propaganda and political legitimization, undertaken by the Nubian kings is the small temple at Medinet

---

[40] Arnold, *Temples*, 54; Leclant, *Ethiopienne*, 85-6; Porter, *Theban*, 5.

[41] Arnold, *Temples*, 47.

[42] Arnold, *Temples*, 47; Porter, *Theban*, 5.

[43] Arnold, *Temples*, 47.

[44] Porter, *Theban*, 5.

[45] Ibid., 14-15.

[46] Morkot, *Pharaohs*, 240.

[47] Leclant, *Ethiopienne*, 63; Morkot, *Pharaohs*, 240.

[48] Leclant, *Ethiopienne*, 63; Morkot, *Pharaohs*, 240.

Habu, in particular the reliefs on the second pylon. The most important scene, for the current study, from the small temple, which was dedicated by Shabaqa, but later possibly usurped by Taharqa,[49] is a depiction on the second pylon of Shabaqa or Taharqa smiting the traditional enemies of Egypt, both Libyan *and* Nubian.[50] Although the iconographical motif of the pharaoh smiting the enemies of Egypt is attested in the earliest periods of dynastic Egypt,[51] the scene from the second pylon of the small temple at Medinet Habu represents a calculated move by the Nubians to depict themselves not as foreigners but as the rightful kings of Egypt. The conscious iconographical makeover the Nubians gave themselves at Medinet Habu can be traced to a temple at Kawa dedicated by Taharqa. A scene from Kawa depicts the king, Taharqa, as a sphinx trampling various Libyans.[52] These reliefs "directly reproduce specific details of a conquest first recorded" during the rule of king Sahura in the Fifth Dynasty.[53] Ritner writes that the Kawa reliefs represent more than just the simple recycling of defeated enemies that was common throughout

[49] Porter, *Theban*, 464; Leclant, *Ethiopienne*, 147-8.

[50] Leclant, *Ethiopienne*, 149; Porter, *Theban*, 465.

[51] See for example the *Narmer Palette* currently housed in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo #JE32169. For a collection of pharaonic smiting scenes arranged in chronological order see Emma Swan Hall, *The Pharaoh Smites his Enemies* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1986). She writes that the pharaonic smiting scene "reached its ultimate expression, its peak" in the Ramesside period (28). Her treatment of pharaonic smiting scenes in the Late Period is extremely cursory, mentioning only that Shabaqa had his name inscribed on scarabs with smiting scenes (42, see Chapter IV of this dissertation for a discussion of one of these scarabs which possibly details Shabaqa's possible re-invasion of Egypt in 712 BC), but giving no attention to the scenes from the pylon discussed above. A similar study was published a short time later by Alan Schulman, *Ceremonial Execution and Public Reward* (Freiburg: Universitätveralg, 1988).

[52] Macadam, *Kawa*, 2:61-5, plates IX and XLVIII-XLIX.

[53] Robert K. Ritner, "Libyan vs. Nubian as the Ideal Egyptian," in *Egypt and Beyond: Essay Presented of Leonard H. Lesko upon his Retirement from the Wilbour Chair of Egyptology at Brown University, June 2005*, ed. Stephen E. Thompson and Peter Der Manuelian (Providence: Brown University Press, 2008), 305

pharaonic history, but was a "manifestation of contemporary political propaganda."[54] He further argues that the political situation of the eighth century BC revolved around the "culture wars" in which the "Libyan and Nubian elites competed in the appropriation of Egyptian cultural symbolism."[55]

The appropriation of Egyptian culture Ritner wrote about is most clearly expressed by the Nubians on the second pylon of the small temple at Medinet Habu. In this relief the Nubian king, either Shabaqa or Taharqa, carries out his duty as pharaoh by smiting the foreigners and thereby upholding *Maat* in the process. The Nubian king is metaphysically transformed from a dangerous foreigner to a contemporary Egyptian king linked with the great kings of Egypt's past. One important question is raised from the examination of the Taharqa smiting scene from Kawa; if smiting scenes reached their zenith during the New Kingdom and since Nubian kings often duplicated or were inspired by New Kingdom royal titulary, why was an Old Kingdom smiting scene chosen over the many more New Kingdom scenes that were visible and available? Perhaps Taharqa believed that by displaying his breadth of Egyptian historical knowledge he established a better connection with the past. Almost every other aspect of political legitimization undertaken by the Nubians, considered in this chapter, involved either additions to New Kingdom monuments or the patronage of the God's Wife of Amen which was initiated in the New Kingdom so it may be that the Nubians, who believed

[54] Ibid., 306.

[55] Ibid. For further discussion of these "culture wars" between the Nubians and the Libyans/Saites see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

themselves to be true Egyptians,[56] felt the need to incorporate *all* of pharaonic history into their political program.

Despite an aggressive and seemingly successful attempt to legitimize the Twenty Fifth Dynasty, Nubian rule in Egypt would prove to be ephemeral.[57] Their successors, the Saites, followed many of the same tactics as their Nubian predecessors by erecting monuments and patronizing religious institutions and cults. The Saites proved to be prolific builders as they created "at least a dozen prominent temples" and "numerous additions to already standing buildings."[58] The Saite kings almost entirely concentrated their building energies in Lower Egypt and with one notable exception, left Thebes alone.[59] The reasons why the Saites left Thebes virtually untouched with any building projects is open to conjecture but it may be that they felt themselves too weak to directly challenge the Theban power base so instead opted for an indirect approach by infiltrating the office of the God's Wife of Amen. The other, more likely, reason may be that outside of the office of the God's Wife of Amen Thebes had little to offer the Saites in terms of power or prestige as the city had long since passed its zenith in the New Kingdom and was after the Twenty Fifth Dynasty relegated to a political "backwater." In fact the rulers of Twenty Fifth Dynasty themselves, after Piankhy, ruled from Memphis which was geographically closer to the kingdoms and events that were unfolding in the Near East in

---

[56] See Chapter IV in the section about Piankhy's invasion of Egypt about how the Nubians viewed themselves in regards to Egyptian culture.

[57] For the Assyrian invasions of Egypt and the subsequent expulsion of the Nubians see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[58] Arnold, *Temples*, 64.

[59] Ibid. The notable exception is the Nitoqris adoption stela which was erected at Karnak Temple. The significance of this stela will be discussed below in this chapter.

the First Millennium BC. The foreign origins of the Saites,[60] which combined with the vanquished but still geographically close Nubians, meant that they were also confronted with the task of legitimizing their dynasty and winning the support of the Egyptian elite like their Nubian predecessors. The first official king of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, the long-lived Psamtek I, wasted no time legitimizing the new dynasty by embarking on an ambitious program of political legitimization which included an addition to the tomb chambers of the sacred Apis bulls, known as the Serapeum and the Ptah Temple in Saqqara.[61]

The Serapeum functioned as the subterranean tombs for the deceased Apis bulls. Above ground, in the district of the Temple of Ptah, were the embalming house (*wabet*), mentioned above, and living quarters of the sacred bull. Archaeologists believe that the

---

[60] On the ethnic background of the Saites and their duplicity in the Nubian-Assyrian wars and ultimate capture of the Egyptian throne see Chapter IV of this dissertation. Especially the section where the Tefnakht stela is discussed and his titles as the "Chief of the Libu" and "Chief of the Ma" which were of course both Libyan tribes.

[61] Although used for centuries, the Serapeum, like all pharaonic temples, eventually fell into disuse. The first century BC historian, Strabo, visited Egypt in 24/25 BC and noticed a half-buried sphinx allee outside of the Seraepeum. Strabo, *Geography: Book I*, trans. Horace Leonard Jones (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001), XVII, I. The modern discovery of the Serapeum was made nearly 2000 years later by French scholar, Auguste Mariette, who found the Serapeum accidentally. Auguste Mariette and G. Maspero, Auguste Mariette and G. Maspero, *Le Sérapeum de Memphis* (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1882), 1. Flinders Petrie was the first English speaking Egyptologist to conduct major research on the Serapeum which he did as he conducted archeological work at the Temple of Ptah. W.M.F. Petrie, *Memphis I* (London: British School of Archaeology, 1909). The over 1000 votive stelae in the Serapeum (see Chapter VII of this dissertation for a discussion of these) have been published in partial volume by: Michel Malinine, Georges Posener, and Jean Vercoutter, *Catalogue des stèles du Sérapeum de Memphis* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1968); Michel Malinine, *Choix de textes juridques en hiératique 'anormal' et en démotique (XXV-XXVII Dynasties)* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1953); Michael Malinine, *Choix de textes juridques en hiératique 'anormal' et en démotique (deuxième partie)* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1983).Georges Posener, *La première domination Perse en Égypte: Recueil d'inscriptions hieroglyphs* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1936); Jean Vercoutter, *Textes biographiques du Sérapéum: Contribution à l'étude des stèles votives du Sérapéum* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1962). More recent archeological work of the Serapeum has been conducted by Michael Jones, see Jones and Angela Milward Jones, "The Apis House Project at Mit Rahinah: First Season, 1982," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 19 (1982): 15-58; "Second and Third Seasons," 20 (1983): 33-39; "The Fourth Season," 22 (1985): 17-28; "The Fifth Season," 24 (1987): 35-46; "The Sixth Season," 25 (1988): 105-116.

embalming house and living quarters of the Apis bull were located in the same section of the temple,[62] which is where the earliest dated structure associated with the Serapeum, a calcite table from the reign of Sheshonq I was located.[63] After the Apis bull died, it was placed on an embalming table in the *wabet* house with its legs up and was mummified.[64] During this process "the underground vaults of the Serapeum were opened only for the 70 days during which the body of the Apis was being embalmed and for the actual burial."[65] The mummy of the Apis bull was then placed on a wheeled cart and paraded in splendor to its final resting place in the subterranean chambers.[66] Although the oldest inscription from the embalming house is dated to the Twenty Second Dynasty, the Serapeum was hundreds of years old by that time.

The oldest chambers of the Serapeum were constructed during the reign of king Amenhotep III in the Eighteenth Dynasty through year thirty of Ramesses II's reign in the Nineteenth Dynasty. The small chambers, "petits souterrains," were built from year thirty of Ramesses II through year twenty-one of Psamtek I in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, and the great chamber was constructed by Psamtek I and expanded by the Ptolemies.[67]

---

[62] John Dimick, "The Embalming House of the Apis Bulls," *Archaeology* 11 (1958): 185

[63] The slab was first published by Henirich Brugsch, "Ein wichtiges Denkmal aus den Zeiten Königs *šeš*onq I," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 16 (1878): 37-41. Also see Jones, "House Project, 1982," 51; Porter, *Saqqara to Dashur*, vol. 3 part II of *Bibliography*, 841.

[64] Dimick, "Embalming," 187.

[65] Jean Vercoutter, "Napatan," 66.

[66] Dimick, "Embalming," 187.

[67] Farouk Gomaà, *Chaemwese Sohn Ramses II und Hoherpriester von Memphis* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973), 39.

Khaemwaset, the talented son of Ramesses II,[68] was responsible for much of the construction of the oldest chambers. Part of his duties as High Priest of Ptah was to oversee construction of the Serapeum and care for the Apis bull. "Zu den Pflichten des Chaemwese als dem Hohenpriester von Memphis gehörte auch die Sorge für den heiligen Apis-Stier, seinen Kult und vor allem Bestatung."[69] No doubt that Psamtek I viewed the patronage of the Apis cult and construction on the Serapeum burial chambers as a key aspect in his quest to legitimize not only his individual rule but that of his new upstart dynasty. Because Saite power was concentrated in their home city of Sais it was imperative for Psamtek I to establish a presence – geographically, politically, and culturally – in other important areas of Egypt. By patronizing the Apis cult, Psamtek I added to his presence in the Memphite region, he was able to continue the link with previous dynasties who also patronized the cult, especially the glorious New Kingdom dynasties, and he was able to play a role in the growing religious movement that was taking place in Egypt at the time – the popular worship and participation in animal cults.[70]

---

[68] Aidan Dodson and Dyan Hilton, *The Complete Royal Families of Ancient Egypt* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2004), 171.

[69] Gomaà, *Chaemwese,* 39.

[70] For the rise of animal cults in the Late Period see, J. D. Ray, "The World of North Saqqara." *World Archaeology* 10 (1978): 149-157; The House of Osorapis," in *Man, Settlement, and Urbanism*, eds. Peter J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G.W. Dimbleby (Cambridge,Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing, 1972), 699-704. On the excavations of the animal necropolises see Geoffery T. Martin, "Excavations in the Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara, 1971-2: Preliminary Report," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59 (1973): 5-15; *The Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara: The Southern* Dependencies (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1981). For archeological studies of other animal necropolises see Alain Zivie, *Découverte à Saqqara: Le vizir oublié* (Paris: Seuil, 1990); and Roger Lictenberg. "Les chats du Bubasteion de Saqqâra: État de la question et perspectives." In *Egyptology at the Dawn of the 21st Century: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, ed. Zahi Hawas and Lyla Pinch Brock (Cairo: American University in Cairo, 2004), 605-11.

A stela from year eleven of Psamtek I from Saqqara relates how Psamtek I made efforts to legitimize his rule through force.[71] The badly damaged text describes the king returning from a trip that was possibly a pilgrimage to a Middle Kingdom monument,[72] only to find that there was an uprising of Libyans in the western districts.[73] Psamtek I responded by ordering a military draft, which was conducted by local mayors, in order to combat the Libyan threat.[74] The propagandistic/legitimizing nature of this text should not be overlooked. The text clearly positions Psamtek I as the legitimate *Egyptian* king of Egypt and the traditional and foreign Libyans as the enemy. Donald Redford notes that the Saites were descended from the Libyans who inundated the Delta centuries earlier:

> The chiefs of the Labu of the 8th Century spawned cultural, if not blood, heirs in Sais and Buto, and 200 years later the 26th Dynasty carried to its logical conclusion the trend established by its spiritual forebears.[75]

The irony of the Saqqara stela lay with the fact that it was a major campaign conducted by Psamtek I against his Libyan cousins; but was he *consciously* aware of this situation? Perhaps this was similar to the situation discussed above concerning the second pylon of

---

[71] The Saqqara Stela dates to year eleven of Psamtek I's reign and is currently housed on the outside of the Egyptian Museum, Cairo. The stela measurements are: 126 cm. high and 101 cm. wide. The stela is comprised of limestone and its original provenance was south Saqqara, near the pyramid of Pepy I. The two most notable publications of the stela, which provide translations in German and English respectively, are Hans Goedicke, "Psamtmetik I. und die Libyer," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäoligischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 18 (1962): 25-49; Peter D. Manuelian, *Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty* (London: Keegan Paul International, 1994), 323-35.

[72] The line is an A pw B nominal construction that reads: [*iwt*] *pw ir n ḥm.f*… "His majesty returned." Manuelian states that "there is considerable room for additional signs before the start of line 2 and the name of Amenemhat." *Archaism,* 328 n. Goedicke believed the trip was to a monument first built by the Middle Kingdom king. "Libyer," 36-7.

[73] Manuelian, *Archaism*, 325. Line 3.

[74] Ibid. Lines 4-11.

[75] Donald Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992), 330. Also see Chapter IV for a discussion of Tefnakht's – who was the mayor of Sais in 728 BC and progenitor of the Saite Twenty Sixth Dynasty – genealogy which linked him to both the Ma and Libu tribes of the Libyans.

the small temple at Medient Habu – Shabaqa/Taharqa desired to be viewed as legitimate Egyptian rulers to the point that he had himself depicted smiting Nubians.[76] If one is to take all of the statements in the stela as fact, then one is led to believe that Psamtek I conducted this campaign out of necessity in order to suppress a possible Libyan invasion, but as discussed in Chapter IV of this dissertation,[77] ancient "historical" texts can and should not always be viewed for the information itself. The motive behind the commissioning of the text should be considered here – why did Psamtek I have this particular event commemorated and who was the intended audience?[78] Since the audience would have been Egyptians and not Libyans then the possibility should be considered that Psamtek I wanted to distance himself as much as possible from his Libyan ancestry so he carried out a campaign against them and then ceremoniously had a stela erected that commemorated his victory over these traditional enemies of Egypt. Like the reliefs from the second pylon of the small temple of Medinet Habu historical facts are less important here because as stated above, "history itself became an ideological model, to be reenacted."[79]

---

[76] The fragmentary nature of Libyan society before their integration into greater Egyptian society should also be considered here as at least part of the explanation. Robert Ritner argues that Libyan society was essentially kin-based an devoid of central leadership which led to the patchwork of kingdoms in Egypt during the Third Intermediate Period that the Nubians were only able to nominally supress. Robert Ritner, "Fragmentation and Re-integration in the Third Intermediate Period," in *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical And Cultural Studies into the 21st-24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at LeidenUniversity, 25-27 October 2007*, eds. G. P. F. Broekman, R.J. Demarée, and O.E, Kaper (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor Het Nabije Oosten, 2009), 334. He further states that during the reign of Psamtek I the last vestiges of Libyan society were consciously eliminated by the king at that the "campaign against the Libyans in year 11 set the seal on the demise of Libyan-era Egypt." 340.

[77] See especially the first few pages of that chapter and the insight provided by Mario Liverani, "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographical Texts," *Orientalia* 42 (1973): 178-194.

[78] Of course this text does fit the *topos* of the king defeating rebels and upholding *Maat*. Chapter V of this dissertation discusses this idea as it pertains to punishment by fire for rebellion. Again, if in fact this text follows a prescribed formula of a specific genre the questions raised above still remain.

