

JOHN DILLERY

THE FIRST EGYPTIAN NARRATIVE HISTORY: MANETHO AND GREEK
HISTORIOGRAPHY

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 127 (1999) 93–116

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE FIRST EGYPTIAN NARRATIVE HISTORY:
MANETHO AND GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY*

In the early 3rd century BC,¹ during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the Egyptian priest Manetho² of Sebennytus (*FGrHist* 609) wrote a history of his native land in the Greek language. The work is clearly indebted both to Egyptian and Greek texts. Its importance cannot be over stressed: two cultures, and the narrative systems they employed, were brought together in the composition of his *Aegyptiaca*, or *Egyptian Matters*. Issues such as the impact of Greek historical writing on Egyptian conceptions of the past, the intended audience of such a work, and the role of the native elite in the Macedonian and Greek governance of Egypt are all opened up through Manetho's work. But all these subjects hinge on a prior question: what exactly was the nature of the *Aegyptiaca*? More precisely, how was its material presented, and in particular, what types of narrative did it contain? Oddly, an examination of Manetho's narrative structures has never really been attempted (cf. Burstein's observation [1996] 600).

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.³ But while Manetho's history was built out of materials whose genres had existed for many centuries before the advent of Greco-Macedonian rule, it was only with the coming of Greek speakers in considerable numbers that a lengthy narrative history of Egypt was composed by an Egyptian.⁴ The most important, if not sole reason for this was the influence of two histories of Egypt composed by Greeks that he must have known well: Herodotus' treatment of Egypt, chiefly, but not confined to, Book 2 of his *Histories*,⁵ and Hecataeus of Abdera's own *Aegyptiaca*.

A significant problem, however, needs to be mentioned at the outset that complicates any appreciation of Manetho's work. The *Aegyptiaca* does not survive intact, indeed far from it. The King List component of his text was transmitted by later writers, mainly Christians, who wanted a chronological framework for dating events from the Bible on an independent basis (e.g. Gelzer [1885] 51-63; Adler [1989] 76-80). This King List portion is not devoid of connected passages, but for the most part it only serves as a guide to where the major narrative panels would have been found in Manetho's original work. For narratives of any length, we must turn to the Jewish priest-historian of the early Roman empire, Josephus (AD 1st).

* This paper grew out of presentations delivered in the Spring of 1997 at Oxford, and in the Spring of 1998 at the University of Chicago: I thank my hosts at both places, esp. R. Lane Fox and F. Millar of Oxford University, and C. Faraone of the University of Chicago. On this second occasion I was a participant at a conference on Narrative Traditions in Greco-Roman Egypt; at certain points in this paper I acknowledge the contributions of other participants. I take the opportunity here to thank S. Burstein who read a late draft. The standard warning applies.

¹ All subsequent dates, unless otherwise indicated, are BC.

² On the problems associated with the name of Manetho, consult Thissen (1980) and (1987). For general treatments, see Otto (1908) II 215-6, Griffiths (1970) 79-80, and Sterling (1992) 117-136.

³ Fraser (1972) I 509 and Redford (1986) 206-29; cf. Helck (1956) 1-4.

⁴ I do not mean to downplay the possibility of early Greek and Egyptian cultural exchange, including narrative traditions: cf. Koenen (1994b), esp. 14-26, and Rutherford (1997) 206. Of course Naucratis was founded in the seventh century. Furthermore, Greek mercenaries had served in Egypt at least since the early sixth century (Meiggs & Lewis no.7), but in all likelihood before as well (cf. *Ody.*14.246ff.); Hellenomemphites, descendants of these men, were a continuous presence from the sixth century onward, Thompson (1988) 95-97.

⁵ The history of Egypt is also dealt with elsewhere in Herodotus, esp. the reign of Cambyses, Book 3. Manetho would have been interested in this material as well, e.g. stories such as Cambyses' treatment of the Apis bull, Hdt. 3.27-29.

In his *Against Apion* Josephus set himself the task of proving the great antiquity of his people. In order to make his case he relied heavily on historians who were both non-Jewish and non-Greek: the former category because of the presumption of impartiality, the latter because the Greeks were thought to be a young people who were hopelessly ill-prepared to provide reliable information about the remote past (*CAp* I.5ff.). In comparison with the other historians he discusses, Manetho takes up by far the most amount of text. By his own admission Josephus uses Manetho's text in different ways: he quotes him directly, summarizes, paraphrases and recapitulates, and at other points does not really make clear how he is deploying Manetho's work. To make matters more complicated Josephus also refers to other versions of Manetho's work that contradict or provide different information from the text he is following. Finally, it has been argued on the basis of factual error and repetition in Josephus' treatment that he was making use of some sort of text that was derived from Manetho but that contained elements that were not genuine. The upshot is that it is sometimes extremely difficult to know on the basis of a passage in Josephus what Manetho's original narrative would have looked like. Any discussion of Manetho's narrative has also to take account of Josephus' own methods and authorial agenda.⁶

While it must be granted that the problematic nature of the preservation of Manetho's text precludes a definitive evaluation of his narrative techniques, we can not only reconstruct a relatively clear picture of the *Aegyptiaca*, we can even use Josephus' own difficulties and misreadings as guides, indicating perhaps features of Manetho's narrative which either Josephus or some intermediary figure found objectionable. Another reason for viewing Josephus as a help towards understanding Manetho as well as a hindrance is that he offers us a clue as to the audience. This issue of the audience of the *Aegyptiaca* is a large and difficult one, but it is worth pointing out here that the reception of his text tells us who was reading it in antiquity: they were, chiefly, other hellenophone non-Greeks such as Manetho himself. Most often, it seems, they were other Egyptian priests, as well as Jewish writers who were eager to counter what they perceived to be anti-Jewish statements in his text (cf. Bickerman [1975/1980] 348).

I. The Narratives

Two large-scale narratives from the *Aegyptiaca* are preserved by Josephus; they cluster around Manetho's 14th, 18th and 19th Dynasties, that is the so-called Hyksos era (Second Intermediate Period) and the earliest rulers of the New Kingdom. That these periods should be the ones that Josephus has quoted and paraphrased is no accident, for they concern events that were connected to the Biblical captivity in Egypt and the Exodus.⁷ It is best to start with brief summaries of each narrative, and then move onto a consideration of them in both their Greek and Egyptian contexts.

The Hyksos Part 1: Sethos & Harmais (*Jos. CAp* I.73-105)

Following a brief observation on Manetho's background and sources (see below), Josephus quotes a section from the second book of the *Aegyptiaca in extenso*, observing "I will present his own words (τὴν λέξιν αὐτοῦ), just as if I was producing that man himself as a witness," a witness, that is, in a court of law, the reference being to the "case" he is making for the antiquity of the Jews (75-78):

Τουτίμαιος {ὄνομα}:⁸ ἐπὶ τούτου οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως θεὸς ἀντέπνευεν, καὶ παραδόξως ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν μερῶν ἄνθρωποι τὸ γένος ἄσημοι καταθαρσύναντες ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἐστράτευσαν καὶ ῥαδίως ἀμαχητὶ ταύτην κατὰ κράτος εἶλον, (76) καὶ τοὺς ἡγεμονεύσαντας ἐν αὐτῇ χειρωσάμενοι τὸ λοιπὸν τάς τε πόλεις ὠμῶς ἐνέπρησαν καὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἱερὰ κατέσκαψαν, πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις ἐχθρότατά πως ἐχρήσαντο τοὺς μὲν φάζοντες, τῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας εἰς δουλείαν ἄγοντες. (77) πέρας δὲ καὶ βασιλέα ἕνα ἔξ

⁶ For a recent treatment of these last issues consult e.g. Schäfer (1997). See also Momigliano (1931) and Aziza (1987), esp. 53-55.