[79] Eyre, "Historical," 423.

Perhaps the most important act, and well known, of political legitimization carried out by Psamtek I was the installment of his daughter, Nitoqris, as the God's Wife of Amen. Despite the office of God's Wife of Amen originating in the late New Kingdom and later being heavily politicized by the Nubians[80] "it was the Saites, not the Libyans nor the Nubians, who monumentalized the official decrees installing their royal princesses as God's Wives of Amun."[81] The installment of the first Saite God's Wife of Amen, Nitoqris, in the ninth year of Psamtek I's reign (656 BC) was commemorated on a stela that was discovered in the forecourt of the temple of Amen at Karnak.[82] The politico-economic importance of this text – in terms of the *imyt-pr* which ceded all property from the previous Nubian God's Wife – has been explored by Betsy Bryan,[83] but it is the propagandistic effect of the stela itself that is of interest here. Psamtek I's political acumen manifested itself once more not only by installing his daughter as the God's Wife and thereby co-opting that important institution into the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, but Ayad believes that the creation and public display of the stela "ensured public acceptance of its contents."[84] Although there is no way of knowing for sure if the

---

[80] Ayad, *God's Wife*, 15; 118.

[81] Ibid., 120.

[82] The stela is currently housed in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo #Jd'E 36327. The stela is comprised of red granite and measures 188.4 cm. height and 145.5 cm. width. For the hieroglyphic transcription and English translation of this text see Ricardo A. Caminos, "The Nitocris Adoption Stela," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 50 (1964): 71-101. For a more current English translation, hieroglyphic transcription, and transliteration see Manuelian, *Archaism*, 297-321. Nitoqris' possible genealogy and familial connections to the earliest Saite rulers, Tefnakht and Bakenrenef, was explored by Louis Christophe, "L'Ascendance de la divine adoritrice Nitocris," *Cahiers d'histoire Égyptienne* 4 (1951): 223-235.

[83] For a study of the *imyt-pr* and other financial aspects of the office of the God's Wife of Amen see, Betsy Bryan, "Property and the God's Wife of Amun," in *Women and Property*, eds. D. Lyons and R. Westbrook (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Center for Hellenic Studies, 2005), 1-15, especially page 4 for an explanation of this legal instrument; Ayad, *God's Wife*, 24-5.

[84] Ibid., 140.

monument ensured acceptance as it was intended to do, evidence of the continued patronage by later Saite kings appears to confirm the acceptance, as a second God's Wife, Ankhnesneferibra, was installed after the death of Nitoqris during the reign of Apries in 596 BC.[85] Despite the God's Wife of Amen being a religious/political institution that the Nubians effectively incorporated into their political program, the Saites saw it as politically expedient to also patronize this institution. The primary reasons being similar to that of their Nubian predecessors – to infiltrate and politically control the Theban political power structure.

Other than the Adoption Stela of Nitoqris and a few small temples dedicated by her and the last Saite God's Wife, Ankhnesneferibra,[86] no Saite king "built a noteworthy monument in the Theban area."[87] The reasons for the lack of Saite building projects in Thebes are not clear, but two possible answers should be considered. The first and most likely explanation may be that simply Thebes no longer held the same amount power and prestige that it enjoyed in the New Kingdom, becoming eclipsed by Lower Egyptian cities in the First Millennium such as Tanis, Bubastis, and more importantly Sais, which was of course the home city of the Twenty Sixth Dynasty. As Egypt's international power waned in the Late Period, the Saites were better served concentrating their political energies in the north where they were much closer to the events unfolding in the

[85] Anthony Leahy, "The Adoption of Ankhnesneferibre at Karnak," *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 82 (1996): 157.

[86] Porter, *Theban*, 13, 19.

[87] Arnold, *Temples*, 64. It should be noted that tombs of the Saite nobles Basa, Pabasa, Ibi, Pedihoresnet, and Ankhor were built at Thebes. 331n.

Levant.[88] Another potential reason for the Saite aversion to Thebes may have more to do with their history of interactions with the Nubians. As demonstrated above in this chapter, the Nubians, especially Taharqa, took an active interest in building projects in Upper Egypt and had influence in the region even before Piankhy's invasion of Egypt in 728 BC. It was also demonstrated in Chapter V of this dissertation that the Saites and Nubians had a particularly acrimonious relationship as the Nubians killed two Saite kings/potentates – Bakenrenef and Nekau I – while the Saites in turn possibly killed a Nubian royal in Nubian and defaced numerous Nubian monuments in Egypt. The Saites then may have viewed Thebes as a "Nubian" city and combined with the first point above concerning political geography, they may have decided that infiltrating the office of the God's Wife of Amen was all that was needed to do concerning Thebes.

Whatever the reason for the limited Saite building projects in Upper Egypt, one worthy of note is the temple at El-Kab which was first published by Sommers Clarke.[89] Clarke first began work on the temple in 1895 and soon discovered stone blocks which made up part of three sanctuaries first built in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty.[90] The building probably began during the reign of Psamtek I "because cartouches of the king and of

---

[88] After the collapse of the Assyrian Empire, Egyptian sovereignty was threatened again by the Chaldean-Babylonian dynasty during the reign of Nekau II; see Chapter IV of this dissertation for an analysis of that conflict. Based on all of the available primary sources it appears that after they were vanquished from Egypt, the Nubians posed little threat to the Saites. Psamtek II's year three campaign in which a Nubian royal was possibly executed and numerous Nubian cartouches on monuments were defaced appears to have been more punitive than a strategic "first strike." Spalinger argues that the campaign was designed as a form of propaganda intended to impress Levantine kings who the Saites were attempting to influence, "The Concept of the Monarchy During the Saite Epoch – An Essay in Synthesis," *Orientalia* 47 (1978): 12.

[89] Sommers Clarke, "El-Kâb and its Temples," *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 8 (1920): 16-40.

[90] Ibid., 30.

Amasis appear in a crypt sunk into the foundations."[91] The El-Kab Temple, despite being severely damaged, shares a similarity with the Hibis Temple in that both were begun in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty and continued through the Twenty Seventh Dynasty.[92] The building at El-Kab may represent a desire by the Saite kings to show their presence in Upper Egypt while avoiding the Theban area. It is also interesting, and no less important, that the Persians also built no significant monuments in Thebes while only adding to the Saite temples at El-Kab and Hibis as their only major contributions in Upper Egypt.[93]

Perhaps the greatest monuments that memorialized and propagandized Saite rule over Egypt were located in Sais and Memphis but unfortunately "all these buildings are destroyed now, and some cannot be located anymore."[94] For the most part the recreation of Memphis and particularly Sais "depends completely on Egyptian inscriptions, the description of Herodotus (II. 169-70, 175), and a few building elements found in the area itself or removed far away."[95] Herodotus gave an in-depth description of the Neith Temple at Sais, which he referred to as the temple of Athene, in the context of the assassination of Apries by Amasis.[96] Herodotus wrote:

---

[91] Arnold, *Temples,* 74.

[92] Ibid. For more on the Hibis Temple see below in this chapter.

[93] For the contributions by the Persians at el-Kab see Clarke, "El-Kâb."

[94] Arnold, *Temples*, 64.

[95] Arnold, *Temples*, 70.

[96] For a full treatment of this regicide see Chapter V of this dissertation.

> The people of Sais buried all the kings who came from the province inside this precinct – the tomb of Amasis, too, though further from the shrine than that of Apries and his ancestors, is in the temple court, a great cloistered building of stone, decorated with pillars carved in imitation of palm-trees, and other costly ornaments. Within the cloister is a chamber with double doors, and behind the doors stands the sepulcher. Here too, in Athene's precinct at Sais, is the tomb of one whose name I prefer not to mention in such a connexion; it stands behind the shrine and occupies the whole length of the wall. Great stone obelisks stand in the enclosure, and there is a stone-bordered lake nearby, circular in shape and about the size, I should say, of the lake called the Wheel on the island of Delos. It is on this lake that the Egyptians act by night in what they call their Mysteries the Passion of that being whose name I will not speak.[97]

After the death of Apries, Amasis apparently felt compelled to leave his mark on Egypt and solidify his standing not only as king but also as a member of the ruling Saite dynasty. According to Herodotus he wasted no time expanding the already large Neith Temple:

> His first work was the marvelous gateway for the temple of Athene at Sais. He left everyone else far behind him by the size and height of this building, and by the size and quality of the blocks of stone which it was constructed. He then presented to the temple some large statues and immense men-sphinxes, and brought for its repair other enormous blocks of stone, some from the quarries near Memphis, and the biggest of all from Elephantine, which is twenty days' voyage by river from Sais. But what caused me more astonishment than anything else was a room hollowed from a single block of stone; this block also came from Elephantine, and took three years to bring to Sais, two thousand men, all of the pilot-class, having the task of conveying it. [98]

Another source of reconstructing the Neith Temple comes from a naophorous statue of the high priest Henat.[99] Instead of holding a naos with a deity inside it, which was

---

[97] Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 1996), Book II, 169-70. Concerning the identity of the one "whose name I will not speak," Sélincourt wrote in the notes that it is Osiris (644, n87 to Book II).

[98] Ibid., Book II, 175.

[99] This statue of Henat is made of black basalt is currently housed in the Museum of Florence #1784. It is 79 cm high. The provenance is more than likely Sais and was created in the late Twenty Sixth or early Twenty Seventh Dynasty. The finely detailed robe and personal facial expression point toward the sculptural style of the late Twenty Sixth or Twenty Seventh Dynasty, which has been characterized as the "second phase" of non-idealized sculpture. Steven B. Shubert, "Realistic Currents in Portrait Sculpture of

common for naophorous statues in the Late Period, Henat is holding a façade of the Neith Temple. Ramadan El-Sayeed wrote:

> Le tiers central représente la façade elle-même du sanctuaire archaïque; on peut interpréter les stries verticals comme la représentation de clayonnage de roseaux fromant le mur léger; il est surmonté d'un grand triangle et d'une toiture bombée posée sur trois elements de charpente.[100]

The expansion of the Neith Temple at Sais was obviously linked to the Saite affinity for the goddess Neith[101] in a spiritual and familial sense, as she was the patron deity of the Saite nome and the object of religious affection for the Saites. The building at the Neith Temple may not have linked the Twenty Sixth Dynasty with the New Kingdom, but it did represent some continuity with the Twenty Fourth Dynasty.

The Saites were also active in Memphis immortalizing their rule, but like at Sais much of what we know has to come from classical accounts. Psamtek I's enlargement of the Serapeum has been discussed above and according to Herodotus he also added a pylon and several statues within the precinct of the Ptah Temple itself. He wrote:

---

the Saite and Persian Periods in Egypt," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 19 (1989): 28. Bernard Bothmer noted that this "smile" first manifested itself around the advent of Saite rule. "From the middle of the seventh century on, we find the outspoken 'smile,' which - together with the rigid frontality and stance of the Egyptian statue - was soon to be taken over by the Greeks." Bernard V. Bothmer, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 100* (New York: Arno Press Incorporated, 1969), XXXViii. Also see Chapter VII of this dissertation for a complete discussion concerning how the turbulent events of the Late Period affected change in artistic methods. There is a similar naophorous statue of black basalt, 60 cm. high, of a man also named Henat in the British Museum EA #134. This is more than likely the same man as he described himself as the director of the Neith Temples and the head lector priest of Neith.

[100] Ramadan El-Sayeed, *Documents relatifs à Saïs et ses divinités* (Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1975), 131.

[101] Robert Schlichting, "Neith," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, ed. Eberhard Otto and Wolfgang Helck (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975), 4:392-4.

> Having become sole master of Egypt, Psammetichus built the southern gateway of the temple of Hephaestus at Memphis, and opposite to it a court for Apis - or Epaphus, which is the Greek name. Apis is kept in this court whenever he appears; it has a colonnade round it, with statues eighteen feet high instead of pillars, and is richly carved with figures.[102]

Overall, the picture painted of the Saites by the combination of extant archeological evidence, Greek historical accounts, and Egyptian inscriptions is one of active participation, especially early in the dynasty, in different aspects of political legitimization. The Saites proved to be especially astute in their political decisions of what religious institutions to patronize – the God's Wife of Amen and the Apis cult – but were also active in building projects throughout Egypt. All of this helped to legitimize a dynasty that was assisted into power by a foreign empire that was no doubt seen in a negative light by most Egyptians.[103]

The numerous building projects and religious institution patronage discussed above may have helped the Saites legitimize the Twenty Sixth Dynasty *within* Egypt, but did nothing to prevent the growing juggernaut, the Achaemenid Persian Empire, from enveloping the "black land."[104] The Persians had a much more difficult task of legitimizing their rule than the Saites – who were, despite their Libyan origins, from Egypt proper – or even the Nubians who although not Egyptian had strong cultural ties to Egypt since the Old Kingdom.[105] The task of the Persians then was to appear as legitimate rulers of Egypt despite following a different religion, speaking a different

---

[102] Herodotus, *Histories*, Book II, 153.

[103] This would probably be especially true for Egyptians around Thebes since their city was sacked and looted by Assurbanipal. See Chapter IV of this dissertation for details.

[104] For details of the Achaemenid Persian invasion of Egypt, see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[105] Morkot, *Pharaohs*, 38.

language, having a different phenotype, and hailing from a land thousands of miles away. To the Persians though Egypt was just another cog in their growing empire, so how they achieved legitimization in the eyes of the Egyptians while reducing them to subject status is truly remarkable and provides a case study of ancient imperialism.

The Persians were well aware of the uses of propaganda,[106] one can see it on the remains of the palace reliefs that depict their subject peoples.[107] The reliefs depict the subject peoples dressed in their traditional clothing, accompanied by inscriptions that amounted to a " politico-ideological message"[108] that stressed Persian authority over the civilized world. Although the reliefs depict the subject peoples bringing the exotic goods of their homelands to the Achaemenid royal court, the purpose was to stress the authority of the Persians more so than a quantitative reading of goods collected. Briant wrote:

> More than a statistical inventory of the economic resources of the Empire, they are amenable to what might be called 'images of the world,' by means of which the Great Kings, especially Darius, intended to impose the idea of the unbounded nature of their authority over territories and populations.[109]

The reliefs of the subject peoples became indicative of the Achaemenid Empire itself, they provided a source of identity that stressed "co-option rather than coercion."[110] Truly, the provinces, or satrapies, that the Persians ruled over were enumerated not in

---

[106] As discussed above in this chapter, the Persians utilized the existing religious structure in the countries they conquered to help forward their political agenda of empire and hegemony.

[107] For a complete cultural-historical study of the reliefs from Persepolis depicting the subject peoples see Gerold Walser, *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis: Historiche Studien über den sogenannte Tributzug an der Apadanatreppe* (Berlin: Akadamie Verlag, 1966). For the original publication of the reliefs see Erich Schmidt, *Persepolis I: Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953).

[108] Pierre Briant, *Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 177.

[109] Ibid.

[110] Erica Ehrenberg, "Persian Conquerors, Babylonian Captivators," in Crawford, 95.

terms of geographic space, but the people who inhabited a certain space. "The word used in the inscriptions is *dahyu* 'people'"[111] and it was "not lands, but various groups of people whom they thought worthy of mention"[112] that they designated.

The best preserved reliefs of the Achaemenid subject peoples come from the Apadana, or palace area of Persepolis. The primary section of the palace area, known as the terrace, contained about a dozen buildings "decorated with relief sculpture, carved on the façades, on the staircases, and on the door and window jambs."[113] The iconography of subject peoples in the art of the ancient Near East was the "ältesten Repräsentation königlicher Macht gehörte im Orient die Darstellung von unterworfenen und abgabenbringenden Völkern."[114] Although the Persian iconography of subject peoples and tribute bearers may have had its origins in Mesopotamia, it broke from the "gewalttätigen Welt der Assyrer"[115] by forwarding a new "Art of monarchischer Theorie."[116] The Achaemenid king desired not to be seen as a virile hunter of lions like

---

[111] Briant, *Cyrus*, 177.

[112] George G. Cameron, "The Persian Satrapies and Related Matters." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32 (1973): 47.

[113] Michael Roaf, "Sculptures and Sculptors at Persepolis," *Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies* 21 (1983): 1.

[114] Walser, *Völkerschaften*, 11. Walser pointed to some of the earliest examples of tribute scenes and subject peoples being the well-known *Standard of Ur* and the *Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III*. He also included Egyptian art in his iconographic survey of ancient Near Eastern subject peoples scenes by showing a depiction of Amenhotep III on a throne supported by foreigners. The Egyptians depicted subject/foreign peoples in a variety of different settings in their art. The *Narmer Palette*, which was discussed above in this chapter, is an early examples of this iconographic technique in Egyptian art while the scene from the tomb of the noble Rekhmira is an example of the tribute scene in the New Kingdom. The ancient Egyptian iconographical technique depicting bound captives in monuments, often in topographical lists, is also similar in style and meaning to the examples used in Near Eastern and Achaemenid art.

[115] Ibid., 26.

[116] Ibid.

his Assyrian predecessors, but as a peaceful ruler of the civilized world, supported on his throne by the subject peoples. Walser argued that despite the king's superior position he was still reliant on the subject peoples for support:

> Sie zeigt nicht nur die ideale Gleichheit aller Völker und Stämme des Reiches in ihrer vornehmsten Funktion, der Stütze des Thrones, sondern versinnbildlicht auch auf eindrückliche Art das Vertrauensverhältnis zwischen Untertanen und Monarchen, der sich ganz auf die stützende Kraft der Reichsvölker kann.[117]

Perhaps this new iconographic technique reflects the Achaemenid Persian political savvy. The Persians realized that peaceful yet firm coercion rather than violent and forceful repression was the best course to take in maintaining their vast empire, which can be seen in their building/propaganda program in Egypt.

The best preserved example of the subject peoples of the Achaemenid Empire, in an Egyptian context, comes from the Darius Statue from Susa.[118] There are twenty four different figures on the base of the statue, each representing a specific people signified by their dress and facial features, seated atop Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions in name

---

[117] Ibid.

[118] The statue of Darius I, currently housed in the Iran National Museum, Tehran, is comprised of greywacke (Egyptian?) and stands 98 ½ inches high. The statue was discovered in Susa in 1972, but due to its Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions mentioning Heliopolis, that city was probably its original provenance. For the original publication of the hieroglyphic inscriptions and French translations see Jean Yoyotte, "Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques Darius et l'Égypte," *Journal Asiatique* 260 (1972): 253-266. For the original publication of the cuneiform inscriptions and French translations see François Vallat, "Les textes cuneiforms de la statue de Darius," *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 4 (1974): 161-170. For the original commentary on the statue see David Stronach, "Descriptions and Comment," *Journal Asiatque* 260 (1972): 240-6. For art-historical studies of the statue see John Boardman, *Persia and the West: An Archaeological Investigation of the Genesis of Achaemenid Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000), 115-16; P. Calmeyer, "Ägyptischer Stil und reichsachaimenische Inhalte auf dem Sockel derDarieos Statue aus Susa/Heliopolis," in *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire: Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop,* eds. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Amélie Kuhrt (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor her Nabije Oosten, 1991), 285-92; Oscar White Muscarella, "Fragment of a Royal Head," in *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*, eds. Prudence O. Harper, Joan Aruz, and Françoise Tallon (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 219-21; Margaret Root Cool, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of an Empire* (Leidein: E.J. Brill, 1976).

rings with arms raised with palms up. The peoples are divided according to topography with most of the peoples on the left side coming from mountainous areas while the left side is comprised mainly of desert dwelling peoples.[119] Furthermore, "this principle of dividing up the peoples according to the nature of their habitats is combined with a sense of geographical proximity so that the left side is mainly of eastern countries and the right is of western and southern countries."[120] One of the more interesting iconographic elements of the statue base is the position of the subject peoples' arms and hands. Roaf noted that in Egyptian art humans are usually depicted with their palms up only when they are carrying something:

> In Egyptian art when kneeling figures are praying their hands are normally held in front with the palms facing forwards; this is the position of the hands on the Canal stelae. On the Darius statue, however, the hands are horizontal, palm up with all four fingers and thumb shown. This gesture is known in Egypt but only when there is some object to be carried or supported. [121]

It should not be seen as a coincidence that this artistic device was also used at Persepolis, as discussed above, to depict the subject peoples holding the throne of the king. The iconography of the Darius Statue, particularly the base, reinforced the relationship of ruler and subject in the Achaemenid Empire.

The Persians, like the Nubians and Saites before them, attempted to legitimize their rule over Egypt through building/propaganda programs. One of the most visible, and interesting, monuments from the Twenty Seventh Dynasty is the Hibis Temple in the el-Kharga Oasis. The el-Kharga oasis is located in the Western Desert approximately

---

[119] Michael Roaf, "The Subject Peoples on the Base of the Statue of Darius," *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 4 (1974): 75.

[120] Ibid.

[121] Ibid., 77.

150 miles west of Thebes. The Hibis Temple was first excavated in 1909 by H.E. Winlock working for the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.[122] Winlock's publication related the background of the temple and the initial archaeological discoveries while Norman Davies' later publication in the same series provided drawings of the reliefs.[123] Some structure is believed to have existed on the site before major construction began in the Late Period, but the holy site always served the cult of Amen-Ra.[124]

Eugene Cruz-Uribe, the most recent scholar to do significant work at the temple, argued that the temple was originally constructed during the Twenty Sixth Dynasty and only finished later by Darius I during the Twenty Seventh Dynasty. He noted that the cartouche of Darius I was actually *painted* in the color blue:

> The temple was constructed by some Saite king and partially decorated. . . After the Persian conquest Darius took an interest in the area and finished the decoration. For the interior rooms (A-M) he painted his cartouche on the completed decorations, perhaps over the cartouches of the Saite king (or blank cartouches). . . As Darius had painted all his cartouches with blue, the red may belong to work performed by an earlier king. Darius also decorated the pillars in hypostyle B, but only in paint.[125]

Cruz-Uribe further argued that most of the places where Darius I's cartouche was painted, he had not built any of those sections himself:

---

[122] H. E. Winlock, *The Excavations*, part 1 of *The Temple of Hibis in El Kharga Oasis* (New York: Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition, 1941), 2.

[123] Norman Davies, *The Decorations*, part 3 of *The Temple of Hibis in el Khargeh Oasis* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1953).

[124] Winlock, *Hibis*, 2.

[125] Eugene Cruz-Uribe, The Hibis Temple Project 1984-85 Field Season, Preliminary Report," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 23 (1986): 164.

> Darius's cartouche was carved on the reveals of the doorways to rooms F, G, H, and J and also on the interior screen walls between M and N, on the west wall of N, and on the exterior of the temple. One possible reason for this phenomenon is that Darius had not built those sections and simply filled his name into blank or painted cartouches.[126]

The Hibis Temple then was a monument initiated by the Saites but then almost entirely co-opted by Darius I. Why did Darius I invest more time and energy to the Hibis Temple, which is much more isolated then other more well known temples in Egypt? Temples were unknown in the Persian home-land; it was not "until around 400 BCE, possibly as a result of Babylonian influence"[127] that temples were first built in Persia. Perhaps the building project at the Hibis Temple was part of a larger economic program that the Persians pursued as the fairly newly domesticated camel gave them the ability to create new trade routes through the desert. This also raises the question; why was Thebes neglected, in terms of building projects, by the Persians? Perhaps the answer may be similar to why the Saites also possibly avoided allocating any significant resources to that region – Thebes was no longer important in a geo-political sense in the late First Millennium BC, the more important cities in Lower Egypt had eclipsed Thebes and relegated in to a backwater. Unfortunately, as discussed above, any remains of a possible Persian building program in Lower Egypt are probably forever lost, but there exists hieroglyphic inscriptions that detail the Persian kings involvement in Egyptian religion and culture.

---

[126] Ibid.

[127] Peter Clark, *Zoroastrianism: An Introduction to an Ancient Faith* (Portland, Oregon: Sussex Academic Press, 1998), 36.

The hieroglyphic text of the naophorous statue of the Egyptian doctor, Udjahorresent,[128] contains a few lines under the right arm that describe squatters living in the Neith Temple. It states:

> The Chief doctor Udjahorresnet, born from Atumirdis, he said: I petitioned to the majesty fo the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Cambyses, concerning all the foreigners who dwell in the Neith Temple. I asked Cambyses to drive out the foreigners from the Neith Temple and restore it to its former greatness. His majesty ordered the expulsion of all foreigners who were residing in the confines of the Neith Temple by throwing out their beds and any other offensive items they left behind.[129]

It remains a mystery if Cambyses or his successor Darius I then made additions to the Neith Temple, but this small move may have paid big dividends as far as legitimizing the Twenty Seventh Dynasty in the eyes of the Egyptian priesthood. It has been demonstrated above how important the Neith Temple was to the Saites so Cambyses' action to remove the squatters from the temple may have helped to ingratiate him towards the Egyptian elite. Udjahorresnet was, besides Cambyses' chief doctor, a priest of Neith,[130] but he was also a "collaborator" [131] who worked with the Persian occupiers to ensure the religious *status quo*. By doing so, Udjahorresnet was able to continue to patronize the important Neith cult while Cambyses added some legitimacy to his rule by simply evicting some foreign soldiers from the confines of the temple. The first two

---

[128] For a complete historiographical discussion of the Udjahorresnet statue and an analysis of the text as it relates to the invasion of Egypt by the Persians and how the text fits into Egyptian literary motifs or *topoi* see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

[129] Posner, *Perse*, 14-5, lines 17-20.

[130] Ibid., 6, line 10.

[131] For the use of this adjective to describe Udjahorresnet and his career as admiral of the Egyptian navy under Amasis and Psamtek III, see Chapter IV of this dissertation.

kings of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty would also patronize one of the most important religious institutions of the Late Period – the Serapeum.

Epitaph stelae from the Serapeum indicate that two bulls were ceremoniously buried during the reigns of Cambyses and Darius I.[132] One bull was buried in year six of Cambyses and the other in year four of Darius I which indicates that the Persians not only saw the importance of the Serapeum, but also took an active role in the maintenance of the cult itself.[133] The Twenty Seventh Dynasty Serapeum texts are in stark contrast to Herodotus' account of Cambyses treatment of the Apis bull. According to Herodotus, Cambyses, in a mad rage, mortally wounded the Apis bull and effectively ended the Apis cult by edict:

> In this way the festival was broken up, the priests punished, and Apis, who lay in the temple for a time wasting away from the wound in his thigh, finally died and was buried by the priests without the knowledge of Cambyses.[134]

Despite the fact that hieroglyphic texts clearly point to the falsehood of Herodotus' account, there may be a kernel of truth in its origins. It is a fact that "outrage against both goods and persons were perpetrated by the troops"[135] but this was not "the manifestation

---

[132] Posner, *Perse*, 30-41. A limestone epitaph stela was dedicated in year six of Cambyses; it measures 66 cm. height and 44 cm. length. The stela is currently in the Louvre Museum, Paris #354. A limestone epitaph stela dedicated in year four of Darius I is also in the Louvre Museum, Paris #357. The stela measures 80 cm. height and 44 cm. width.

[133] It is unknown if either Persian king actually took a physically active role in the cult rituals, but by placing their names on the monuments they were at least metaphysically participating.

[134] Herodotus, *Histories*, 182-3, Book III, 29. David Asheri believes that this anecdotal story is the result of different themes or *topoi*. He states the wound has symbolic meaning of a "moral link between sin (Apis' wound on the thigh) and punishment (Cambyses' death by wound on the thigh). In Mithraic inconography the bull's throat is slit." David Asheri, "Book III," in *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I-IV*, eds. Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 429.

[135] Briant, *Cyrus*, 56. Refer back to the foreign soldiers squatting in the Neith Temple as an example of an outrage on the Egyptian people.

of anti-Egyptian policy laid down and enforced by Cambyses."[136] The murder of the Apis bull and other anecdotal stories amounts to little more than anti-Persian propaganda. One should realize that Herodotus, Strabo and other Greco-Roman historians' writings "were built on a series of cultural stereotypes such as can be found in many other Greek authors."[137] Part of this may have been the result of "gathered information and opinion from Persian circles that were very hostile to Cambyses"[138] while the invasion that ushered in the Second Persian Period in 343 BC also proved to damage the image of Persian rule in Egypt. Lindsay Allen writs:

> Artaxerxes' comprehensive and violent reconquest of Egypt brought negative judgments down on his head, from those whom he had displaced; this negativity permeates the later sources, as similar stories had influenced Herodotus' account of Cambyses.[139]

Leo Depuydt continues to promote the validity of the classical sources, despite evidence to the contrary,[140] which clearly shows that the first two kings of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty took an active role in patronizing the Serapeum and Apis cult. The pattern of legitimization established by the kings of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty demonstrates that any abuse of the sacred Apis bull would have been anathema to any propaganda program of the Persians.

---

[136] Ibid., 57

[137] Ibid., 14.

[138] Ibid., 59.

[139] Lindsay Allen, *The Persian Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 109. For a more thorough analysis on the Greco-Roman philosophy of history and how it affected the way ancient historians recorded events see Chapter III of this dissertation.

[140] Leo Depuydt, "Murder in Memphis: The Story of Cambyses's Mortal Wounding of the Apis Bull (ca. 523 B.C.E.)," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54 (1995): 119-126.

One of the more interesting and utilitarian building projects that the Saites began but the Persians completed was the canal that linked the Red Sea to the Nile River. There are both Egyptian and Greco-Roman sources that testify to the completion and use of this canal. Herodotus wrote:

> Psammetichus left a son, Necos, who succeeded him. It was Necos who began the construction of the canal to the Arabian gulf, a work afterwards completed by Darius the Persian. The length of the canal is four days' journey by boat, and its breadth sufficient to allow two triremes to be rowed abreast. The water is supplied from the Nile, and the canal leaves the river at a point a little south of Bubastis and runs past the Arabian town of Patumus, and then on to the Arabian gulf. The first part of its course is along the Arabian side of the Egyptian plain, a little to the northward of the chain of hills by Memphis, where the stone-quarries are; it skirts the base of these hills from west to east, and then enters a narrow gorge, after which it trends in a southerly direction until it enters the Arabian gulf. The shortest distance from the Mediterranean, or Northern Sea, to the Southern Sea - or Indian Ocean- namely, from Mt Casius between Egypt and Syria to the Arabian gulf, is just a thousand stades. This is the most direct route - by the canal, which does not keep at all a straight course, the journey is much longer. The construction of the canal in the time of King Necos cost the lives of 120,000 Egyptians. Necos did not complete the work, but broke it off in deference to an oracle, which warned him that his labour was all for the advantage of the 'barbarian' - as the Egyptians call anyone who does not speak their language.[141]

Diodorus agreed with Herodotus that Nekau I started construction of the Canal and that it was also unfinished, but disagreed over the reason it was not completed:

> From the Pelusiac mouth there is an artificial canal to the Arabian Gulf and the Red Sea. The first to undertake the construction of this was Necho the son of Psammetichus, and after him Darius the Persian made progress with the work for a time but finally left it unfinished; for he was informed by certain persons that if he dug through the neck of the land he would be responsible for the submergence of Egypt, for they pointed out to him that the Red Sea was higher than Egypt.[142]

The fact that both sources relate that work on the Canal was suspended, although for

---

[141] Herodotus, *Histories*, 159, Book II, 158-9.

[142] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, trans. C.H. Oldfather (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004), 111-13, Book I, 33.

different reasons, suggests that there were problems with its construction. Herodotus' reason for the suspension of construction on the Canal should be viewed with caution as it reflects "fifth century Egyptian opinion hostile to the Persian canal as something serving the foreign overlord's interests."[143] The completion of the Canal(s) can also be corroborated by a number of hieroglyphic stelae.

George Posener conducted the first major study of the Canal, from the Egyptian perspective, when his translations and commentary of the "Suez Stelae" were published in 1936.[144] The best preserved of the three badly damaged stelae was discovered near Tell el-Maskhoutah in 1889 by Wladimir Golénscheff and transported to the Egyptian Museum, Cairo in 1907.[145] Posener's work includes hieroglyphic transcriptions, French translations, and some commentary.[146] Posener followed up his initial work with a more complete analysis in a 1938 article.[147]

Five years after Posener's second publication of the Canal stelae, George Cameron published a study of the Canal from a Persian perspective. Cameron attempted to date the Canal stelae based on the Old Persian inscription on a block from Persepolis known as DPe.[148] Cameron compared the subject peoples of the Canal stelae with that of

---

[143] C. Tuplin, "Darius' Suez Canal and Persian Imperialism," in *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire*, ed. A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Leiden: Institute for Eastern Studies, 1991), 242.

[144] George Posener, *Perse*, 48-87.

[145] Ibid., 50.

[146] Ibid., 48-87.

[147] Georges Posener, "Le canal du Nil à le Mer Rogue avant les Ptolemées," *Chronique d'Egypt* 13 (1938): 259-73.

[148] George Cameron, "Darius, Egypt, and the 'Lands Beyond the Sea,'" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2 (1943): 307-313.

DPe and arrived at the conclusion that since both included the Scythians, they were made around 513.[149] Although Cameron's article has some value when viewed from the Persian perspective, it is dated. His attempt at establishing the missing ten subject peoples on the Tell el-Maskhoutah stela fell short with his assignment of the twentieth satrapy to Punt.[150] Although his argument was logical, one can now say with almost certainty whom the missing ten peoples were according to the base on the Darius Statue, which identifies twenty four subject peoples/satrapies.[151]

Walther Hinz was the next person to publish a major scholarly work on the ancient Suez Canal.[152] Hinz's study combined translation and commentary of the three Suez stelae with the then recent discovery of the Darius Statue to ascribe a completion date for both in the last part of Darius I's reign.[153] He argued that Darius made three different trips to Egypt[154] and on the third trip in Darius' twenty fourth year of rule in 498."[155] The discovery of the Darius Statue helped to date the Suez stelae based on the list of subject peoples already discussed and also the spelling of the king's name. Hinz correctly pointed out that Darius's name was spelled differently on the Canal stelae and Statue than on previous monuments:

---

[149] Ibid., 313. For Darius I's Scythian campaign see Herodotus, *The Histories,* trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 1996), Book IV., 1-4, 102-103, 118-129.

[150] Cameron, "Darius," 309.

[151] See above in this chapter for discussion about the iconography of the subject peoples in Persia and on the Darius statue.

[152] Walther Hinz, "Darius und der Suezkanal," *Archäologischen Mitteilungen aus Iran* 8 (1975): 115-121.