⁷ The association of the Hyksos period with the Captivity and Exodus is probably datable to the Persian occupation of Egypt, a time when hostility towards the Jews was esp. felt: Yoyotte (1963); cf. Mendels (1990) and Assmann (1997).

⁸ Accepting Gutschmid's resolution of τουτμαιοκονομα.

αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν, ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν Κάλιτις· καὶ οὗτος ἐν τῇ Μέμφιδι κατεγίνετο τὴν τε ἄνω καὶ κάτω χώραν δασμολογῶν καὶ φρουρᾶν ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδαιοτάτοις καταλιπὼν τόποις· μάλις-τα δὲ καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀνατολὴν ἠσφαλίσατο μέρη προορώμενος Ἄκκυριον τότε μείζον ἰχυρόντων ἐσομένην ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς αὐτῆς βασιλείας ἐφόδου. (78) εὐρὼν δὲ ἐν νομῶ τῷ Σεθροίτῃ πόλιν ἐπικαιροτάτην κειμένην μὲν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν τοῦ Βουβακτίτου ποταμοῦ, καλουμένην δ' ἀπὸ τινος ἀρχαίας θεολογίας Αὔαριν, ταύτην ἔκτισέν τε καὶ τοῖς τείχεσιν ὀχυρωτάτην ἐποίησεν ἐνοικίας αὐτῇ καὶ πλῆθος ὀπλιτῶν εἰς εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσαρα μυριάδας ἀνδρῶν προφυλακὴν (*FGrHist* 609 F 8, Waddell F 42).

There follows a list of five more Hyksos kings, who, we are told, were ever more desirous of "eradicating Egypt" (τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐξῆραι τὴν ρίζαν, 81), then a technical section devoted to an Egyptian etymology for the name "Hyksos". It is at this point that Josephus alludes to yet another version (ἄλλω ἀντιγράφῳ, 83) of Manetho's history, one in which the term "Hyksos" receives a different explanation. They are either "King-shepherds" or, in the alternative reading, "Captive Shepherds". In the remainder of the fragment it is clear that Josephus is paraphrasing. The Shepherd kings ruled for 511 years until a native king from the Thebaid, Misphegmothosis, led a revolt, defeated the Hyksos and trapped them in a place (τόπος) called Avaris (86). The Shepherds fortify Avaris and are besieged by Thummosis, son of Misphegmothosis. He fails and strikes a treaty with the Shepherds, who leave Egypt and go to Syria; fearing the Assyrians, they build a city in Judaea called Jerusalem. Josephus again refers to the alternative etymology of Hyksos (Captive Shepherds), noting that Manetho claimed that this explanation was found in Egyptian "sacred books" (ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς αὐτῶν βίβλοις, 91). This is the etymology Josephus approves of because of the connection he sees between "Captive Shepherd" and the nomadism of his ancestors together with the Biblical story of Joseph and the subsequent Egyptian captivity of the Hebrews.

Having digressed for a second time on the meaning of Hyksos, Josephus then returns to Manetho: "again, then, I will outline (ὑπογράψω)⁹ how the affairs of Manetho correspond to the organization of our chronology. He speaks as follows φησὶ δὲ οὕτως..." (93). The following text may be taken as a close paraphrase. Picking up the story of the expulsion of the Hyksos under the pharaoh Tethmosis, Josephus provides a kinglist of 17 monarchs (16 kings, 1 queen), totaling precisely 333 years,¹⁰ down to "Sethos also called Ramesses",¹¹ and his brother Harmais.

The story of Sethos and Harmais is important in two ways: first, it is really the chronology of the story that interests Josephus because it concludes with a reference to the Greek names of Sethos and Harmais, namely Aegyptus and Danaus, thus allowing him to compare the relative ages of the Greek and Jewish people. Danaus is an important *Stammvater* in Greek myth. Otherwise, this section of narrative does not at all bear on events related to the Jews or people easily assimilated to them such as the Hyksos. Secondly, inasmuch as the passage has a good chance of being relatively free from later ethnic polemic, it is interesting to note that it has often been seen as the text that best represents Manetho's probable merging of King List with narrative (Fraser [1972] II 734-5 n.124); further, as I will demonstrate below, the Greek of this portion is the best of the sections of Manetho that survive. The story is a familiar one, however, from any royal annals (98-101):

τοῦ δὲ ("his", sc. Amenophis' son) Σέθως, ἰππικὴν καὶ ναυτικὴν ἔχων δύναμιν τὸν μὲν ἀδελφὸν Ἄρμαϊν ἐπίτροπον τῆς Αἰγύπτου κατέστησεν καὶ πάσαν μὲν αὐτῷ τὴν ἄλλην βασιλικὴν περιέθηκεν ἐξουσίαν, μόνον δὲ ἐντείλατο διάδημα μὴ φορεῖν μηδὲ τὴν βασιλίδαν μητέρα τε τῶν τέκνων ἀδικεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων βασιλικῶν παλλακίδων. (99) αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπὶ Κύπρον καὶ Φοινίκην καὶ πάλιν Ἄκκυριους τε καὶ Μήδους στρατεύσας

⁹ ὑπογράψω indicates an "outline" or "summary"; cf. Gutschmid (1983) 442.

¹⁰ Even though the regnal years are often given in years and months, they all add up to 333 years exactly.

¹¹ Jacoby ad loc. considers the addition of "Ramesses" to be the work of a later copyist of the text.

ἅπαντας τοὺς μὲν δόρατι, τοὺς δὲ ἀμαχητὶ φόβῳ τῆς πολλῆς δυνάμεως ὑποχειρίους ἔλαβε, καὶ μέγα φρονήσας ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐπραγίαις ἔτι καὶ θαρσαλεώτερον ἐπεπορεύετο, τὰς πρὸς ἀνατολὰς πόλεις τε καὶ χώρας καταστρεφόμενος. (100) χρόνου δὲ ἱκανοῦ γεγονότος Ἄρμαϊς ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πάντα τᾶμπαλιν οἷς (ὁ) ἀδελφὸς παρῆνει μὴ ποιεῖν ἀδεῶς ἔπραπτεν· καὶ γὰρ τὴν βασιλίδα βιαίως ἔσχεν καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις παλλακίαις ἀφειδῶς διετέλει χρώμενος πειθόμενός τε ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων διάδημα ἐφόρει καὶ ἀντῆρε τῷ ἀδελφῷ. (101) ὁ δὲ τεταγμένος ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερέων τῆς Αἰγύπτου γράψας βιβλίον ἔπεμψε τῷ Σεθῶσει δηλῶν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ ὅτι ἀντῆρε ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτῷ Ἄρμαϊς· παραχρήμα οὖν ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Πηλοῦσιον καὶ ἐκράτησεν τῆς ἰδίας βασιλείας (*FGrHist* 609 F 9, Waddell F 50).

Thus Sethos returned by way of Pelusium and recovered control of Egypt. In other versions of this story—the bare narratives provided by the King Lists transmitted separately from Josephus—we learn that Harmais was exiled from Egypt.

Hyksos Part 2 (Jos. *CAp* I.227-287)

This is perhaps the most celebrated and controversial fragment of Manetho. Returning to Manetho after a break of more than a hundred chapters, Josephus uses him for a completely opposite purpose: whereas before Manetho was credited as corroborating Jewish claims to extreme antiquity, he now comes under attack for gross misrepresentation. There is, accordingly, a reassessment of Manetho's sources. Whereas earlier Josephus had noted that Manetho relied for his information on sacred chronicles (73 δέλτων ἱερῶν; 228 ἀναγραφαίς), for what follows, he claims that Manetho inserted untrustworthy accounts (λόγους ἀπιθάνους) as he wished to record the legends and rumor about the Jews (τὰ μυθεύόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 229).¹² According to Josephus, then, the following account is different from those based on priestly sources: unlike the earlier narratives, what he is about to relay from Manetho has an oral component and is implied to be popularly known and transmitted, distinct from the restricted scribal and priestly material.

Josephus begins his discussion of the text by noting that the king during whose reign the events transpired is false, or more specifically, his is a "false name" in a list of rulers: Amenophis is a king with no regnal years (230). To this king Manetho has attached legends (μυθολογίας) concerning, among other things, the Shepherds (*CAp*. I. 232-236), whose expulsion Manetho already discussed as happening some 518 years before.

εἶτα τὸν Ἀμένωφιν εἰσποιήσας ἐμβόλιμον "interpolated" βασιλέα, φησὶν τοῦτον ἐπιθυμῆσαι θεῶν γενέσθαι θεατὴν, ὥσπερ Ὠρ, εἷς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ βεβασιλευκότων, ἀνενεγκεῖν δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὁμωνύμῳ μὲν αὐτῷ Ἀμενώφει, πατὴρ δὲ Π(α)άπιος ὄντι, θείας δὲ δοκοῦντι μετεσχηκέναι φύσεως κατὰ τε σοφίαν καὶ πρόγνωσιν τῶν ἐσομένων. (233) εἰπεῖν οὖν αὐτῷ τοῦτον τὸν ὁμώνυμον, ὅτι δυνήσεται θεοὺς ἰδεῖν, εἰ καθαρὰν ἀπὸ τε λεπρῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μιαρῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν χώραν ἄπασαν ποιήσειεν. (234) ἠσθέντα δὲ τὸν βασιλέα πάντα τοὺς τὰ σώματα λελωβημένους ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου συναγαγεῖν· γενέσθαι δὲ τοῦ πλήθους μυριάδας ὀκτώ. (235) καὶ τούτους εἰς τὰς λιθοτομίας τὰς ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἀνατολὴν μέρει τοῦ Νείλου ἐμβαλεῖν αὐτόν, ὅπως ἐργάζοιντο καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Αἰγυπτίων εἶεν κεχωρισμένοι· εἶναι δὲ τινὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῶν λογίων ἱερέων φησὶ λέπρα συνεσχημένους. (236) τὸν δ' Ἀμένωφιν ἐκείνον, τὸν σοφὸν καὶ μαντικὸν ἄνδρα, ὑποδείξει πρὸς αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸν βασιλέα χόλον τῶν θεῶν, εἰ βιασθέντες ὀφθήσονται· καὶ προσθέμενον εἰπεῖν, ὅτι συμμαχῆσουσί τινες τοῖς μιαιοῖς καὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου κρατήσουσιν ἐπ' ἔτη δεκατρία, μὴ τολμῆσαι μὲν αὐτόν εἰπεῖν ταῦτα τῷ βασιλεῖ, γραφὴν δὲ καταλιπόντα περὶ πάντων ἑαυτὸν ἀνελεῖν, ἐν ἀθυμίᾳ δὲ εἶναι τὸν βασιλέα (*FGrHist* 609 F 10, Waddell F 54).

¹² Gruen (1998) 57-58; he discusses briefly the question of the authenticity of the Leper fragment, noting the doubters at 58 n.57.

Up to this point Josephus seems to have paraphrased, and his editorial hand is particularly to be felt at the beginning where he comments on the fictitious nature of Amenophis the King. He now changes his tack and quotes directly, as we can tell from the phrase "and he [Manetho] has written *verbatim* as follows" (... κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως γέγραφεν, 237).

The passage is too long to quote in full, so I offer a close summary. After suffering for a considerable period of time, the polluted living in the quarries beg Amenophis to grant them the city of Avaris, a place identified with Typhon "according to sacred lore" (κατὰ τὴν θεολογίαν, 237). There the polluted live under the authority of one of the leprous priests, Osarseph (238),¹³ who establishes a code of law that they should live in direct contravention of traditional Egyptian law and communicate with no one other than themselves. Osarseph then oversees the re-fortification of Avaris in preparation for war against Amenophis. An embassy is also sent to the Shepherds in Jerusalem, who gladly return to Avaris. Amenophis, devastated by the news and mindful of Amenophis the Seer's prophecy (τῆς παρὰ Ἀμενώφειος τοῦ Παάπιος μνηθεὶς προδηλώσεως, 243), summons a council. He arranges for the protection of Egypt's sacred animals and images, sends his son away, and marches out to meet the enemy. Amenophis then reverses himself, electing not to join battle with the invaders, but to take the Apis bull and other sacred animals with him and flee to Ethiopia. There the Ethiopian king welcomes him and quarters his army; he also sees to the defense of his frontier. Amenophis resides in Ethiopia for the requisite 13 years, during which time Egypt experiences a period of great suffering, indeed so bad that the first domination of the Shepherds is made to seem "golden" (κράτησιν χρυσοῦν, 248): not only are the sacred animals killed, the temples are used as kitchens, and the priests are compelled to butcher the beasts; later they are themselves thrown out of the sanctuaries naked. Osarseph is again identified as the lawgiver of the lepers, his name is glossed, and then we are told he changed it to Moses.

II. Manetho's Narratives and Greek Historiography

For the elite priesthood of Egypt learning Greek meant learning not just the language of the Greco-Macedonians, it meant learning, if at times only superficially, Greek literature and culture.¹⁴ It seems a reasonable assumption that in adopting the language of the new masters of Egypt, Manetho also became acquainted with the historical writing of the Greeks. In the case of Herodotus we are certain that Manetho read him, and what is more, read him very closely, for he corrected his work in the *Aegyptiaca* (cf. Burstein [1996] 600). I will return to his engagement with Herodotus' work immediately below.