[153] Ibid., 115.

[154] Ibid., 116.

[155] Ibid.

> Der Name Darius wird auf ägyptischen Denkmälern lange Zeit hindurch meist entweder *t-r-w-š* oder *t-r-j-w-š* geschreiben. Auf der in Susa gefundenen Statue und auf den Suezkanal-Stelen erscheint dafür jedoch die Schreibung *in-t-r-j-w-š*.[156]

Hinz also translated the Canal stelae as Darius I being present for a "grand opening," "Zur Einweihung des Suezkanales hatte der Herrscher - so berichten die Stelen - all Fürsten un Würdenträger eingeladen."[157] Hinz's article is compelling, namely the dating of the stelae and Statue, but more could have been said about the Canal and Statue's relationship to each other. If the Suez Canal and the Darius Statue were created at approximately the same time was there a specific reason? If Darius I conducted "opening ceremonies" for the Canal as Hinz argued then the Darius Statue may have served, along with the stelae, as a commemorative monument of the king's greatness. Although none of the inscriptions on the Darius Statue mention the Canal, one should not discount that this may have been the Statue's function.

Two more recent scholarly works on the ancient Suez Canal are also worth mentioning. Carol Redmount argued that there was more than one canal in operation:

> Detailed study of the available ethnographic and archaeological data indicates, however, that, at least in the western portion of the Wadi, there were two canals, not one. The first canal hugged the northern perimeter of the Wadi; the second ran along the valley's southern fringe.[158]

Redmount also examined both ancient and medieval primary sources to conclude that construction of the Canal required a strong central government and an immense labor

---

[156] Ibid., 115.

[157] Ibid., 117.

[158] Carol Redmount, "The Wadi Tumilat and the 'Canal of Pharaohs,'" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54 (1995): 133.

force.[159] Tuplin's study of the ancient Suez Canal focused on reasons for its construction.[160] He disregarded most of the obvious reasons for the construction of the Canal such as trade with Arabia[161] and stated that "symbolic considerations were probably predominant."[162] If the Canal offered few trade and/or military benefits to the Achaemenid Empire then why did Darius I complete the project? The answer may be that it was a symbolic act that helped to legitimize Persian rule in Egypt. The Canal may have been nearly completed under Nekau I so the possibility that it was not a strain on Darius's resources to finish it should be considered. By finishing the Canal, Darius created yet another bridge of continuity from previous pharaonic dynasties to the Twenty Seventh Dynasty. On the other hand Redmount's argument that there were two canals in operation simultaneously is intriguing and if accepted would seem to indicate that Darius I had more than just a "symbolic" desire concerning this building project. Perhaps Darius I saw Egypt and the Red Sea region in particular as part of a long term economic program where the canals he built were vital to the flow of goods and people between the Mediterranean and Persia. If practical/economic considerations were the primary motive behind the Canal, that still does not discount any symbolic motivations either.

The Persians' patronage of the Apis cult, additions to existing Egyptian temples, and completion of the Red Sea Canal are all examples of tangible efforts to legitimize the Twenty Seventh Dynasty, but there is also evidence the new rulers of Egypt made further efforts to accept certain aspects of Egyptian religion. The Persian practice of allowing

---

[159] Ibid., 135.

[160] C. Tuplin, "Canal," 237.

[161] Ibid., 273.

[162] Ibid., 281.

the subject peoples of the Achaemenid Empire to practice their native religions unhindered, for the most part, has been extensively researched and does not need to be addressed further here.[163] Of importance here is what aspects of Egyptian religion the Persians accepted and why? The why relates not so much to the obvious reason of grafting the Egyptians into their empire, but more so why certain theological and therefore ideological aspects were accepted while others were discarded. Consideration of these may help to illuminate how, not just the Persians, but possibly the Nubians to some extent as well, justified to themselves their acceptance of foreign religion. Evidence, in the form of inscriptions, from both Egypt and Persia suggests that the Persians had an affinity to the Egyptian god Atum and may have altered their own religion – at least publicly – to conform to Egyptian religion. Ultimately, although the Persians may have altered their religion publicly in order to conform to the conquered Egyptians' religion, they did so in a *conscious* way that was suitable to their own theological beliefs, which demonstrates another aspect of Persian political savvy.

The Persian public patronage of Atum appears to follow a pattern noted above in this chapter similar to how they restored and patronized the Marduk cult in Babylon after they conquered that kingdom in 539 BC. A survey of the surviving royal hieroglyphic inscriptions from the Twenty Seventh Dynasty reveals that Atum was invoked in a variety of these and appears to suggest his prominence among the Achaemenid rulers in Egypt.[164] Some of the most interesting of the Twenty Seventh Dynasty inscriptions that

---

[163] Briant, *Cyrus*, 388-422.

[164] For a thorough analysis concerning why Atum was chosen as the primary deity of the Persians in Egypt over other gods, particularly Osiris, see Jared Krebsbach, "The Persians and Atum Worship in Egypt's 27th Dynasty," in *Current Research in Egyptology 2010: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium*, eds. Maarten Horn, Joost Kramer, Daniel Soliman, Nico Staring, Carina van den Hoven, and

invoke Atum come from the Memphite Serapeum. Most inscriptions in the Serapeum – either on votive stelae donated by non-royals or epitaphs left by kings – invoked the syncretic deity Apis-Osiris. Although the common Apis-Osiris was invoked in Serapeum inscriptions from the reigns of Cambyses and Darius I, there exist two notable instances of the syncretic Apis-Atum. Epitaph stelae from year six of Cambyses[165] and year four Darius I[166] invoked Apis-Atum as he "who grants all life"[167] in these inscriptions. It should be pointed out that although an Osiris-Apis-Atum-Horus is known from a Nineteenth Dynasty Serapeum inscription,[168] these two mentions of Apis-Atum by the Persians are the most known from any one dynasty.

Another important primary source in which the Persians gave homage to Atum in a hieroglypic inscription is the statue of Darius I from Susa.[169] In this inscription the king is described as "the son of Ra born of Atum"[170] while Atum is referred to as the "lord of Heliopolis."[171] The historical significance of this statue cannot be overstated because it is the only known example of Persian colossal royal statuary from the Achaemenid

---

Lara Weiss (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2011), 97-104. The most important points concerning this paper are covered here.

[165] Posener, *Perse*, 30-35. Also see above in this chapter for the Persians' patronage of the Serapeum and the distorted Greek accounts of Cambyses' treatment of the Apis bull. For a complete translation, transliteration, museological, and bibliographical information see #7 of the Appendix.

[166] See above.

[167] Ibid., 31, 37.

[168] Brugsch, "Denkmal," 38; Eberhard Otto, *Beiträge zur Geshicte des Stierkulte in Ägyptien* (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964), 19.

[169] For the complete hieroglyphic transcription see Yoyotte, "Darius," 254-7.

[170] Ibid.

[171] Ibid. The mention of Heliopolis may point to the statue's original provenance being that Egyptian city, possibly at a terminus point of the Canal discussed above.

period,[172] so the placement of Atum as foremost of the Egyptian pantheon is significant. Another Twenty Seventh Dynasty sources that place Atum in an central position is the Hibis temple in the el-Kharga oasis.[173] Although the Hibis temple is primarily dedicated to the god Amen and construction began in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty during the reign of Psamtek II and continued through the Roman period, Darius I's cartouche is written in numerous places and there are several references to Atum and an image of the king with that god.[174]

So why was Atum elevated above other Egyptian gods when there were several important ones to choose from? The Persians probably viewed the chthonic attributes of Osiris as foreign, such as the very act of mummification which required the priests to handle "unclean" corpses.[175] That may explain why Osiris was excluded; but why was Atum elevated by Persians? The answer is probably a combination of Atum and Ahuramazada, the Persian god, sharing some of the same attributes – particularly concerning the sun and creation. In these early religious texts, Atum was often depicted as a solar god who created the universe. As a solar god he was sometimes paired with

---

[172] Heinz Luschey, "Die Darius-Statuen aus Susa und Ihre Rekonstruktion," *Archäologischen Mitteilungen aus Iran* 10 (1983): 193; Muscarella, "Fragment," 219-20.

[173] Davies, *Hibis*, plate 2, register VI; plate 3, register VI; plate 5, register IV; plate 6, register IV; plate 23; plate 55, register IV; plate 56, east lintel of the inner gateway; plate 65, portico Q, south gate; plate 67; plate 71. Eugene Cruz-Uribe, *Translations, Commentary, Discussions and Sign-List,* vol. 1 of *Hibis Temple Project* (San Antonio: Van Siclen Books, 1988), 4, 5, 18, 44, 96, 99, 162, 163, 182.

[174] Ibid., plate 5, register IV. The king is offering *Maat* to Atum-Ra-Horakhty.

[175] Krebsbach, "Atum," 100. Persian mortuary rituals were diametrically opposed to the Egyptian. The tradition of mummification dates back to the Old Kingdom and is attested in the *Pyramid Texts* where one Utterance states that the dead king receives "natron that you may be divine." Richard O. Faulkner ed. and trans., *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts* (Stilwell, Kansas: Digireads.com Publishing, 2007), Utterance 423. The Achaemenid Persians on the other hand believed that corpses were unclean "only professional undertakers and corpse-bearers approached it." Mary Boyce, *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London: Routledge, 2001), 44. Although the Achaemenid kings interred their dead in tombs, Boyce, *Zoroastrians*, 5; Herodotus noted that in his time, the caste of Persians known as the Magi, were already practicing the ritual of corpse exposure, Herodotus, *Histories*, Book I, 140.

Ra,[176] but also stood alone as the sun.[177] His creative attributes were depicted in many texts as the "earth was issued from Atum"[178] but he also protected the dead king by "enclosing him within your arms"[179] and made "the king sturdy."[180]

Ahuramazada was also associated with creating the world and protecting the earthly Achaemenid king. The trilingual inscription of Behistan – which was inscribed on the face of a cliff above an ancient caravan route in Persia – relates the accounts of Darius I's suppression of rebellions in the Achaemenid Empire. In the five columns of Old Persian inscriptions, Ahuramazda, the primary Persian god, is invoked seventy times.[181] In these texts, Ahuramazda mainly serves as a protector of Darius and bestower of his role as the king of the Achaemenid Empire. Lines 48-61 of column one proclaimed:

---

[176] Faulkner, *Pyramid*, Utterance 217. Henri Frankfort believed that Ra and Atum were different aspects of the same god. He stated, "Attempts to treat Re and Atum, not as different aspects of a single god manifest in the sun, but as two deities who were originally distinct, rely on purely hypothetical constructions and must do so since the earliest texts do not allow the distinction to be made." Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 379n. On the other hand Lászlo Kákosy wrote that the Atum cult in Heliopolis did not completely merge with Ra. "Ist sein Kult selbst in Heliopolis nicht vollkommen mit dem des Re verschmolzen." Lászlo Kákosy, "Atum," in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975), 1:551.

[177] Faulkner, *Pyramid*, Utterance 362. "Oh my father Atum in darkness!"

[178] Ibid., 49-50, Utterance 222.

[179] Ibid., 42-3, Utterance 215.

[180] Ibid., 131-2, Utterance 403.

[181] For transliteration and English translation of the Old Persian inscriptions from Behistan see Roland Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1953), 116-134.

> After that I besought the help of Ahuramazda; Ahuramazda bore me aid; of the month Bagayadi ten days were past, then I with a few men slew that Gaumata the Magian, and those who were his foremost followers. A fortress by name Sikayauvati, a district by name Nisaya, in Media – there I slew him. I took the kingdom from him. By the favor of Ahuramazda I became king; Ahuramazda bestowed the kingdom upon me.[182]

In the fourth column of the Old Persian inscriptions from Behistan, Darius further explained that Ahuramazda gave him aid because "I was not a Lie follower."[183] The Lie in the Behistan texts – known in Old Persian as *drug*[184] – is explicitly equated with the rebellions against Darius, on both a physical and metaphysical level, as "a violent onslaught against the established order."[185] As such, Darius was viewed as "Ahuramazda's representative on Earth . . . who maintains the just moral order within society while protecting society from rebellion."[186]

Inscriptions from the magnificent palace at Persepolis, built during the reign of Darius I, and his tomb at Naqsh-i Rustam also reveal much about how the Persians viewed Ahuramazda. At Persepolis, Ahuramazda is credited as the one who "created Darius the king, he bestowed on him the kingdom"[187] while at his tomb the god is described as the one "who created this earth, who created yonder sky, who created

---

[182] Ibid., 120.

[183] Ibid., 132, Lines 61-7.

[184] There appear to be some basic similarities between the ancient Egyptian and Persian cosmogonies. The Egyptian ideas of *Maat*, or order, versus *Isfet*, or chaos that make up the universe correspond to the Persian concepts of *Asha,* or truth, versus *Drugh*, or lie. "*Asha* is the opposite of *drug*, for *asha* is the personification, in Zoroastrian terms, of truth, and, being truth, it is the ideal form of the universal Ahuric law by which it is intended the cosmos is to be regulated." Clark, *Zoroastrianism*, 31.

[185] Zaehner, *Dawn*, 156.

[186] William Malandra, *An Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religion: Readings from the Avesta and Achaemenid Inscriptions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: 1983), 47.

[187] Kent, *Persian,* 136, DPd lines 1-5.

man."[188] Perhaps the most important Old Persian inscription, as far as the current topic is concerned, that invoked Ahuramazda and his attributes as a creator is on the statue of Darius I mentioned above. The Old Persian, Akkadian, and Elamite cuneiform inscriptions on the robes of the statue describe Ahuramazda as the god "who created the sky and the below, who created man, who created happiness for man."[189] The fact that Ahuramazda is invoked on the same statue – and is the only known such occurrence – as Atum is extremely important for the current study.

The Persian affinity for Atum appears to originate with their own religious beliefs, as Atum's attributes concerning creation, kingship, and protection most closely mirrored their own god Ahuramazda. Ahuramazda's hatred of the Lie and love of the truth can also be seen in the Egyptian idea of truth or *Maat,* versus chaos or *Isfet.* The Persians would have had access to the Egyptian priesthood and knowledge of Egyptian myth and cult[190] so therefore would have been able to *choose* an Egyptian deity in Twenty Seventh Dynasty texts who most closely represented their own theological ideas. As much as the functions and attributes of Atum corresponded closely to Ahuramazda, Osiris, who ruled from the underworld and was associated with death and mortuary cult, may have appeared foreign and strange to the Persians. These theological factors for the Persians' affinity to Atum are compelling, but a final reason for their worship of this god which concerns the Persian concept of kingship must be examined.

---

[188] Ibid., 138, DNa lines 1-8.

[189] For a French translation of the cuneiform inscriptions see Vallat, "cuneiforms," 161-170.

[190] Udjahorresent – the doctor and high priest of Neith discussed above – was made by Cambyses to "live at his side as companion and administrator of the palace." Posner, *Perse*, 6, line 13.

Unfortunately due to a dearth of textual evidence, the Achaemenid concept of kingship was rarely articulated in writing. Henri Frankfort believed that the origins of Achaemenid period kingship can be traced directly to Mesopotamia. He wrote:

> In the ruins of Pasargadae, Persepolis, and Susa we have material proof that kingship under Cyrus the Great and Darius I was given a setting for which there were no Persian precedents and in which the Mesopotamian ingredients are clearly recognizable. If the pillared halls of the Achaemenian palaces had prototypes in the vast tents of nomadic chieftains, the walled artificial terrace, the monstrous guardians at the gates, the revetments of sculptured stone slabs, and the panels of glazed bricks derived from Babylon, Assur, and Nineveh, even though they were executed by craftsmen from all over the empire and transfused with a spirit demonstrably Persian.[191]

The Mesopotamian idea of the king being the ruler of the world can be traced back to Sargon of Akkad who first designated himself as "he who rules the Four Quarters"[192] while his son Naram-Sin took the epithet "King of the Four Quarters."[193] Later, the Assyrian king Shamsi-Adad would modify the epithet more to "King of the Universe."[194] It was from these ideas of kingship that Cyrus, the first king of the Achaemenid Empire, styled himself as ruler when he marched victoriously into Babylon in 539 as written on the *Cyrus Cylinder*. On the cylinder, Cyrus was very explicit that he was king not just of Persia and Mesopotamia, but of the entire world. He stated:

> I am Cyrus, king of the world, great king, legitimate king, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four rims of the Earth.[195]

---

[191] Frankfort, *Kingship*, 338.

[192] Ibid., 228.

[193] Ibid.

[194] Ibid., 229.

[195] A. Leo Oppenheim, trans., "Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. with supplement., ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969), 316.

Atum was also referred to in religious texts as the "All Lord" or "Lord of All"[196] which coincides with the Persian concept of kingship. When Cambyses conquered Egypt he found a god, Atum, who not only corresponded theologically in many ways with his god, Ahuramazda, but also to his self-appointed position as king and lord of the universe.

Atum then was a sort of Marduk of Egypt in the sense that the Persians gravitated towards that god and patronized his cult for their own political reasons. The research shows that the Persians were not willing to accept just any god, but had to find one that corresponded in some ways theologically with their own creator god. The Persian theological ideas of the Lie versus chaos also paralleled the Egyptian concepts of *Maat* and *Isfet*. One final reason for the Persian's elevation of Atum in the Twenty Seventh Dynasty concerns that god's association with kingship and the Persian concept of kingship. In Egyptian texts Atum was the "Lord of All" while the Persian king was described as the "Lord of the Universe." In summary, all of this evidence points towards a *conscious* decision by the Persians to elevate Atum to a place of prominence in the Twenty Seventh Dynasty, which helped them legitimize their rule over Egypt while never forfeiting what was important to them on a spiritual level.