The first narrative admirably illustrates Manetho's relation to Greek historical writing, both his debt to it, as well as his independence. In chapter 73 of the first book of *Against Apion* (*FGrHist* 609 T 7, F 42 Waddell) we learn that Manetho, while an Egyptian by race, was a man "possessed of Greek culture" (τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς μετεσχηκῶς παιδείας, cf. Gutschmid [1893] 419). For Josephus, this dual character is clear from the fact the he wrote in the Greek language a history of his own land from sacred records, as Manetho said himself, "translating" (μεταφράσας), and on several points indicating Herodotus as a falsifier of fact, but out of ignorance (ὄπ' ἀγνοίας), not (by implication) out of malice (T 7; cf. Armayor [1985] 8). The accumulation here of personal detail about Manetho as well as polemic against Herodotus is highly significant. Behind these few remarks probably lies a traditional proem or a programmatic statement of some kind by Manetho himself.¹⁵ He perhaps named himself at the start of his history, and gave his background, and hence established his authority for what followed: "Manetho, an Egyptian by birth, but of Greek learning, wrote the following account of Egypt." What is more, he identified his sources and hence, indirectly, asserted his privileged knowledge: "I have written, having translated from

¹³ For a recent treatment of the name Osarseph, see Redford (1993).

¹⁴ Powerfully demonstrated by Thompson (1994), esp. 75ff.; see also Morgan (1997).

¹⁵ Note Jacoby's presentation of the fragment, *FGrHist* 609 F 1.

sacred records."¹⁶ Finally, he employed polemic to help him articulate the unique value of his history of Egypt, using Herodotus as his target; this response to Herodotus may have been part of the proem, or it may have occurred throughout the *Aegyptiaca*, wherever Manetho thought Herodotus was in need of correction.

In other words, Manetho may well have begun his history in an emphatically Greek way. Indeed, note that he probably claimed participation in Greek culture, not merely knowledge of the Greek language (cf. Thompson [1994]). From its very beginnings (Hecataeus of Miletus *FGrHist* 1 F 1) Greek historical writing offers us numerous examples of historians who begin their accounts with their name, ethnic, and polemic against other writers as part of a defense of their own methodology and subject matter. These constituents of the proem were well known: for instance, Dionysius of Halicarnassus knew that historians made it a practice to talk about themselves in their introductions (cf. Koenen [1993a]) and to attack other historians (*FGrHist* 72 F 1, 115 F 24 [Dion. Hal. *AR* I.1.1], on Anaximenes and Theopompus). For Manetho to have written in a similar way (if in fact he did so) would have signaled that his work was oriented along Greek historiographic lines.

On close inspection, however, there are distinctly unhellenic elements in this most Hellenic passage. Greek historiography put a great premium on the historian as judge: indeed, he was a "*histor*".¹⁷ Herodotus declares his independence from received lore (albeit allegedly barbarian) at the beginning of his history, and instead stresses his own role in preserving from oblivion the epic glory that the events of the Persian wars so richly deserve, both Greek and barbarian. There is no real mention in his introduction of his sources; rather, his account will take as its starting point the man *he himself knows* (Hdt. 1.5 οἶδα αὐτός) to have been the initiator of hostilities between East and West. This is intriguing, given that his own chronological determination of the epoch of this man (Croesus, king of Lydia) involves a King List, much as Manetho employed. For Herodotus, however, his use of a list in this context was revolutionary by Greek standards (Burkert [1995]). Similarly, in his introduction, Thucydides makes a great deal out of the fact that he kept *his own record* of the Peloponnesian war from its outset (Thuc. 1.1), and a few chapters later points to the shortcomings of second-hand accounts and stresses the value of personal knowledge (§22).

Manetho, according to Josephus, wrote a native history (πάτριον ἱστορίαν) from sacred records (ἐκ δέλτων ἱερῶν, see n. 15). The word used here for "records" is in fact "tablets", no doubts books from temple libraries. The Greek historian is notoriously weak when it comes to documents (Marincola [1997] 103-5). For Manetho on the other hand, the records of his country are at the heart of his enterprise. What is more, they are probably texts in Egyptian oral and written tradition that are being alluded to here, a point of major importance when we turn to Manetho's history in its Egyptian setting. In other words, Manetho may well have stressed his dependence on Egypt's written past in his proem, whereas the Greek historian in the same place drew notice to the independence or even uniqueness of his view of history (cf. Bickerman [1988] 223). The kind of historian Manetho became is precisely the type that would have drawn the ire of Polybius: historians who spend their days in libraries and who put a high value on knowledge gained from *hypomnemata*, but who do not rely on their own practical experience and are not (seemingly) independent thinkers (Plb. 12.25e.4).

As the narrative continues we clearly move from introductory material to the history proper: indeed Josephus tells us that the story of the events during Toutimaios' reign are from the second book of the *Aegyptiaca*, and hence is not to be connected to the background information about Manetho that he has just related. "Toutimaios: in his reign, for reasons I know not, god blasted Egypt..." (above, p. 94). This statement, from a Greek perspective, is surprising. To admit ignorance is not at all unusual; to admit ignorance without also providing even a provisional explanation of some kind, based on one's own rea-

¹⁶ The entire sentence in Josephus appears as follows: Μανεθῶς δ' ἦν τὸ γένος Αἰγύπτιος ἀνὴρ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς μετεσχητικῆς παιδείας, ὡς δηλὸς ἐστίν. γέγραφεν γὰρ Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν ἐκ δέλτων ἱερῶν, ὡς φησὶν αὐτός, μεταφράσας.

¹⁷ See Dewald (1987) and Connor (1993).

soning, is highly unusual. Indeed, much is left unclear.¹⁸ The invaders, characterized as being of "obscure" origin, attack from an ill-defined eastern region. Who precisely are they?¹⁹ More importantly, they conquer Egypt "easily" and "without a fight"; surely this remarkable feat deserves an explanation, but none is forthcoming. If this portion of the text is truly by Manetho, and there is no compelling reason not to think so (in fact, this section may be direct quotation), one must conclude that the absence of any explanation of points such as these suggests that the text is concerned with reporting matters that were not what a Greek reader would expect. By way of contrast, Thucydides advanced in his so-called Archaeology very specific reasons why the early Greek naval supremacies were successful, including an analysis of the Trojan War (Thuc. 1.4-14). Herodotus, for his part, also took up remote history on several occasions. An instance in some ways parallel to Manetho's account of the coming of the Hyksos might be Herodotus' statements regarding the Cimmerians. An equally mysterious people, Herodotus reports in different places throughout his history where they lived and why they invaded Asia Minor (see esp. Hdt. 1.103, 4.11-13). It is not simply the case that Greek historians were more at ease treating remote events; in fact, a writer closer in time to Manetho, Ephorus, echoed his predecessors in noting the problems of studying periods of the remote past (*FGrHist* 70 F 9).

For an extensive narrative that can be read as being Greek in orientation one need look no further than the Sethos and Harmais episode. The story unfolds through artfully crafted parallel sentences that rely heavily on the coordinating particles μέν and δέ, one set embedded in another:

τοῦ δὲ Σέθου, ἰππικὴν καὶ ναυτικὴν ἔχων δύναμιν, τὸν μὲν ἀδελφὸν Ἄρμαϊν ἐπίτροπον τῆς Αἰγύπτου κατέστησεν καὶ πάσαν μὲν αὐτῷ τὴν ἄλλην βασιλικὴν περιέθηκεν ἔξουσίαν, μόνον δὲ ἐντείλατο διάδημα μὴ φορεῖν μηδὲ τὴν βασιλίδαν μητέρα τε τῶν τέκνων ἀδικεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων βασιλικῶν παλλακίδων. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπὶ Κύπρον καὶ Φοινίκην καὶ πάλιν Ἀκκυρίους τε καὶ Μήδους στρατεύσας...

The first, or outer, μέν/δέ pair (single underlining) details Sethos' actions in order: he appoints his brother, and then departs on campaign. Within this pair of actions the instructions to Harmais are carefully itemized (double underlining): first (μέν) the positive instructions (all the royal prerogatives), then (two uses of δέ, one of μηδέ) the negative (what Harmais cannot do). The construction of μέν/δέ compound sentences is a hallmark of Greek, and the manipulation of two such structures which we see here, with the interior group articulated into three limbs, suggests a significant degree of sophistication.²⁰

At the lexical level, too, the Greek language has been carefully managed. The loyal priest who informs Sethos of Harmais' treachery is styled in an elaborate nominalized participial phrase: "the one appointed over the priests of Egypt" (ὁ δὲ τεταγμένος ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερέων τῆς Αἰγύπτου). ὁ τεταγμένος ἐπί τινος is a standard phrase for Ptolemaic officials, as, for example, in the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus of 136 and the famous Canopus Decree of 238.²¹ If we look at the Canopus Decree, where

¹⁸ Cf. Gutschmid (1893) 422 who viewed the passage as so problematic that he chose to emend it.

¹⁹ ἄχημοι. Redford (1986) 242 argues that his term may be an attempt to translate Egyptian *hsi* ("weak") and ultimately even "vulgar", and hence close to the Greek "undistinguished". He also asserts (p. 241) that the phrase "god blasted" is derived from the Egyptian "to storm". Note, too, the language of the *Alexander Romance* which in a couple of places speaks of a "cloud" (νέφος) of invaders into Egypt (I.1.3, 2.2 Kroll; rec. γ 2 v. Lauenstein); indeed, at I.1.3 the cloud of enemies falls "suddenly" (αἰφνιδίως) on Egypt, and at I.2.2 we are told that they are from the East (ἔθνη ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνατολῆς), much as in the first Shepherd fragment (*FGrHist* 609 F 8, Waddell F 42 παραδόξως ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν μερῶν). The images of "storm" and "cloud" are no doubt to be connected to the god of chaos and storm, Seth/Typhon. Note, too, that the marshes of the eastern Delta near Pelusium were called αἱ Τυφῶνος ἐκπνοαί or "the blasts of Typhon", Plutarch *Antony* 3.6; cf. *eundem, de Is. et Os.* 373D. In the Greek novels the home of the *boukoloi/poimenes* (Shepherds) is the marshes of the Delta: Heliodorus *Aeth.* 1.5.2, Xenophon *Eph.* 3.12.2, Ach. Tat. *Leuc. and Cli.* 3.9.2. Cf. Rutherford (1997) 207. In Heliodorus, Typhon is (not surprisingly) prominently discussed in connection with the Isis and Osiris myth, 9.9.4-5.

²⁰ Norden (1918) 485 deploys the usage μέν/δέ of as an index of the "Greekness" of Luke's prose. Cf. Kühner-Gerth (1904) 268-71.

²¹ See *P. Rev.Laws* ed. Bingen (1952, *Sel.Pap.* 203, col.51.9): οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερέων τεταγμένοι. In the first edition Grenfell (1896) 148 ad loc. cites the Canopus Decree (Bernand [1970]; *OGIS* 56) line 73: ὁ δὲ ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἱερέων καθεκτηκῶς

we have both the Hieroglyphic and Demotic companion phrases for the Greek expression "the one in each temple appointed overseer and high priest," we do not have the participial phrase but nominal ones: "the councilors in the temples, and the governors of the temples (Hieroglyphic) and "Councilor-priests of each temple, and the governors of each temple" (Demotic).²² There is, as the Greek text of the Canopus Decree shows, a perfectly good word for overseer or high priest, which is used together with the participle. But Manetho, like the papyrus of the Revenue Laws and in accordance with Ptolemaic documentary usage,²³ here prefers the participle without noun, though he does call Harmais at the start of the passage ἐπίτροπος. It seems highly probable that Manetho, as an important priest himself, will have encountered the developing bureaucratic Greek on a regular basis, so that his own control over the language will have been shaped by this exposure.

At the thematic level, most importantly, we also see significant elements that could be considered borrowings from Greek historical writing. However, caution must be observed when so common a folk-motif (fraternal strife, treachery) is at the center of the story (see Thompson [1957] no. K2211). With this caveat in mind it is worth noting how the coup of Harmais unfolds. (i) Sethos conceives grand plans (μέγα φρονήσας) on the basis of his earlier successes and proceeds yet more boldly against unnamed eastern foes; (ii) Harmais contravenes every one of his brother's commands, by mistreating the queen and concubines, and by taking up the royal diadem on the advice of his friends, thereby declaring his revolt from Sethos. Three narrative features are prominent: the reversal of fortunes for Sethos, and the cause and postponement of the most important fact until the end of the passage. In the first case a *peripeteia* or sudden reversal of sorts is clearly aimed at in the text because of the vagueness of the detail: Sethos' earlier conquests are identified, and it is only after his campaign against these named eastern regions that Harmais revolts.²⁴ Postponement is equally important. The sentence that informs us of Harmais' treachery leaves until the end the most essential piece of information: Ἀρμαίῳ ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πάντα τᾶμπαλιν οἷς (ὁ) ἀδελφὸς παρήνει μὴ ποιεῖν, ἀδεῶς ἔπραττεν. Moreover, the list of crimes postpones to the end the item that had been the first in the original set of negative instructions: Harmais took up the diadem and thereby formally revolted.

Countless examples from Greek historiography could be cited for these thematic details. But most important are those that reproduce the narrative structures mentioned above. The occurrence of a reversal following a monarch's estimation of his own power is a hallmark of Herodotean story-telling; indeed some would place it in the larger matrix of ideas surrounding the concept of the "rise and fall" of tyrants and reciprocal action generally.²⁵ No clearer example can be found than that of Croesus, king of Lydia: μετὰ δὲ Κόλωνα οἰχόμενον ἔλαβε ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροΐσον, ὡς εἰκάσαι, ὅτι ἐνόμιζε ἑωυτὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων ὀλβιώτατον (Hdt. 1.34). The most famous case of royal *peripeteia* from Herodotus may be Xerxes' intention to conquer Greece, and then the rest of the world (7.8γ), followed of course by his disastrous and self-destructive invasion.²⁶ The phrase μέγα φρονήσας that describes Sethos' planning after his initial success is noteworthy in this context. It is true that the phrase can have a neutral or even positive force: "to have high thoughts, to be high-spirited" (LSJ s.v. φρονέω; cf.