In order for the Persians to meld Egypt into their world empire they had to legitimize their rule in the eyes of the native Egyptians. The Persian program of legitimization included the Serapeum and Apis cult, building at Hibis, and the overall acceptance of Egyptian religion through their adopted god, Atum, but one important Late Period institution they conspicuously ignored was the office of God's Wife of Amen. Ankhnesneferibra, the daughter of Psamtek II, succeeded Nitoqris as the last God's Wife

[196] Raymond O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts* (London: Aris and Phillips, 2004), Spell 167.

of Amen in 586 BC,[197] but the office disappeared after her death which was "shortly after the Persian conquest of Egypt"[198] in 525 BC. Why did the Persians not accept and patronize this import Late Period religious institution the same way they did with the Apis cult, the Serapeum, and worship of Atum? One would think that patronage of the God's Wife of Amen, the same way the Nubians and Saites did, would go a long way towards legitimizing their rule in Egypt, but it appears gender dynamics and manner of socializing between the Egyptians and Persians played a key role in this decision. Ayad argues that the power held by the God's Wife of Amen was alien to the Persians whose "royal daughters were not trained nor were they expected to hold such powerful positions."[199] Furthermore, Ayad argues that a key factor in Persian power politics was the marriage of their princesses while the God's Wives of Amen were celibate or "single."[200] Ayad states:

> In the Achaemenid court, marriage, not celibacy, was used as a means of controlling the dissemination and transmission of power. This is perhaps the most important point in trying to understand why an unmarried Achaemenid royal daughter could not be sent to Thebes to hold office as a God's Wife of Amun.[201]

The Persians were willing to adapt to Egyptian culture to a certain extent in order to legitimize their rule, but apparently their treatment of the institution of the God's Wife of

---

[197] Ayad, *God's Wife*, 27. For the hieroglyphic transcription and English translation of the adoption stela of Ankhnesneferibra see Leahy, "Ankhnesneferibre," 145-65.

[198] Ayad, *God's Wife*, 153.

[199] Mariam Ayad, "Some Thoughts on the Disappearance of the Office of the God's Wife of Amun," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 28 (2001): 7.

[200] Ayad, *God's Wife*, 154. She states that although there is no evidence any God's Wife of Amen was married or bore children that does not mean the women were required to be celibate. "There is documented evidence that the ancient Egyptians knew of, and used contraceptives and abortifacients from as early as the Middle Kingdom."

[201] Ayad, "Disappearance," 7.

Amen demonstrates that they had their limits. The God's Wife of Amen was a powerful institution in Egypt at the time of the first Persian conquest, but one that the Persians were unwilling to co-opt due to their culture and political power structure that was established long before they came to Egypt.

After the Persians were expelled from Egypt in 404 BC[202], the rulers of the three relatively short-lived dynasties that followed, Twenty Eighth through Thirtieth Dynasties, were, for the most part, more concerned with their own existence then with propagandizing their rule.[203] Arnold notes:

> Above all, the short reigns of the first kings of the 29th Dynasty of altogether twenty to twenty-one years did not favor ambitious governmental programs of temple building. Only Hakoris (29th Dynasty), Nectanebo I, Teos, and Nectanebo II (30th Dynasty) undertook building campaigns with the aim of replacing all major Egyptian temples.[204]

It appears that by the Thirtieth Dynasty the kings had "revived the ancient concept of the deified ruler"[205] that had given way to a more pragmatic approach to kingship in the Late Period.[206] The Thirtieth Dynasty concept of the "royal cult was specifically established in the birth houses, in which the young king was identified with the son of the divine

---

[202] For the chronology of the Twenty Eighth through Thirtieth dynasties see Friedrich Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundet vor der Zeitwende* (Berlin: Akademieverlag, 1953), 166-80.

[203] On the expulsion of the Persians and the Egyptian alliance/dependence on Greek military see chapter four of this dissertation. On Nectanebo I's usurpation of the throne, and possible regicide of Nepherites II see Chapter V of this dissertation.

[204] Arnold, *Temples*, 93.

[205] Ibid., 94.

[206] For a complete discussion of the pragmatic nature of kingship in the Late Period and how it contributed to numerous acts of regicide, see Chapter V of this dissertation. This argument was first formulated with regard to the Saites by Spalinger, "Monarchy," 12-36.

family."[207] Besides making additions to many existing temples, the kings of the Thirtieth Dynasty donated several statues "to major sanctuaries, a practice that was later intensified by Nectanebo II."[208] Herman De Meulenaere demonstrated, through a collection of cult statues of Thirtieth Dynasty kings, that this trend was inspired by Nectanebo I. He wrote:

> Nectanébo II, nous le savons, s'est montré un constructeur beaucoup plus inspire que son prédécesseur Nectanébo I. C'est sans doute la raison pour laquelle les mentions du culte de ses statues sont aussi plus fréquentes.[209]

The program to bring back the divine status of the king in the Thirtieth Dynasty was most likely a *conscious* effort on the part of Nectanebo I and his successors to legitimize their dynasty which came to power through a *putsch*.[210]

The kings of the Thirtieth Dynasty, especially Nectanebo I and II, were active at Karnak memorializing their rule, which had been neglected "since the Kushites"[211] ruled Egypt. Nectanebo I had the Amen Temple at Karnak surrounded by brick enclosure walls[212] and an avenue of human headed sphinxes leading to the northern temples was also built during the Thirtieth Dynasty.[213] Perhaps the most visible addition at Karnak made during the Thirtieth Dynasty was the first pylon of the Amen Temple.[214] These

---

[207] Arnold, *Temples*, 94. For an early article on the divine concept of kingship in the Thirtieth Dynasty see Jean Yoyotte, "Nectanebo II comme faucon divin?" *Kemi* 15 (1959): 70-74.

[208] Arnold, *Temples*, 105.

[209] Herman D. Meulenaere, "Les monuments du culte des rois Nectanebo." *Chronique d'Egypte* 35 (1960): 107.

[210] On the *putsch* and possible regicide of Nepherites II see Chapter V of this dissertation.

[211] Arnold, *Temples*, 115.

[212] Ibid. Porter, *Theban*, 21.

[213] Porter, *Theban*, 21.

[214] Ibid., 23.

additions truly solidified the dynasty's place with their contemporaries and posterity as they are the most visible to any visitor of Karnak. In the northern group at Karnak, Nectanebo I built a gate in front of the Maat Temple[215] which Nectanebo II later added a scene of him with Asiatic prisoners.[216] The scene is another good example of a Late Period king advertising his role as the legitimate Egyptian king by carrying punishment, therefore *Maat*, against the traditional foreign enemies of Egypt. Another ambitious project commissioned by Nectanebo I was a road of sphinxes that connected the Karnak and Luxor Temple complexes.[217] Notably, the road began in front of the pylon of Ramesses II at the Luxor Temple,[218] which thereby connected the Thirtieth Dynasty with the glories of the New Kingdom. Nectanebo I was also responsible for some modest additions at Medinet Habu, notably a gate outside the small temple,[219] and a Nilometer nearby the gate.[220]

One of the more interesting building programs that was conducted in the aftermath of the First Persian Period was the additions by Nectanebo I and II on the Hibis Temple. As stated above in this chapter, the Hibis Temple was begun during the Twenty Sixth Dynasty, but continued and in many ways taken over by the Persians, particularly Darius I. At first glance then it would seem odd that any king of the post-First Persian Period would have anything to do with the Hibis Temple, but upon examination it is

---

[215] Ibid., 11.

[216] Ibid., 12.

[217] Mahmud Abd El-Razik, Study on Nectanebo Ist in Luxor temple and Karnak," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 22 (1968): 150-161.

[218] Ibid., 156.

[219] Porter, *Theban*,474.

[220] Ibid., 475.

revealed that they had just as much to do with this site as any other in Egypt. Nectanebo I added a portico to the front of the temple.[221] His successor, Nectanebo II, even "inserted a column partially blocking the entrance to room L to support the ceiling which threatened to collapse."[222] In addition to the preventative measures he took to preserve the temple, Nectanebo II also "rebuilt the west jamb of the door" to room K.[223] There are also two obelisk bases in front of the kiosk of Nectanebo I that were of "considerable dimensions"[224] although it is unknown for sure who erected those. Nectanebo II's final touch on the Hibis Temple was a pylon.[225] So why then did the Nectanebo kings invest considerable resources into a temple that was clearly marked with the name of Darius I? It may have been that the el-Kharga oasis became more strategically important – the Romans would later build a fort there[226] – or possibly the Hibis Temple became more religiously and ideologically important in the Late Period than modern scholars are aware of at this point. Perhaps it is a combination of the two; the strategic importance of the el-Kharga oasis meant that the Nectanebos had to delegate resources to the region while maintaining the Hibis Temple continued their connection to previous Egyptian dynasties.

---

[221] Cruz-Uribe, "Report," 158.

[222] Ibid., 162.

[223] Ibid., 219.

[224] Arnold, *Temples*, 134.

[225] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 228.

[226] Winlock, *Hibis*, 4. Winlock stated that the Hibis Temple was probably an administrative center and that the increasing importance of the camel in this period contributed to the oasis becoming an important trade center, as these animals were able to traverse the long roads in the Western Desert.

The Serapeum continued to be an important political and religious center as the Egyptian people continued to donate votive stelae there[227] and the native Egyptian kings continued to oversee burials of the Apis bulls after the Persians were repulsed. Nepherites I, the first king of the Twenty Ninth Dynasty, dedicated two hieratic stelae for a dead Apis bull in year two of his reign.[228] Nectanebo I also left his mark at the Serapeum by adding the human headed sphinx walkway[229] that was discovered by Mariette in the nineteenth century,[230] he also added a pylon to the entrance of Serapeum.[231] Nectanebo I no doubt ingratiated himself with pious Egyptians who utilized the Serapeum, which further helped to legitimize his tenuous hold over the country.

Nectanebo I's successor, Nectanebo II, apparently did not want to be outdone and so expanded the area around the Serapeum with "the extension of a cult and burial complex of sacred animals at the western slope of the Abusir promontory."[232] The temple contained galleries that housed mummies of baboons, hawks, ibises, cats, along with various statues and other votive objects.[233] The building projects conducted by the last native Egyptian kings clearly represents their desire to legitimize their rule by

---

[227] For a collection of non-royal stelae donated to the Serapeum see Jean Vercoutter, *Textes biographiques du Sérapéum: Contribution à l'étude des stèles votives du Sérapéum* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1962).

[228] Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 191; Porter, *Saqqara*, 804.

[229] Porter, *Saqqara*, 778.

[230] Mariette, *Sérapeum*, 1.

[231] Porter, *Saqqara*, 780.

[232] Arnold, *Temples*, 130.

[233] Porter, *Saqqara*, 820-9. See Chapter VII of this dissertation for a discussion of the theological and social aspects of the animal necropolises.

connecting to previous dynasties, but the creation of the animal necropolei in Saqqara represents a new aspect of Egyptian culture. Animal cults began to grow in influence in the Twenty Sixth Dynasty[234] and seem to have been institutionalized in the Thirtieth Dynasty as an "appeal by the rulers to native religiosity, and to the gods who were the embodiment of Egyptian values and self-esteem."[235]

The various dynasts of the Late Period were faced with the monumental task of legitimizing dynasties that were often foreign – such as the Nubians and Persians – native usurpers such as the Thirtieth Dynasty, or an upstart dynasty that acquired power through duplicitous acts with foreigners such as the Saites. Because of such circumstances, the dynasts of the Late Period were forced to develop a number of propaganda methods in order to legitimize their rule in the eyes of the Egyptians. The most common form of propaganda employed in this period was the building or addition to existing monuments. By doing so, the kings of the new dynasty were able to connect themselves with the previous dynasties by depicting themselves in the various archetypical roles as king such as conducting priestly duties and – ironically considering the Nubians and the Saites to a lesser extent – smiting the traditional enemies of Egypt. The propaganda programs employed by the Late Period dynasts also included patronage of the important Late Period religious institutions of the Apis cult and the God's Wife of Amen. Although all of the dynasties considered in this dissertation faced similar obstacles to legitimization and attempted to overcome those obstacles in similar ways, the Persians had a bigger task

---

[234] Arnold, *Temples*, 65.

[235] J. D. Ray, "Egypt: Dependence and Independence (425-343 B.C.)," in *Sources, Structures and Synthesis: Proceedings of the Groningen 1983 Achaemenid History Workshop*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1987), 86.

due to the distance of their homeland and much different culture. Because of this, the Persian methods of propaganda and legitimization were more sophisticated and can be traced back to their capital of Persepolis. The various uses of political propaganda used by the Late Period dynasts proves once again that this was far from being a period of decline in Egypt, as these rulers had to demonstrate greater political acumen than any other kings in pharaonic history.

Chapter VII: Conclusion

Ancient Egypt's Late Period was a unique time in many ways compared to earlier periods of pharaonic history. Complex historical processes were taking place that continually riveted the Nile Valley as potentates vied for the title of king of Upper and Lower Egypt. An analysis of the available Late Period primary sources from Egypt and her neighbors, as well as art historical and archaeological findings reveals that these processes took place in patterns or cycles and this cyclical nature of Late Period history can be discerned by taking both a chronological and thematic approach to the period. Ultimately, the research reveals that three major historical processes, which helped shape the character of the often enigmatic Late Period, were at work from 728-341 BC. A survey of these processes and more specifically the methods the would be dynasts used during these processes also divulges that many of these ancient dynasts were actually much more politically astute and savvy than they have been given credit for in past studies.

Since much of modern historical studies of the Late Period are dependent to varying degrees on the writings of the classical historians any study of this period without a critique of those authors would be done in err. Greek and later Roman historians had many biases when it came to their perceptions of foreign people, which were often negative, but even when the perceptions were more benign, as in the case of Egypt, their views were still skewed. Greco-Roman views of Egypt as a wonderful and exotic locale and culture could range from patronizing to exhalative – the Egyptians were often seen as the first to "do" many things – but an examination of the sources compared with the Egyptian philosophy of history and historiography reveals that these histories were

influenced greatly by the Egyptian priests who transferred the historical knowledge that they considered important to the Greco-Roman historians. The Greco-Roman historians were dependent on what information was transmitted to them so today any chronological or thematic study of the Late Period – or both as in the case of the current study – should be aware of this fact. A clear understanding of the classical sources and their Egyptian influences is imperative before the study of the Late Period historical processes can be conducted.

The first of these processes or phases of dynastic transition was the initial invasion that placed the new dynasty into power. Although this seems to be the most obvious of the processes in this study, a closer examination reveals that it is probably the least understood and most complex. The invasions of the Late Period were much more than just mere military campaigns intended to vanquish the opposing army and king, in fact the actually military maneuvers played a far less important role compared to the political maneuvers employed by the dynasts before and after the invasions. Most of the would-be dynasts took advantage of Egypt's fragmented political situation during the Late Period in order to assume power. The political fragmentation of the Libyan dominated Third Intermediate Period was taken advantage of first by Piankhy and then by his successor, Shabaqa, to establish Nubian rule and the Twenty Fifth Dynasty in Egypt. The Nubians' political rivals, the Saites, under Psamtek I, also used political divisions that existed in Egypt at the time along with the aid of the Assyrian Empire to eliminate all rivals and establish the Twenty Sixth Dynasty. The last native Egyptian dynasts also played on political rivalries and relied on the aid of the Greeks to assume power over the Nile Valley.

Another pattern revealed in this study that was somewhat peripheral to invasion itself, but involved the Egyptian military, was the foreign policy pursued by many of the Late Period dynasts. The Nubians and Saites injected themselves into the geo-politics of the Levant and played a duplicitous game in attempts to re-assert Egyptian influence in that region, which had been absent for the most part since the New Kingdom.[1] Most of the dynasties in the Late Period attempted some degree of geo-political archaization in the eastern Mediterranean region by either inserting themselves into regional conflicts indirectly through diplomatic influence, as was witnessed in the "Piru affair," or more directly such as with the Battle of Eltekeh. Ultimately, attempts by Late Period dynasts to re-establish any semblance of hegemony in the Levant proved unsuccessful, which is probably the reason why there is a dearth of Egyptian historical texts concerning this subject. Most of what modern scholarship knows about Late Period dynast's geo-political maneuvering in the Levant comes from Assyrian, Biblical, and Greco-Roman sources which says much about how the Egyptians viewed these endeavors; they were unsuccessful and possibly even viewed as a threat to Egyptian stability so they were omitted from the historical record.

The second historical process of dynastic transition discerned and analyzed in this dissertation was regicide. Although regicide was not unknown in earlier periods of pharaonic history, it was extremely rare – or at least rarely mentioned – either due to the

[1] The one notable exception being the Libyan Twenty Second Dynasty king Shoshenq I's excursion into the Levant in 925 BC ca. For the topographical list see, Chicago Epigraphic Survey, *The Bubastite Portal*. part 3. *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954). For the biblical account see 1 Kings 14:25-26. For a modern chronological reconstruction of the campaign see Kenneth Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: (1100 to 650 BC)*, 2nd ed. (Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris and Phillips, 1995), 293-98, 432-47. This campaign was a meager attempt to exert any type of foreign influence even when compared to the failed geo-political policies of the dynasties covered in this study.

perception of the Egyptian king as divine and/or because the act itself was anathema to the existing order or *Maat*. In the Late Period, regicide was much more common to the point that it became routine for the king of a new dynasty to assassinate the last king of the previous dynasty. An examination of the sources and the historical-religious context of these acts reveals that it was a more complicated act than it looks at first glance.