ἐπιστάτης καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς. Also see, for example, *P. Köln* VII col B 13-16 μήτε τῶν ἄλλων τῶν - - - τεταγμ[ένων ἐπὶ - - - τῶν τε [βασ]λικῶν καὶ πολιτικῶν κ[αὶ ἱερειτικῶν] in a royal edict of Oct. 9, 186 BC. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* III p.168f. and *Fachwörter* p.170 sv. τάσσω.

²² English translations from Wallis Budge. Cf. Waddell (1940) 104 n.1. Spiegelberg (1922) translates the Hieroglyphic as the "Kuratoren in den Tempeln und den Tempelvorstehern," and the Demotic as the "Kurator, der zu jedem gehört, und der Lesonispriester."

²³ οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως τεταγμένοι occur *passim* in the *P.Rev.Laws* (above, n. 21) see index s.v. διοίκησις.

²⁴ The list (Jos. *CAp* I.99) is important: Cyprus, Phoenicia, and then the Assyrians and Medes. There are anachronisms here (the Assyrians and the Medes), as well as phrasings that seem derived from Egyptian terms for areas traditionally hostile to Egypt (e.g. Phoenicia, "Land of Khor", a translation that is also found in Ptolemaic bilingual texts). See Redford (1986) 241 and n.45, 258.

²⁵ Cf. Immerwahr (1966) esp.76-8; Gould (1989) Ch.4.

²⁶ Cf. Immerwahr (1966) 177, on Xerxes' *megalophrosyne*.

Fraenkel [1950] II 105-6).²⁷ But given that the revolt of his brother is reported immediately after his formation of a new and bolder plan, one that is made because of Sethos' earlier victories, the narrative strongly implies that the Harmais' coup acts as a counter-weight to Sethos' success. He is hit by his brother's sedition at the height of his success and power. While Sethos handles the revolt of his brother with relative ease, and the event represents only a temporary setback for him, this should not obscure the fact that his brother's coup was a serious challenge to his rule, one that necessitated the abandonment of his grand plans (note too the phrase *θαρσαλεώτερον ἐπεπορεύετο*), and forced his return to Egypt. As such, *μέγα φρονήσας* leads to a *peripeteia*, even if only in an abbreviated sense, one that checked Sethos' ambitions. Indeed, to borrow from Herodotus again, it is precisely the phrase *μέγα φρονεῖν* that Xerxes' uncle Artabanus uses to try to dissuade his nephew from launching his invasion of Greece: οὐ γὰρ ἔῃ φρονεῖν μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἄλλον ἢ ἑωυτόν (Hdt. 7.10ε). The god allows no other but himself to conceive grand designs; divine, or even cosmic *phthonos* will "correct" any human sense of exaggerated self-importance.

It has been noted for some time that postponement, both of words at the sentence level, and key details at the level of larger units of narrative, is a central tool of Herodotean story-telling: both ancient and modern readers of Herodotus have noted that his "strung-together" style (*λέξις εἰρομένη*) relies heavily on key concepts being placed in last position.²⁸ As Aristotle knew well, the *peripeteia* involves matters happening contrary to expectation (Arist. *Poetics* 1452a). Postponement of important facts is obviously crucial in such a plot-scheme. A good example comes from Herodotus 3.74ff., where we are told about the death of Prexaspes, advisor to the Magi who have usurped the throne of Persia. Herodotus is very careful to demonstrate the confidence that the Magi place in him, and reports Prexaspes' acceptance of their offers of friendship in return for his help in consolidating their rule. But when the crucial point arrives, and Prexaspes has been positioned on top of a tower in order to identify one of the Magi as the lawful ruler, he reverses his earlier promises, reveals the true identity of the current rulers, and then kills himself. Herodotus has not at all prepared us for this narrative development, and its suddenness is underscored by Prexaspes' unanticipated suicide. The passage turns on the important phrase, ὁ δὲ τῶν μὲν δὴ ἐκείνοι προεδέοντο αὐτοῦ. τούτων μὲν ἐκὼν ἐπελήθητο... (Hdt. 3.75.1). The structure of the sentence, with the adverb/verb pair (*ἐκὼν ἐπελήθητο*) postponed to the end of the phrase for emphasis, parallels precisely that describing Harmais' actions (*ἀδεῶς ἔπραττεν*).²⁹

Another detail that merits attention is the explanation given for Harmais finally taking up the diadem in contravention of his brother's wishes. We are told that he did on the advice of his friends. While by no means solely a Hellenic motivation, this detail does resonate with similar Greek stories of royal or princely intrigue. Indeed Xenophon's account of a coup by the subsatrap Meidias against his liege, Mania of Dardanus, contains the point that he was spurred to action by others (*ἀναπτερωθεὶς ὑπὸ τινῶν*, *Hellenica* 3.1.14), a detail similar to Harmais being persuaded by his friends (*πειθόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων*). Both of these passages are used to undermine the character of the usurper, showing that he lacks the resolve on his own to carry out the coup. In a sense both passages demonstrate that the two are unworthy leaders by revealing their "unkingly" actions: each goes forward with his plan only after his circle of friends has urged him on. This is the opposite situation from the case of the Egyptian

²⁷ It should be pointed out in connection with the positive meaning of *μέγα φρονεῖν* that from the point of view of Egyptian kingship ideology as manifested in the Königsnovelle (see below), the king is by definition the maker of great and "beautiful" plans: Hermann (1938) 15-19. The Greek and the Egyptian traditions pull in different directions (see the following remarks).

²⁸ See e.g. Aristotle *Rh.* 1409a on Hdt's first sentence (though the ref. to Hdt. may be a later interpolation: see Kassel's critical note [1976] ad loc.); more securely, Demetrius *de Eloc.* 17: cf. Dillery (1992). For modern treatments of Herodotus' style and *λέξις εἰρομένη* see Immerwahr (1966) 46-51 and the bibliography cited there. The postponement of the main verb to the end of the Herodotean sentence is unusual and therefore emphatic: Dunn (1988) 78. For postponement or "suppression" of narrative detail in Herodotus, see esp. Fraenkel (1950) III 805.

²⁹ It is further interesting to note that, as Gutschmid has observed (1893) 456, the first use of the adverb *ἀδεῶς* occurs in Herodotus (9.109), a story that also concerns a royal court and treachery.

Königsnovelle (see below): there, while the king meets with his council before taking action, one senses that the leader is solely responsible for the action to be taken.

It is fair to ask why the Sethos and Harmais episode, while clearly built from Egyptian materials, perhaps even from historical reliefs (Redford [1986] 258), seems so Greek in outlook, both at the level of sentence structure, and even rhetorical strategy. We do not have far to look for an answer. By the time Manetho was writing his *Aegyptiaca* a considerable body of lore about Sesostris/Sesoosis (*Senwesret I*) was already in existence, written by Greek authors. Herodotus knew his deeds well, and even discusses the nature of his eastern campaign in a fashion similar to Manetho's Sethos: some peoples resist, others capitulate (Hdt. 2.102). The same monarch is also a central figure in Hecataeus of Abdera's account.³⁰ The Hellenic aspect of Manetho's treatment of Sethos may result from the fact that he had Greek authors to follow for the presentation of the similar deeds of another "world conqueror" figure. While it may be objected in Herodotus' case that Manetho sought in general to correct him, that should not stop us from seeing in the older historian a model for Manetho: polemic towards Herodotus often accompanies a significant debt to him (Murray [1972] 205, 209-10).