The concept of divine kingship that was apparent in earlier periods of pharaonic history – although as discussed in Chapter V, not all scholars agree that all Egyptians believed in the idea of divine kingship – gave way to a more pragmatic view of kingship that perhaps made it easier to view regicide merely as the killing of a man and not a god. This more secular view of kingship was augmented with the fact that many of the Late Period dynasts were foreign in varying degrees – the Persians definitely were, the Nubians were as well although definitely "Egyptianized" to an extent, while the Saites were also outsiders to a degree[2] – and so found it easy to disregard traditional Egyptian ideas of kingship and decorum. On the other hand Late Period dynasts had to demonstrate in numerous ways that their rule was legitimate and the previous dynasts were pretenders or even rebels who threatened *Maat*. What better way to deal with a rebel than through execution, preferably by fire? Despite the secularization and pragmatic view of kingship in the Late Period, it should be pointed out that no Egyptian

[2] See Chapter IV for a brief cultural background of the Saites. Although the Saites were descended from Libyans, by all accounts, like their Nubian rivals, they were members of the larger Egyptian civilization. Outside of the names they chose, there is little to nothing that distinguished them from other Egyptians – at least in their cultural practices. Despite this, they did remain political outsiders in the eighth century BC relegated to the Delta in a city that had little importance before their rise to power.

text explicitly mentions a regicide of a reigning Egyptian king during this period,[3] which indicates that some taboos held strong even in turbulent times.

The final historical process of dynastic transition examined in this dissertation was the various modes of political legitimization, or propaganda, used by the dynasts once they assumed power. The level of effectiveness in political legitimization could be the difference between a dynasty being short, chronologically speaking, and ephemeral – the Twenty Ninth Dynasty for example – or a relatively long dynasty that was respected in later generations, such as the Twenty Fifth and Twenty Sixth Dynasties. The methods of political legitimization utilized by Late Period dynasts primarily involved monument building and patronage of religious institutions and cults, but these acts were far more nuanced then just simply building a temple or donating to a cult.

The act of building, or even more so, adding to an existing monument was a way for the dynast in question to connect himself and his dynasty to earlier periods of Egyptian history that may have been viewed as more stable or glorious. By viewing these building programs in their historical context a number of patterns can be discerned. It appears that geography played a role in where building programs took place. The Nubians canvassed the Theban region with a plethora of Twenty Fifth Dynasty monuments but left the Delta – as far as modern scholarship can determine – alone while their arch rivals, the Saites, left Thebes untouched of any major Twenty Sixth Dynasty monuments. Later, the Persians were active with some building projects in Egypt, but nothing of significance in Thebes while the Thirtieth Dynasty kings Nectanebo I and II

[3] The exception being the burning of the Nubian "king" mentioned in the *Tanis Stela* (see Chapter V), although this example is not contrary to Egyptian religion/culture as the king behind the regicide, Psamtek II, is the rightful Egyptian king while the Nubian is viewed as a traditional foreign enemy, rebel, and possible usurper.

were active in the Theban region. A number of factors may have played a role in these geographic building discrepancies by the different dynasties. The Nubian affinity for Thebes probably was related to their long standing influence in that region even before 728 BC while their apparent aversion of Lower Egypt may be connected to that region being the homeland of their Saite rivals. Likewise, the Saite activities in the north and their lack of building in the south is probably due to similar reasons, but the status of Thebes being an ancient "backwater" by the seventh century BC should also be considered. Thebes' relegation to a provincial city of little importance may be the primary reason why there was a lack of Persian building activity there since by that time the Nubians were no longer a threat to re-take Egypt and they therefore had no real need to consolidate their hold on the region and keep an eye on them as the Saites did.

An examination of Late Period monument building also illuminates some important aspects of appropriation of pharaonic culture by foreign dynasts. In their quest to depict themselves as true Egyptians the foreign dynasts of the Late Period sometimes went to lengths that visibly conflicted with their origins and challenged ideas of ethnic identity. The Nubian king Taharqa depicted himself at the small temple in Medinet Habu in a relief scene smiting the traditional enemies of Egypt, both Libyan *and* Nubian, which perhaps best demonstrates the desire by foreign dynasts to be viewed as Egyptian in order to make their rule and dynasty legitimate. Psamtek I's stela from Saqqara that commemorated his victory over the Libyans also follows this model of political legitimization to a certain degree. When considered in its historical context – it was a campaign against a traditional Egyptian enemy during the reign of the first king of a new dynasty that usurped the previous dynasty – one can glean more from the text than what

is actually written in it. In this context, Psamtek I's Saqqara stela may be viewed less as a military/historical text and more as a tool of political legitimization that proclaimed his right to rule as a legitimate Egyptian king while distancing himself as far as he could from his Libyan ancestry.

The Late Period dynasts also patronized religious institutions, the God's Wife of Amen and the Apis cult in particular, in order to legitimize their rule. As central power eroded in Egypt during the Third Intermediate Period, the office of the God's Wife of Amen and the Apis cult became more prominent, although for different reasons. The God's Wife of Amen became a powerful political office in the Theban region which the Nubians viewed taking control of as vital to the overall political program of the Twenty Fifth Dynasty. By installing Amenirdis as the heiress apparent to the incumbent Libyan God's Wife of Amen, the Nubians were able to exert their influence over the powerful religious institution and further consolidate their already existing power base in the Theban region. The Saites followed the Nubians as Psamtek I had his daughter, Nitoqris, installed as the God's Wife of Amen. Although the move was for the most part done for the same reason that the Nubians installed their own women in the office – to consolidate their power base in the Theban region – the Saites did so because they also needed to counter any lingering Nubian influence in the region. The Persians ultimately did away with the office of the God's Wife of Amen probably partly due to the position being at odds with their concept of gender roles while geography again had to have been a consideration. Thebes was not important to the Achaemenid political program in Egypt so there was no reason to devote resources to an institution that offered them few benefits in terms of political consolidation and legitimization.

The Apis cult was the other major Late Period religious institution that the different dynasts patronized in order to legitimize their rule. Every dynasty covered in the scope of this study contributed in some way to the Apis cult; ceremonial burials of dead bulls and installments of successor bulls, additions to the tomb complex, and additions to the exterior of the Serapeum such as the pylon and sphinx avenue erected by Nectanebo I all indicate not just the religious importance of this institution but also its political importance. The Serapeum was a religious and cultural focal point during the Late Period and perhaps that is one of the major reasons why all of these dynasts – including the Persians who were the most removed theologically from the idea of animal worship – dedicated their time and resources to maintaining the cult.

The ultimate result of these turbulent historical processes or patterns that were at work in Egypt during the Late Period was changes to the Egyptian cultural fabric that were for the most part positive and creative. There was a fundamental change in religious practices in Late Period Egypt which can be seen primarily in the increase in personal piety or "popular religion"[4] and the dramatic increase in animal cults and a the number of non-royals who patronized them by donating votive stelae and animal

[4] For a detailed survey of popular religion from the New Kingdom through the Late Period see, Ashraf Iskander Sadek, *Popular Religion in Egypt During the New Kingdom* (Hiledesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1998). Sadek notes that during the Late Period "the role of sacred animals of this kind changed in two ways. First, the entire species was considered sacred, as the possession of the god or goddess – so, mass populations of these creatures were sometimes maintained, as of ibises. Second, the veneration of the gods through such animals was taken over by the official religion, and highly organized. The cult of the ibises at Saqqara was run by a committee of the priests of Ptah of Memphis, with a staff of people to man the chapels, the embalmery, and the feeding and hatching arrangements for the ibises." 275. J. D. Ray further connected the turbulence of the Late Period with the increase in the animals cults, "Equally typical of the period, although more surprising to the modern mind, is the continued growth of animal-cults. Animals were essentially seen as immanent gods, known in an increasingly cosmopolitan world to be characteristically Egyptian. Such gods both embodied Egyptian values and represented forces which were accessible and would not abandon their pious follower, no matter which kings or armies came and went." "Egypt: Dependence and Independence (425-343 B.C.)," in *Sources, Structures and Synthesis: Proceedings of the Groningen 1983 Achaemenid History Workshop*, ed. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1987), 88.

mummies. North Saqqara eventually became a focal point of popular religion as the animal cults grew in popularity which made the region important not only in terms of religion, but also in trade and economics.[5]

The turbulent historical patterns of the Late Period also profoundly affected the art of Egypt, especially statuary, in positive ways. As the eminent art historian Bernard Bothmer noted, the Egyptian people were shook from their insular cocoon in the Late Period:

> Having once been shaken out of their splendid introspective isolation, the Egyptians rose to the challenge of a modern world, in which neighboring peoples had to be reckoned with. Not to suffer in their pride, they became demonstrative and extroverted. Under the eyes of foreigners, they gave visible proof of their faith and tenacity of tradition by filling their temples with statues in hard stone in a profusion that belies the modern dismissal of the waning centuries of ancient Egyptian civilization as weak and decadent.[6]

The artistic religious innovations in the Late Period not only prove that the period was not "decadent" but that the historical processes studied here were significant and interconnected to all aspects of Egyptian society.

At first glance it can be easy for one to disregard Late Period Egypt as unimportant in terms of "pure" Egyptology or in the *longue durée* of Egyptian history because of the numerous foreign peoples who ruled Egypt at the time and its study cannot be conducted without considering other contemporary cultures' histories and so in fact

---

[5] J. D. Ray enumerated the economic development of the region that took place as a result of the popularity of the animal cults as follows: "hostels for pilgrims, shops to satisfy their needs, associated trades, and the paraphernalia of a festival community with its fortunetellers, reciters, carvers of hieroglyphs on bronze statues for dedication in the temples, sweepers of shrines, conjurers, astrologers and relatives." "The World of North Saqqara," *World Archeology* 10 (1978): 153.

[6] Bernard V. Bothmer, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 100* (New York: Arno Press Incorporated, 1969), xxxiii. Similarly, Eberhard Otto also argued that tension in the Late Period led to both innovations and archaism in Egyptian art, *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit: Ihre Geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Bedeutung* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954).

does take it out of the purview of a “pure” study of Egyptian history. Because of this, serious historical studies of the Late Period that attempt to unravel some of the historical processes at work during the time have been ignored. This study presented some of these historical processes that the author identified which affected not only the course of Egyptian history, but the history of the entire Near East from 728-341 BC.

Bibliography

Allen, George Thomas ed. and trans. *The Book of the Dead or Going Forth by Day: Ideas of the Ancient Egyptians Concerning the Hereafter as Expressed in Their Own Terms*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Allen, James. *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Allen, Lindsay. *The Persian Empire.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Arnold, Dieter. *Temples of the Last Pharaohs.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Asheri, David. "General Introduction." In Murray and Moreno, 1-56.

———. "Book III." In Murray and Mereno, 379-527.

Assmann, Jan. *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt.* Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Aston, D. A. "Dynasty 26, Dynasty 30, or Dynasty 27? In Search of the Funerary Archeology of the Persian Period." In *Studies of Ancient Egypt in Honour of H.S. Smith*, 17-22. London: Egypt Exploration Society,1999.

Aurelius, Marcus. *Meditations.* Translated by Martin Hammond. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.

Ayad, Mariam F. Some Thoughts on the Disappearance of the Office of the God's Wife of Amun." *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 28 (2001): 1-14

———. *God's Wife, God's Servant: The God's Wife of Amun (c. 740-525 BC).* London: Routledge, 2009.

Baines, John. "Society, Morality, and Religious Practice." In Shafer, 123-200.

———. "On the Composition and Inscriptions of the Vatican Statue of Udjahorresne." In *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson,* edited by Peter Der Manuelian, 83-92. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1996.

Balcer, Jack Martin. *Herodotus and Bisitun: Problems in Ancient Persian Historiography.* Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1987.

Bakry, Hassan S. K. "Two Saite Monuments of Two Master Physicians." *Oriens Antiquus* 9 (1970): 325-341.

———. "Two Statues of Samtowetefnakhte." *Kemi* 20 (1970): 19-36.

Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. "An Episode in the Fall of Babylon to the Persians." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 52 (1993): 241-261.

Bernard, André and Oliver Masson. "Les inscriptions Grecques d'Abou-Simbel." *Revue des etudes Grecques* 70 (1957): 1-46.

Beckerath, Jürgen von. *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen.* Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1984.

Blausis, Andreas and Bernd Ulrich Schipper, eds. *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritsche Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem greichish-römischen Ägypten.* Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2002.

———. "Die 'Apokalyptischen' Texte aus Ägypten: Ein Forschungsüberblick." In Blausis and Schipper, 7-20.

Bleeck, Arthur H., ed. *Avesta: The Religious Books of the Parsees.* 3 vols. Lexington, Kentucky: Elibron Classics, 2005.

Boardman, John, N.G.L. Hammon, D.M. Lewis, M. Ostwald, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd ed. 14 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Boardman, John. *Persia and the West: An Archaeological Investigation of the Genesis of Achaemenid Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2000.

———, Jasper Griffin, and Oswyn Murray, eds. *The Oxford History of Greece and the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Bonnet, Hans. "Herkunft und Bedeutung der naophoren Statue." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 17 (1961): 91-98.

Bothmer, Bernard V. *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period: 700 B.C. to A.D. 100.* New York: Arno Press Incorporated, 1969.

———. *Egyptian Art: Selected Writings of Bernard V. Bothmer.* Edited by Madeleine E. Cody with the assistance of Paul Edmund Stanwick and Marsha Hill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Botti, Giuseppe, and Pietro Romanelli. *Le Sculture del Museo Gregoriano Egizio.* Vatican City: Vatican City Press, 1951.

Boucharlat, R. "Susa under Achaemenid Rule." In *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Persian Period,* edited by J. Curtis, 54-67. London: British Museum Press, 1997.

Boyce, Mary, ed. and trans. *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

———. *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Briant, Pierre. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire.* Translated by Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Breasted, James Henry, ed. and trans. *Ancient Records of Egypt.* 4 Vols. Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2001.

Brewin, Christopher. "Research in a Global Context: A Discussion of Toynbee's Legacy." *Review of International Studies* 18 (1992): 115-130.

Broekman, G. P. F., R. J. Demarée, and O. E. Kaper, eds. *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical And Cultural Studies into the 21st-24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at LeidenUniversity, 25-27 October 2007.* Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2009.

Brosius, Maria. *The Persians.* London: Routledge, 2006.

Brugsch, Heinrich. "Ein wichtiges Denkmal aus den Zeiten Königs *šeš*onq I." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 16 (1878): 37-41.

———. "Der Apis-Kreis aus den Zeiten der Ptolemäer nach den hieroglyphischen und demotischen Weihinschriften des Serapeums von Memphis." *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 22 (1884): 110-136.

Brunner, Hellmut. *Die Geburt des Gottkönigs: Studien zur Überlieferung eines altägyptischen Mythos.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964.

———. "Archaismus." In Otto and Helck, 1:386-395.

Bryan, Betsy. "Property and the God's Wife of Amun." In *Women and Property*, edited by D. Lyons and R. Westbrook, 1-15. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Center for Hellenic Studies, 2005.

Bull, Ludlow. "Ancient Egypt." In Denton, 1-33.

Burton, Anne. *Diodorus Siculus Book I: A Commentary*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972.

Calmeyer, P. "Ägyptischer Stil und reichsachaimenische Inhalte auf dem Sockel der Darieos Statue aus Susa/Heliopolis." In *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire: Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop,* edited by Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Amélie Kuhrt, 285-292. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor her Nabije Oosten, 1991.

Cameron, George C. "Darius, Egypt, and the 'Lands Beyond the Sea.'" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2 (1943): 307-313.

———. "The Persian Satrapies and Related Matters." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32 (1973): 47-56.

———. "Ancient Persia." In Denton, 77-97.

Caminos, Ricardo A. *The Chronicle of Prince Osorokon*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1958.

———. "The Nitocris Adoption Stela." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 50 (1964): 71-101.

Charles, R. H., trans. *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu: Translated from Zotenberg's Ethiopic Text.* Merchantville, New Jersey: Evolution Publishing, 2007.

Chassinat, Émile. "Textes provenant du Sérapéum de Memphis." *Recueil de travaux relatifs á la philologie et á l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 21 (1899): 56-73.

———. "Textes provenant du Sérapéum de Memphis." *Recueil de Travaux relatifs á la philologie et á l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 22 (1900): 9-26; 163-180.

———. Textes provenant du Sérapéum de Memphis." *Recueil de travaux relatifs á la philologie et á l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 23 (1901): 76-91.

Chicago Epigraphic Survey. *The Bubastite Portal*. Part 3. *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Christophe, Louis A. "L'Ascendance de la divine adoritrice Nitocris." *Cahiers d'histoire Égyptienne* 4 (1951): 223-235.

Clark, Peter. *Zoroastrianism: An Introduction to an Ancient Faith.* Brighton, United Kingdom: Sussex Academic Press, 2001.

Clarke, Somers. "El-Kâb and its Temples." *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 8 (1920): 16-40.