III. Manetho's Narratives and their Egyptian Context

It has become clear from the discussion of Manetho's narratives in the context of Greek historiography that real difficulties emerge when we try to see his indebtedness to Greek writers: the Greekness of his text seems distinctly superficial.³¹ The proem, lost but clearly echoed in Josephus, is a powerful statement of alignment with Greek historiographic principles, but in detail it reveals features that are problematic when read against other introductions by Greek historians. The Sethos and Harmais story does indeed have a strong Greek aspect to it in both structure and theme, but here Manetho may have been relying on previous Greek accounts, at least in how he chose to present his material. Finally, it should be noted that we have not dealt at all with the longest of Manetho's narratives from Josephus, the third one treating the Lepers and the return of the Shepherds to Egypt. In what follows Manetho's narratives will be examined in their Egyptian setting, and along the way some of the problems encountered in the Greek reading of them will be resolved when viewed through Egyptian lenses.

It is important to remember at the outset that the Leper narrative is thought by Josephus to be an *ἀπίθανος λόγος* ("an unreliable tale"), as opposed to the other long quotation of Manetho devoted to the first invasion of the Shepherds and the Sethos and Harmais story; these passages were built from chronicles (*ἀναγραφαί*). This characterization of the Leper story reflects the fact that it undoubtedly derives from a different set of Egyptian materials: narratives such as royal biography, historical romance, prophecies, and other related texts (cf. Reymond [1983]). Many of these texts share the same narrative form: the *Königsnovelle*.³² While not a genre in and of itself, the *Königsnovelle* constitutes an important narrative type, one that orients an historical event around an earlier king of Egypt and thus represents a classical form of Egyptian historiography (cf. Hermann [1938] 34): typically a message of some kind, often a dream or a prophecy is communicated to pharaoh, who then discusses the matter with a council; he then forms a plan and acts upon it, with the speed of the plan's realization being especially emphasized. The overall effect of this type of narrative is to make pharaoh the focal point of the account: he is the initiator of action, and his decisions and their outcome become the matters of historical consequence. Often the planning and/or execution go awry, and troubles befall Egypt. This creates a subgroup, the "prophetic *Königsnovelle*" in L. Koenen's terminology (Koenen [1985] 188-94). One of the most important features of this narrative technique is the presence of a text within the text. A first king of times immemorial receives the prophecy. His decisions and actions regularly lead to the writing of

³⁰ *FGrHist* 264 F 25, Diodorus 1.53-58: in general consult Lloyd (1982a).

³¹ Cf. Fowden (1993) 54: "...[Manetho's] linguistic medium...was innovative, far more so than his message...His was clearly the mentality of the translator rather than the interpreter or commentator."

³² Hermann [1938]; cf. Koenen [1985] 172-73 and n. 6.

the prophecies in a book and form a frame around the prophecies in the center of narrative. At the end of this centerpiece appears the second, much later King who will bring an end to the trouble and restores Egypt. The two elements, frame and centerpiece, are not infrequently merged, with the result that elements from the frame are alluded to in the prophetic portion, and the frame often refers to the divine communication. In this type of prophetic *Königsnovelle*, two pharaohs are obviously central; the one in the historical frame, the other in the prophecy. The first legitimizes the latter. The prophecy reflects the historical deeds of the prophesied king and the woeful times from which he saves Egypt. Or, in later times, the prophecy focuses on the bad times experienced by the reader or the audience, while the hope of salvation looks to the future. But both kings of the story are generalized figures that reflect the ideologies of Egyptian kingship, not really specific kings, though they may bear historical names (cf. Hermann [1938] 11).³³

In several important respects the Leper fragment conforms to the *Königsnovelle* model. At first glance, the narrative seems to focus solely on the character of Amenophis the King: he desires to see the divine; he acts on the prophecy delivered to Amenophis the Seer; he purifies Egypt; he prepares the defense of Egypt; he flees. There are also divine communications from the seer Amenophis: the initial one recommending the removal of the polluted persons, and the second predicting the 13 year rule of the foreigners. Furthermore, the restoration of Egypt and the return of the king implicitly suggest the fulfillment of the prophecy. There is also the meeting of a council after which the king decides to protect the temples and sacred animals of Egypt.

What is missing, or rather seems to be missing, is a significant prophetic text. To be sure, as was mentioned above, frame and divine communication do not have to be kept completely separate: for example, in the Oracle of the Potter, the destruction of the pots from the frame also figures in the prophecy (the emptying of the kiln symbolizes the depopulation of the foreigners' city: P² Rainer 33, P³ Oxy. 56 Koenen [1968]).³⁴ This similarity is but one of many between the Leper prophecy and the Oracle of the Potter. The woeful times are characterized in much the same way. To mention just two examples, in the *Potter-Oracle* the images of the gods return at the end of Egypt's tribulations, in the Leper fragment we may assume that the divine animals return with the king. The Leper fragment says that, during the rule of the Shepherds/Jews the temples are desecrated and serve as kitchens for roasting sacred animals (*CAp.* 249), while in an anti-Jewish prophecy within the tradition of the *Potter-Oracle*, the temples become horse stables.³⁵ But the most obvious correspondences are the names of the pharaohs involved (both Amenophis), the unanticipated death of the prophet, and the subsequent detailing of how the prophecy was preserved in writing. The Potter dies suddenly while speaking (compare the suicide of Amenophis the Seer); the king orders him to be buried in Heliopolis (P² Rainer 51-52); the vision of the Potter is to be written down in a sacred book (P¹ Graf 33-34) and stored in sacred treasuries.³⁶

³³ I owe this summary of the *Königsnovelle* to Koenen (1985), and to his paper at the Chicago conference (see n. *).

³⁴ The two versions of the *Oracle of the Potter* are dated to the end of the 2nd century, P² Rainer to soon after 129 and P³ Oxy. to 116: Koenen (1984). Koenen communicated to me the idea of the merged frame and prophecy at the Chicago conference; cf. Koenen (1968) 182-84. Further, I learned at the same conference from Robert Ritner of the actual breaking of pots in Egyptian magical practice: see Ritner (1993) 144-53.

Fraser (1972) I 681 discusses the similarities between the *Alexander Romance*, the Dream of Nectanebo, the Oracle of the Potter and the Demotic Chronicle, as well as their dating (antecedents to the years of Ptolemaic rule). Reymond (1983) 50 reports two Demotic prophetic fragments of Ptolemaic date (P. Vindob. D 9906 and 6758) that may be related to the *Potter Oracle*; see also Potter (1994) 266 n.31. A fragment from a Demotic version of the Dream of Nectanebo has now been published: Ryholt (1998). See also Burstein (1995/94) 45-46, and the bibliography cited there.