Clarysee, Willy, Antoon Schoors, and Harco Willems eds. *Egyptian Religion the Last Thousand Years: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur*. 2 Parts. Leuven: Departement Oosterse Studies, 1998.

Clère, J. J. "Une statue naophore Hathorique d'Époque Saïte." *Revue d'égyptologie* 24 (1972): 51-54.

———. "Autobiographie d'un général gouverneur de la haute Égypte à l'Époque Saïte." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie oreintale* 83 (1983): 85-100.

Cogan, Morton. *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.

Cooney, John D. "Persian Influence in Late Egyptian Art." *Journal of the American ResearchCenter in Egypt* 4 (1965): 39-48.

Cowley, A., ed. and trans. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Claredon Press, 1923.

Crawford, Harriet, ed. *Regime Change in the Ancient Near East and Egypt: From Sargon of Agade to Saddam Hussein.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Cruz-Uribe, Eugene. "On the Existence of Psammetichus IV." *Serapis* 5 (1980): 35-39.

———."The Hibis Temple Project 1984-85 Field Season, Preliminary Report." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 23 (1986): 157-166.

———. *Translations, Commentary, Discussions and Sign-List.* Volume 1. *Hibis Temple Project.* San Antonio: Van Siclen Books, 1988.

———. "The Invasion of Egypt by Cambyses." *Transeuphratène* 25 (2003): 9-60.

Curtis, J. E. and J. E. Reade. *Art and Empire: Treasures from Assyria in the British Museum.* London: British Museum Press, 1995.

Darresy, Georges. "Stèle de l'an III D'Amasis." *Recueil de travaux relatifs a la l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 22 (1900): 1-9.

Davies, Norman. *The Decorations.* Part 3 of *The Temple of Hibis in el Khargeh Oasis.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1953.

Dawson, Christopher. "Toynbee's Study of History: The Place of Civilizations in History." In Montagu, 129-139.

Decker, Wolfgang. *Sports and Games of Ancient Egypt.* Translated by A. Guttmann. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Denton, Robert C., ed. *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1983.

Depuydt, Leo. "Murder in Memphis: The Story of Cambyses's Mortal Wounding of the Apis Bull (ca. 523 B.C.E.)." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54 (1995): 119-126.

Devachelle, D. "Le sentiment anti-Perse chez les anciens Egyptiens." *Transeuphratène* 9 (1995): 67-80.

Dillery, John. "Hecataeus of Abdera: Hyperboreans, Egypt, and the 'Interpretatio Graeca.'" *Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 47/3 (1998): 255-275.

———. "The First Egyptian Narrative History: Manetho and Greek Historiography." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 127 (1999): 93-116.

Dimick, John. "The Embalming House of the Apis Bulls." *Archaeology* 11 (1958): 183-189.

———. "The Embalming House of the Apis Bulls." In *Mit Rahineh 1955,* ed. Rudolf Anthes, 75-79. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1959.

Diodorus Siculus. *The Library of History.* Translated by C.H. Oldfather. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Drews, Robert. *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.

———. *The End of the Bronze Age: Changes in Warfare and the Catastrophe ca. 1200 B.C.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Driver, G. R., ed. and trans. *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Eaton-Krauss, M. "The Earliest Representation of Osiris?" *Varia Aegyptiaca* 3 (1987): 233-236.

Ehrenberg, Erica. "Persian Conquerors, Babylonian Captivators." In Crawford, 95-103.

Erman, Adolf, and Hermann Grapow. *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1971.

Farag, Sami. "Two Serapeum Stelae." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 61 (1975): 165-167.

Farid, Adel. "Neun demotische Inschriten aus dem Serapeum von Memphis im Louvre-Museum." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 49 (1993): 69-91.

Faulkner, Richard O. *A Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Oxford: Griffith Institute, 1999.

———. *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts.* London: Aris and Phillips, 2004.

———. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts.* Stilwell, Kansas: Digireads.com Publishing, 2007.

Felber, Heinz. "Die Demotische Chronik." In In Blausius and Schipper, 65-111.

Fornara, Charles William. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

Frankfort, Henri. *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

———. *Ancient Egyptian Religion: An Interpretation.* Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 1978.

Gardiner, Alan H. "Piankhi's Instructions to his Army." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 21 (1935): 219-233.

Geyl, Pieter. "Toynbee's System of Civilizations." In Montagu, 39-72.

———. *Debates with Historians*. New York: Meridian Books, 1958.

Goedicke, Hans. "Psammetik I. und die Libyer." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 18 (1962): 26-49.

———. "The Campaign of Psammetichus II against Nubia." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 37 (1981): 187-198.

———. *Studies in 'The Instruction of King Amenemhet I for his Son.'* San Antonio, Van Siclen, 1988.

Gomaà, Farouk. *Chaemwese Sohn Ramses II und Hoherpriester von Memphis.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973.

———. *Die libyschen Fürstentümer des Deltas vom tod Osorkons II. bis zur wiedervereinigung Ägyptiens durch Psametik I.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974.

Gozzoli, Roberto B. "La Campagna Nubiana di Psammetico II e i testi di Frontiera Saitici."*Discussions in Egyptology* 38 (1997): 5-16.

———. *The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millennium BC (ca. 1070-180 BC): Trends and Perspectives.* London: Golden House Publications, 2006.

Grayson, A. Kirk, ed. and trans. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Green, Alberto R.W. "The Identity of King So of Egypt – An Alternate Interpretation." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 52 (1993): 99-108.

Griffiths, J. Gwyn. *The Origins of Osiris and his Cult.* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.

Grimal, Nicholas. *Le stèle tromphale de Pi(ankh).* Cairo: *L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 1981.

———. *Les termes de la propaganda royale égyptienne: De la XIXe dynastie à la conquête d'Alexandre.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1986.

Grugel, Lee E. "In Search of a Legacy for Arnold Toynbee." *The Journal of General Education* 31 (1979): 35-44.

Gunn, Battiscombe. "The Stela of Apries at Mîtrahîna." *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Egypte* 27 (1927): 211-237.

———. "The Inscribed Sarcophagi in the Serapeum." *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Egypte* 26 (1926): 82-91.

———. "Two Misunderstood Serapeum Inscriptions." *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Egypte* 26 (1926): 92-94.

Hall, Emma Swan. *The Pharaoh Smites his Enemies*. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1986.

Harper, Prudence O, Joan Aruz, and Françoise Tallon eds. *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.

Harrison, Thomas. "Upside Down and Back to Front: Herodotus and the Greek Encounter with Egypt." In Matthews and Roemer, 145-155.

Helck, Wolfgang. *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den agyptischen Königslisten.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956.

Herodotus. *The Histories.* Translated by A. D. Godley. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926.

———. *The History*. Translated by David Grene. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

———. ———. Translated by Aubrey De Sélincourt. London: Penguin Books 1996.

———. ———. Edited by Carolyn Dewald and Translated by Robin Waterfield. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Hinz, Walther. *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen.* Berlin: Verlag, 1969

———."Darius und der Suezkanal." *Archäologischen Mitteilungen aus Iran* 8 (1975): 115-121.

Hölscher, U. "Der erste Pylon von Karnak." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 12 (1943): 139-149.

Hopfner, Theodor. *Der Tierkult der alten Ägypter nach den griechish-römischen Berichten und den wichtigeren Denkmälern*. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1914.

Hornemann, Bodil. *Types of Ancient Egyptian Statuary.* 7 Vols. Copenhagen: Musnksgaard, 1969.

Hornung, Erik. *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many.* Translated by John Baines. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003.

Jansen, H. Ludin, ed. and trans. *The Coptic Story of Cambyses' Invasion of Egypt: A Critical Analysis of its Literary Form and its Historical Purpose*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1950.

Jansen-Winkeln, Karl. "Eine Grabübernahme in der 30. Dynastie." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 83 (1997): 167-178.

Jeffreys, D. G., and H. S. Smith. *The Anubieion at Saqqâra I: The Settlement and the Temple Precinct*. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1988.

Jelinková-Reymond, E. "Quelques recherches sur les réformes d'Amasis." *Annales du Service de aniquités de l'Égypte* 54 (1957): 251-287.

Johnson, Janet H. "The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source." *Enchoria* 4 (1974): 1-17.

———. "The Demotic Chronicle as a Statement of a Theory of Kingship." *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 13 (1983): 61-72.

———. "Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?" In *Grammatica Demotica: Festschrift for Erich Lüddeckens*, edited by Heinz Thissen and Karl Zauzich, 107-124. Würzburg: Gisela Zauzich, 1983.

———. "Multiple Meaning and Ambiguity in the Demotic Chronicle." In *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, edited by Sarah Israelit-Groll, 494-506. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.

———, ed. "Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1992.

———. "The Persians and Continuity of Egyptian Culture." In *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change: Proceedings of the Last Achaemenid History Workshop April 6-8, 1990,* edited by Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, Amélie Kuhrt and Margaret Root Cool, 149-159. Leiden: Netherlands Institute of Near Eastern Studies, 1994.

Joisten-Pruschke, Anke. *Das religiöse Leben der Juden von Elephantine in der Achämenidenzeit.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008.

Joll, James. "Two Prophets of the Twentieth Century: Spengler and Toynbee." *Review of International Studies* 11 (1985): 91-104.

Jones, Michael, and Angela Milward Jones. "The Apis House Project at Mit Rahinah: First Season, 1982." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 19 (1982): 51-58.

———. "The Apis House Project at Mit Rahinah: Preliminary Report of the Second and Third Seasons, 1982-1983." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 20 (1983): 33-39.

———. "The Apis House Project at Mit Rahinah: Preliminary Report of the Fourth Season, 1984." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 22 (1985): 17-28.

———. "The Apis House Project at Mit Rahinah: Preliminary Report of the Fifth Season, 1984-1985." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 24 (1987): 35-46.

———. "The Apis House Project at Mit Rahinah: Preliminary Report of the Sixth Season, 1986." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 25 (1988): 105-116.

Josephson, Jack A. *Egyptian Royal Sculpture of the Late Period: 400-246 B.C.* Mainz: Philipp von Zabern Verlag, 1997.

Junge, Friedrich. *Late Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction*. Translated by David Warburten. Oxford: Griffith Institute, 2001.

Jursa, Michael. "The Transition of Babylonia from the Neo-Babylonian Empire to Achaemenid Rule." In Crawford, 73-94.

Kahn, Dan'el. "Inaros' Rebellion Against Artaxerxes I and the Athenian Disaster in Egypt." *Classical Quarterly* 58/2 (2008): 424-440.

———, and Oded Tammuz. "Egypt is Difficult to Enter: Invading Egypt – A Game Plan (seventh to fourth centuries BCE)." *Journal of the Society for the Study of Ancient Antiquities* 35 (2008): 37-66.

Kanawati, Naguib. "Saqqara Excavations Shed New Light on Old Kingdom History." *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 1 (1990): 55-67.

———. *Conspiracies in the Egyptian Palace: Unis to Pepy I.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Kent, Roland G. *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon.* 2nd ed. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1953.

———. "Old Persian Texts." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 1 (1942): 415-423.

Kerkeslager, Allen. "The Apology of the Potter: A Translation of the Potter's Wheel." In *Jerusalem Studies in Egyptology*, edited by I. Grumach, 67-79. Wiesbaden: Harrosswitz Verlag, 1998.

Khaldun, Ibn. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Translated by Franz Rosenthal. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Kienitz, Friedrich K. *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundet vor der Zeitwende*. Berlin: Akademieverlag, 1953.

Kitchen, Kenneth A. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: (1100 to 650 BC).* 2nd ed. Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris and Phillips, 1995.

———. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Williams B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2003.

Krebsbach, Jared. "The Persians and Atum Worship in Egypt's 27th Dynasty." In *Current Research in Egyptology 2010: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium*, edited by Maarten Horn, Joost Kramer, Daniel Soliman, Nico Staring, Carina van den Hoven, and Lara Weiss, 97-104. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2011.

Krutchen, Jean-Marie. *Le décret d'Horemheb: Traduction, commentaire épigraphique, philogique et institutionnel*. Brussels: L'Univesite de Bruxelles, 1981.

Kuhrt, Amélie. *The Ancient Near East: c. 3000-330 BC*. 2 Vols. London: Routledge, 1995.

Kyle, Donald G. *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

La'Da, Csaba A. "Encounters with Ancient Egypt: The Hellenistic Greek Encounter with Egypt." In Matthews and Roemer, 145-155.

Lateiner, Donald. *The Historical Method of Herodotus.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Lauer, J. *Saqqara, the Royal Cemetery of Memphis: Excavations and Discoveries since 1850.* London: British Exploration Society , 1976.

Leahy, Anthony. "Death by Fire in Ancient Egypt." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 22 (1984): 200-206.

———. "The Libyan Period in Egypt: An Essay in Interpretation." *Libyan Studies* 16 (1985): 51-65.

———, ed. *Libya and Egypt c. 1300-750 B.C.* London: Society for Libyan Studies, 1990.

———. "Royal Iconography and Dynastic Change, 750-525 B.C.: The Blue and Cap Crowns." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 78 (1992): 223-40.

———. "The Adoption of Ankhnesneferibre at Karnak." *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 82 (1996): 145-165.

Leclant, Jean. *Montouemhat: Quatrième prophète d'Amon prince de la ville*. Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1961.

———. *Recherches sur les monuments Thébains de la XXVe Dynastie dite Ethiopienne.* Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1965.

Lesko, Leonard. *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*. 2 Vols. Fall River, Massachusetts: Fall River Modern Printing Company, 2002.

Lichtheim, Miriam, ed. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Reading*. 3 Vols. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975-2006.

———. *Moral Values in Ancient Egypt.* Göttingen: Fribourg University Press, 1997.

Liverani, Mario. "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographical Texts." *Orientalia* 42 (1973): 178-194.

Lloyd, Alan B. "The So-Called Galleys of Necho." *The Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 58 (1972): 307-308.

———. "Triremes and the Saïte Navy." *The Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 58 (1972): 268-279.

———. "Were Necho's Triremes Phoenician?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 95 (1975): 45-61.

———. *Herodotus Book II*. 3 Vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975-1989.

———. "The Inscriptions of Udjahorresnet: A Collaborator's Testament." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68 (1982): 166-180.

———. "Book II." In Murray and Moreno, 219-378.

Lohwasser, Angelika. "Queenship in Kush: Status, Role, and Ideology of Royal Women." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 38 (2001): 61-76.

Loprieno, Antonio, ed. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms.* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.

———. "Views of the Past in Egypt During the First Millennium BC." In Tait, 139-154.

Lorton, David. "The Treatment of Criminals in Ancient Egypt through the New Kingdom." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 20 (1977): 1-64.

———. "Considerations on the Origin and Name of Osiris." *Varia Aegyptiaca* 1 (1985): 113-126.

Luckenbill, Daniel David., ed. and trans. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. 2 Vols. London: Histories and Mysteries of Man Ltd., 1989.

Luschey, Heinz. "Die Darius-Statuen aus Susa und Ihre Rekonstruktion." *Archäologischen Mitteilungen aus Iran* 10 (1983): 191-206.

Macadam, M. F. *The Temples of Kawa*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949.

MacKenzie, John. *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

Malamat, A. "Josiah's Bid for Armageddon. The Background of the Judean-Egyptian Encounter in 609 B.C." *The Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 5 (1973): 267-279.

Malandra, William W. *An Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religion: Readings from the Avesta and the Achaemenid Inscriptions.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Málek, Jaromir. "Who was the first to Identify the Saqqara Serapeum?" *Chronique d'Egypt* 58 (1983): 65-72.

———. "Sais." In Otto and Helck, 5:355-357

Malinine, M. *Choix de textes juridques en hiératique 'anormal' et en démotique (XXV-XXVII Dynasties).* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1953.

———, G. Posener and J. Vercoutter. *Catalogue des stèles du Sérapeum de Memphis.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1968.

———. *Choix de textes juridques en hiératique 'anormal' et en démotique (deuxième partie).* Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1983.

Malitz, J. "Das Interesse an der Geschichte: Die griechischen Historiker und ihr Publikum." In *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek History from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.*, edited by H. Verdin, 323-349. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 1990.

Manetho. *Aegyptiaca.* Translated by W. G. Waddell. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Manuelian, Peter D. *Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty.* London: Keegan Paul International, 1994.

Mariette, Auguste, and G. Maspero. *Le Sérapéum de Memphis*. Paris: F. Vieweg, 1882.

Marincola, John. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Marr, John. "The Death of Themistocles." *Greece and Rome* 42 (1995): 159-67.

Matthews, Roger and Cornelia Romer, eds. *Ancient Perspectives on Egypt*. London: University College London Press, 2003.

———. "Introduction: The Worlds of Ancient Egypt – Aspects, Sources, Interactions." In Matthews and Roemer, 1-20.

Martin, Geoffrey T. "Excavations in the Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara, 1971-2: Preliminary Report." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59 (1973): 5-15.

———. *The Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara: The Southern Dependencies.* London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1981.

Meulenaere, Herman D. *Herodotus over de 26ste Dynastie.* Leuven: Leuven University,1951.

———. "Une statuette Egyptienne à Naples." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéolgie orientale* 60 (1960): 117-129.

———. "Les monuments du culte des rois Nectanebo." *Chronique d'Egypte* 35 (1960): 92-107.

———. "La famille royale des Nectanebo." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 90 (1965): 90-93.

———. "Nektanebos I." In Otto and Helck, 4:450-451.

———. "Netanebos II." In Otto and Helck, 4:452-453.

———. "Réflexions sur la 'formule Saïte'." *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch Egyptish Gezelschap Ex Oriente Lux* 34 (1995-1996): 81-85.

Michaelides, G. "Quelques objects inédits d'époques Perse." *Annales du Service de aniquités de l'Égypte* 43 (1943): 91-103.

Mills, L. H., trans and ed. *The Zend-Avesta.* 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Middleton, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1987.

———. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990

Montagu, M. F. Ashley, ed. *Toynbee and History: Critical Essays and Reviews.* Boston: Porter Sargent, 1956.

Montet, Pierre. "Trois gouverneurs de Tanis d'après le inscriptions des statues 687, 689, et 700 du Caire." *Kemi* 7 (1938): 123-159.

Morenz, Siegfried. *Egyptian Religion.* Translated by Ann E. Kemp. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Morkot, Robert. *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers.* London: The Rubicon Press, 2000.

———. "Archaism and Innovation in Art from the New Kingdom to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty." In Tait, 79-99.

———. "Tradition, Innovation, and Researching the Past in Libyan, Kushite, and Saïte Egypt." In Crawford, 141-164.

Murnane, William J. *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1977.

Murray, Oswyn. "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56 (1970): 141-171.

———. "Greek Historians." In Boardman, Griffin, and Murray, 214-239.

——— and Alfonso Moreno eds. *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I-IV.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Muscerella, O. W. "Fragment of a Royal Head." In Harper, Aruz, and Tallon, 219-221.

Myśliwiec, Karol. *Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI-XXX.* Mainz: Phillipp von Zabern, 1988.

———. "A Lower Egyptian Sculptor's "School" of the Late Dynastic – Early Ptolemaic Period." *Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan* 6 (1992): 61-80.

———. *The Twilight of Ancient Egypt: First Millennium B.C.E.* Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Naumann, Rudolf. "Bauwerke der Oase Khargeh." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 8 (1939): 1-16.

Navari, Cornelia. "Arnold Toynbee (1889-1975): Prophecy and Civilization." *Review of International Studies* 26 (2000): 289-301.

Olmstead, A. T. *History of the Persian Empire.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Otto, Eberhard. *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit: Ihre Geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Bedeutung.* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954.

———. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Stierkulte in Ägyptien*. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964.

———, and Wolfgang Helck eds. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie.* 6 Vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1975.

Parker, Richard A. "Darius and his Egyptian Campaign." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 58 (1941): 373-377.

Parpola, Simo, and Kazuko Watanabe trans., and eds. *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. Vol. 2 of *State Archives of Assyria*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988.

Paul, G.M. "'Urbs Capta': Sketch of an Ancient Literary Motif." *Phoenix* 36 (1982): 144-155.

Peet, T.E. trans., and ed. *The Great Tomb Robberies of the Twentieth Dynasty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Petrie, W. M. Flinders. *Memphis I.* London: British School of Archaeology, 1909.

Pilgrim, Cornelius von. "Tempel des Jahu und 'Strasse des Königs" – Ein Konflikt in der späten Perserzeit auf Elephantine." In *Egypt – Temple of the Whole World: Studies in Honour of Jan Assmann*, edited by Sibylle Meyer, 303-317. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.

Pischikova, E.V. "Representations of Ritual and Symbolic Objects in Late XXVth Dynasty and Saite Private Tombs." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 31 (1994): 63-77.

Polyaenus. *Stratagems of War.* Translated by R. Shepard. Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1974.

Porten, Bezalel. *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.

Porter, Bertha, and Rosalind L.B. Moss. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings.* 8 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.

Posener, Georges. "Le canal du Nil à le Mer Rogue avant les Ptolemées." *Chronique d'Égypt* 13 (1938): 259-273.

———. *La première domination Perse en Égypte: Recueil d'inscriptions hiéroglyphs*. Cairo: *L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, 1936.

———. *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe dynasties.* Paris: Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes, 1956.

———. *De la divnité du pharon*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1960.

———. "Du noveau sur Kombabos." *Revue d'Égyptologie* 37 (1986): 91-96.

Potts, D. T. *The Archaeology of Elam: Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* 3rd ed. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Ray, J. D. "The House of Osorapis." In *Man, Settlement, and Urbanism*, edited by Peter J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G.W. Dimbleby, 699-704. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing, 1972.

———. "The World of North Saqqara." *World Archaeology* 10 (1978): 149-157.

———. "Egypt: Dependence and Independence (425-343 B.C.)." In *Sources, Structures and Synthesis: Proceedings of the Groningen 1983 Achaemenid History Workshop*, edited by Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, 79-95. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1987.

———. "Egypt 525-404 B.C." In Boardman, Hammond, Lewis, and Ostwald, 254-286.

Raziq, M. Abd El. "Study on Nectanebo Ist in Luxor temple and Karnak." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 22 (1968): 150-161.

Reade, J. E. "Sargon's Campaigns of 720, 716, and 715 B.C.: Evidence from the Sculptures." *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 35 (1976): 95-104.

Redford, Donald B and K. S. Freedy. "The Dates in Ezekiel in Relation to Biblical, Babylonian and Egyptian Sources." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 462-485.

———. "Sais and the Kushite Invasions of the Eighth Century B.C." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 22 (1985): 5-15.

———. *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*. Mississauga, Canada: Benben Publications, 1986.

———. *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992.

———, ed. *The Ancient Gods Speak A Guide to Egyptian Religion.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Redford, Susan. *The Harem Conspiracy: The Murder of Ramesses III.* Dekalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002.

Redmount, Carol A. "The Wadi Tumilat and the 'Canal of Pharaohs'." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54 (1995): 127-135.

Reisner, George A. *Excavations at Kerma.* Two Vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1923.

———. "The Meroitic Kingdom of Ethiopia: A Chronological Outline." *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 9 (1923): 34-77.

Rilley, Claude. "Une nouvelle interprétation du name royal Piankhi." *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 101 (2001): 351-368.

Ritner, Robert K. "Libyan vs. Nubian as the Ideal Egyptian," In *Egypt and Beyond: Essay Presented of Leonard H. Lesko upon his Retirement from the Wilbour Chair of Egyptology at Brown University, June 2005*, Edited by Stephen E. Thompson and Peter Der Manuelian, 305-314. Providence: Brown University Press, 2008.

———. "Fragmentation and Re-integration in the Third Intermediate Period." In Broekman, Demarée, and Kaper, 327-340.

———. *The Libyan Anarchy: Inscriptions from Egypt's Third Intermediate Period.* Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Roaf, Michael. "The Subject Peoples on the Base of the Statue of Darius." *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 4 (1974): 73-160.

———. "Sculptures and Sculptors at Persepolis." *Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies* 21 (1983): 1-164.

Robbins, Gay. *The Art of Ancient Egypt*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Roeder, Gunther. "Zwei hieroglyphische Inschriften aus Hermpolis (Ober-Ägypten)." *Annales du Service des anitquite's de l'Égypte* 52 (1952): 315-412.

Root, Margaret Cool. *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of an Empire*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

Rosenberg, Stephen G. "The Jewish Temple at Elephantine." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 67 (2004): 4-13.

Ryholt, Kim. "Nectanebo's Dream or the Prophecy of Petesis." In Blausius and Schipper, 221-41.

———. "The Assyrian Invasion of Egypt in Literary Tradition: A Survey of the Narrative Source Material." In *Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*, edited by J.G. Dercksen, 483-510. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2004.

Russmann, Edna R. *The Representation of the King in the XXVth Dynasty.* New York: The Brooklyn Museum, 1974.

———. "Egypt and the Kushites: Dynasty XXV," in: *Africa and Africans in Antiquity*, edited by E. M. Yamauchi, 113-131. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2001.

Sachau, E. *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militärkolonie zu Elephantine*. Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs, 1911.

Sadeek, Wafaa el. *Twenty-Sixth Dynasty Necropolis at Giza: An Analysis of the Tomb of Thery and Its Place in the Development of Saite Funerary Art and Architechture.* Vienna: Institute for African and Egyptian Studies, 1984.

Sadek, Ashraf Iskander. *Popular Religion in Egypt During the New Kingdom.* Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1988.

Sauneron, Serge, and Jean Yoyotte. "Le campagne Nubienne de Psammétique II et sa signification historique." *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 50 (1952): 157-207.

———. "L'avis des Egyptiens sur la cuisine Soudanaise." *Journal of Sudan Antiquities Service* 8 (1959): 63-70.

Sayeed, Ramadan el. "Quelques éclaircissements sur l'histoire de la XXVI dynastie, d'après la statue du Caire CG. 658." *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéolgie Orientale* 74 (1974): 29-46.

———. *Documents relatifs à Saïs et ses divinités.* Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Oreintale, 1975.

———. *La désse Neith de Sais.* Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Oreintale, 1982.

Schlichting, Robert. "Neith." In Otto and Helck, 4:392-394.

Schmidt, Erich F. *Persepolis I: Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Schulman, Alan R. *Ceremonial Execution and Public Reward*. Freiburg: Universitätveralg, 1988.

Sethe, Kurt. *Die Altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte.* Leipzig: Hinrich, 1908.

Shafer, Byron E, ed. *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths, and Personal Practice.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Shubert, Steven Blake. "Realistic Currents in Portrait Sculpture of the Saite and Persian Periods in Egypt." *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 19 (1989): 27-47.

Simpson, William Kelly. "A Running of the Apis in the Reign of 'Aha and Passages in Manetho and Aelian." *Orientalia* 26 (1957): 139-142.

———. "Egyptian Sculpture and Two-Dimensional Representation as Propaganda." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68 (1982): 266-271.

Smith, H. S. "Dates of the Obsequies of the Mothers of Apis." *Revue d'Égyptologie* 24 (1972): 176-187.

———. "La mère d'Apis: Fouilles récemtes de l'Egypt Exploration Society à Saqqara Nord." *Bulletin de la Société Française Egyptologie* 70-71 (June and October 1974): 11-27.

———, C.A.R. Andrews, and Sue Davies. *The Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara: The Mother of Apis Inscriptions*. 2 Vols. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2011.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Smith, M. "Did Psammetichus I Die Abroad?" *Orientalia Loviensia* 22 (1991): 101-109.

Smith, Stuart Tyson. *Wretched Kush: Ethnic Identities and Boundaries in Egypt's Nubian Empire.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Snape, Steven. "The Emergence of Libya on the Horizon of Egypt." In *Mysterious Lands*, edited by David O'Connor and Stephen Quirke, 93-106. London: University College London Press, 2003.

Spalinger, Anthony. "The Year 712 B.C. and its Implications for Egyptian History." *Journal Of the American Research Center in Egypt* 10 (1973): 95-101.

———. "Esarhaddon and Egypt; An Analysis of the First Invasion of Egypt." *Orientalia* 43 (1974): 295-326.

———. "Assurbanipal and Egypt: A Source Study." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94 (1974): 316-328.

———. "Psammetichus, King of Egypt: I." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 12 (1976): 133-147.

———. "The Concept of the Monarchy During the Saite Epoch – An Essay in Synthesis." *Orientalia* 47 (1978): 12-36.

———. "The Reign of Chabbash: An Interpretation." *Zeitschrift für ägyptisches Sprache und Altertumskunde* 105 (1978): 142-154

———. "The Military Background of the Campaign of Piye (Piankhy)." *Studienzur Altägyptischen Kultur* 7 (1979): 273-301.

———. "The Civil War Between Amasis and Apries and the Babylonian Attack against Egypt." In *First International Congress of Egyptologists*, edited by W. F. Reineke, 593-604. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Speiser, E. A. "Ancient Mesopotamia." In Denton, 35-76.

Spengler, Oswald. *The Decline of the West*. Translated by Charles Francis Atkinson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.

Spiegelberg, Wilhelm. *Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris nebst den auf der Rückseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914.

Spycher, Lotty. "Propaganda." In Otto and Helck, 4:1120-1122.

Steindorff, G. "Reliefs from the Temples of Sebennytos and Iseion in American Collections." *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 7/8 (1944-46): 59.

Steve, Marie-Joseph. "Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse." *Studia Iranica* 3 (1974): 135-169.

Strabo. *Geography.* Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Stronach, David. "Descriptions and Comment." *Journal Asiatique* 260 (1972): 240-246.

Tadmor, Hayim. "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 12 (1958): 22-100.

Tait, John, ed. *'Never Had the Like Occurred': Egypt's View of Its Past*. London: University College, London Press, 2003.

———. "Introduction – '. . . since the Time of the Gods.'" In Tait, 1-14.

Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Steven Lattimore. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1998.

Tobin, Vincent Arieh. "Creation Myths." In Redford, 246-251.

Török, László. *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization.* Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———, T. Eide, T. Hägg, and R. H. Pierce eds. and trans. *Fontes Historiae Nubioram: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region Between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD*. 3 Vols. Bergen: University of Bergen, 1994-2008.

Toynbee, Arnold J. *Greek Historical Thought from Homer to the Age of Heraclius*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1924.

———. *A Study of History*. Edited by D.C. Somervell. 2 Vols. New York: Dell Publishing, 1974.

Tresson, Paul. "Sur deux monuments Égyptiens inédits de l'époque d'Amasis et de Nectanébo Ier." *Kemi* 4 (1933): 126-150.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "Testing the Toynbee System." In Montagu, 122-124.

Tuplin, C. "Darius' Suez Canal and Persian Imperialism." In *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire.* 237-283. Leiden: Institute for Eastern Studies, 1991.

Uphill, E. P. "The Ancient Egyptian View of World History." In, Tait, 15-29.

Vallat, François. "Deux inscriptons Elamites de Darius Ier (Dsf et Dsz)." *Studia Iranica* 1 (1972): 8-11.

———. "Les textes Cuneiformes de la statue de Darius." *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 4 (1974): 161-170.

———. "Un fragment de tablette Achemenide et la turqoise." *Akkadica* 33 (1983): 63-68.

Vandier, Jacques. "La découverte du Sérapéum et les funérailles de l'Apis d'après certaines stèles du Sérapéum." *Journal des Savants* (1964): 128-135.

Van Siclen, Charles C. III. "Nectanebo II's Great Naos for Bastet." In *Essays in Egyptology in Honor of Hans Goedicke,* eds. Betsy M. Bryan and David Lorton, 321-322. San Antonio: Van Siclen Press, 1994.

Verbrugghe, Gerald P., and John M. Wickersham, eds. and trans. *Berossos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Vercoutter, Jean. "Une epitaphe royale inédite du Sérapéum." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 16 (1958): 333-345.

———. "The Napatan Kings and Apis Worship." *Journal of the Sudan Antiquities Organization* 8 (1960): 62-76.

———. *Textes biographiques du Sérapéum: Contribution à l'étude des stèles votives du Sérapéum*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1962.

Vernus, Pascal. *Affairs and Scandals in Ancient Egypt.* Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Walser, Gerold. *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis: Historiche Studien über den sogenannte Tributzug an der Apadanatreppe*. Berlin: Akadamie Verlag, 1966.

Welsby, Derek A. *The Kingdom of Kush: The Napatan and Meroitic Empires.* Princeton, New Jersey: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1998.

Whiston, William, ed. *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. New Updated Edition. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.

Wiesehöfer, Joseph. *Ancient Persia from 550 B.C. to 650 A.D.* London: Tauris Publications, 1996.

Willems, H.O. "The Nomarchs of the Hare Nome and Early Middle Kingdom History." *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap ex Oriente* 28 (1985): 80-102.

Williams, Ronald J. "Literature as a Medium of Political Propaganda in Ancient Egypt." In *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Hounour of T.J. Meek*, edited by W.S. McCullough, 14-30. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

Winlock, H. *The Excavations.* Part 1 of *The Temple of Hibis in El Kharga Oasis.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1941.

Xenophon. *The Persian Expedition*. Translated by Rex Warner. London: Penguin Books, 1972.

Yoyotte, Jean. "Sur le voyage Asiatique de Psammetique II." *Vetus Testamentum* 1 (1951): 141-144.

_____. "Le martelage des noms Éthopiens par Psammétique II." *Revue de Egyptologie* 8 (1951): 215-239.

———. "Plaidoyer pur l'authenticité du scarabée historique de Shabako." *Biblica* 37 (1956): 457-476.

———. "Nectanebo II comme faucon divin?" *Kemi* 15 (1959): 70-74.

———. "Les principautés du Delta au temps de l'anarchie Libyenne." *Mélanges Maspero* 4 (1961): 121-181.

———. "Bocchoris à tanis et l'expansion des premiers rois Saïtes ver l'orient." *Kemi* 21 (1971): 35-45.

———. "Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques Darius et l'Égypte." *Journal Asiatique* 260 (1972): 253-266.

Žabkar, L. V. *Apedemak Lion God of Meroe: A Study in Egyptian-Meroitic Syncretism*. Warminster, U.K.: Aris and Phillips, 1975.

Zaehner, R. C. *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism.* New York: G.P. Puntnam's Sons, 1961.

Zeissl, Helene von. *Äthiopen und Assyrer in Ägypten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Spätzeit.* Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 1955.

Zivie, Alain. *Découverte à Saqqara: Le vizir oublié*. Paris: Seuil, 1990.

——— and Roger Lictenberg. "Les chats du Bubasteion de Saqqâra: État de la question et perspectives." In *Egyptology at the Dawn of the 21st Century: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, edited by Zahi Hawas and Lyla Pinch Brock, 605-11. Cairo: American University in Cairo, 2004.