³⁵ *PSI* 982 (*CPJud.* III 520; Koenen, *Gnomon* 40 [1968] 256); the reading and meaning is confirmed by an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus which L. Koenen has shown to me (P. Oxy. [26] 3B. 52B. [13]. [a], 2nd cent.); this prophecy reflects the 2nd cent. settlement of Onias, a Jewish high priest, in the area of Heliopolis; see Bohak (1995). Heliopolis also plays an important roll in the *Potter Oracle* and, of course, in the Leper fragment, where Moses is said to be from Heliopolis.

³⁶ P² Rainer 52: compare Amenophis the Seer leaving behind his prophecy in writing.

When we turn to the Leper fragment, we see a deviation from the typical narrative pattern. There is usually a significant prophetic text in this type of *Königsnovelle*. This is certainly the case with the *Potter Oracle* (P³ Oxy.). There is no corresponding prophecy in the Leper fragment of Manetho, only very brief allusions to its contents at different points. Furthermore, in the *Königsnovelle* the prophecy is usually given to a king of the remote past, making the events that constitute its fulfillment appear to be divinely sanctioned. The same king receives the prophecy, flees Egypt during its tribulations, and finally returns victoriously to restore order. It is important to see that Manetho has reconfigured the prophetic element, and to suggest a reason why he has evidently altered his narrative from the standard form.

Amenophis desired to see the divine, as his predecessor Or had done. Amenophis the Seer, who is described as possessing wisdom and foreknowledge, states that the pharaoh can achieve his wish if he cleanses Egypt. There is, strictly speaking, no mention of a divine communication here, though it is strongly implied by reference to the seer's knowledge of the future. When the seer Amenophis fears the wrath of the gods at the treatment of the leprous priests, he does have a prediction, later referred to as a *προδήλωσις*, in which he states that the polluted of Egypt will have allies who will rule Egypt for 13 years. But note, that is all that is referred to in connection with the prophecy itself. The remainder of the fragment tells of the establishment of the Lepers' community at Avaris and Osarseph/Moses' lawgiving, and then the actual invasion and rule of the Shepherds. All of these events are reported in historical narrative. The coming troubles for Egypt have been transformed into real events in a sequence of past time. The prophecy, in other words, has been historicized,³⁷ and only a truncated remnant of its authentic form is left in the text: the brief mention of the *προδήλωσις*.

Here again we may find an explanation by looking at the one Greek historian we know for certain that Manetho read: Herodotus. One of the narrative puzzles in the Leper story concerns the king's response to the news of the invasion of the Shepherds. Recalling the *προδήλωσις* of Amenophis the seer he first takes measures both to protect the sacred elements of Egyptian cult (animals, shrines) and formulates a plan of active defense (300,000 soldiers). Then he elects not to "fight the gods" (*θεομαχεῖν*), but chooses instead to flee to Ethiopia and wait out the 13 years. Amenophis' initial resolve to defend Egypt and his flight which follows seem contradictory.

Herodotus recounts the reigns of three rulers of Egypt, Anysis, the Ethiopian Sabacos, and Sethos, in one narrative section from Book 2 of his *Histories* (Hdt. 2.137-41). The first king flees Egypt, this time to the marshes (the Delta?), in order to avoid an invader from Ethiopia. There he remains for 50 years. The invader Sabacos, who dreams that a man advised him to assemble all the priests of Egypt and cut them in half, elects not to do this but to leave Egypt after the allotted time had passed (*ἔξεληλυθέναι τὸν χρόνον ὀκόσον κεχρηῆσθαι*). Sethos, the son of Anysis, goes out to meet the new invader, Senacherib and the Assyrians, but without a professional army, which he has offended, and which therefore refuses to serve. In a dream he is told he should march out anyway. This Sethos does, but before his scratch-army engages the enemy, mice sent by the divine disable the enemy's weapons, forcing them to retreat.

While no one episode precisely corresponds to Amenophis' actions against the Lepers, taken together certain unmistakable similarities do emerge with Herodotus 2.137-41: the army assembled but not used; the flight and return of pharaoh (father and son); the foreign rule of Egypt for a set period of time. As was already mentioned, a unique feature of Manetho's account is the detail that the king who receives the initial prophecy is the same one who returns to restore order. In this the Leper text resembles the *Alexander Romance*, where Alexander is imagined as the *νέος/νεάζων Νεκτανεβῶ* returning to Egypt (I.3.5, 34.5 Kroll): in a sense, the same pharaoh returns who also first receives the prophecy. No doubt authentic Egyptian materials lay behind Herodotus' account, despite the glaring inaccuracies (cf. Lloyd [1988] 90-105); it was probably a story similar to Manetho's, used to explain the foreign domination of Egypt both in a remote time (the Hyksos, the Assyrians), and in the time of its composition (the

³⁷ Cf. Mendels (1990) 105 on Manetho's parallel "historicizing" of the King List tradition.

Persian period).³⁸ Assuming this is the case, perhaps Herodotus' adaptation of the *ex eventu* prophecy, his historicizing of it, pointed the way for Manetho. Thus a remarkable situation obtains: a Greek historian makes his influence perhaps most strongly felt on an Egyptian through modeling how Egyptian materials could be merged to generate narrative history.

If we assume that Manetho has altered the original form of the Leper text, it may prove useful to assume he did the same for the first part of the first Shepherd narrative. There, it will be remembered, a considerable problem from a Greek perspective was Manetho's admission that the easterners invaded for reasons he did not know. This inability to explain would, I think, have been equally unsatisfactory from an Egyptian point of view. Perhaps what happened in this narrative was that Manetho simply left out the frame and used the prophecy for his historical detail; the frame would no doubt have explained the prophecy of the coming of the Shepherds as a response to some human action, probably an action performed by a king. Alternatively, it is possible that Josephus (or an intermediary figure between himself and Manetho) edited the first Shepherd narrative according to his own interests and in this way removed the frame.³⁹

Further, if we look at all the Manetho narratives preserved by Josephus, a point emerges of some importance, one that simultaneously locates Manetho firmly in the world of the Egyptian priest under foreign dominance, and at the same time explains what may have been innovative from an Egyptian perspective. In both the Sethos/Harmais episode and the Leper story priests are central characters. Indeed, if we pay close attention to the narrative detailing the expulsion of the Lepers and the return to Egypt of the Shepherds, it is clearly told in two narrative segments. The first does indeed focus on the actions of Amenophis the King. But in the second the most important character is really Amenophis the Seer. A schematic review of the narrative helps to underscore this point, while also illustrating the derivation of this narrative from the Egyptian *Königsnovelle*.⁴⁰

Narrative I: The Story of Amenophis the King

Manetho's Narrative	Egyptian <i>Königsnovelle</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amenophis the king desires to see the gods. 2. He communicates this desire to Amenophis the Seer who is praised. 3. Amenophis the Seer advises Amenophis the king to purge the country of lepers and other unclean persons. 4. The king completes this deed. 	<p>Introductory Story (possibly in assembly of Council):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amenophis the king desires to see the gods. 2. He communicates this desire to Amenophis the Seer who is praised. 3. Amenophis the Seer advises Amenophis the king to purge the country of lepers and other unclean persons. <p>Main Story:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The king completes this deed.

³⁸ In general consult Assmann (1997).

³⁹ Compare the apparent editing of the Dream of Nectanebo: there it seems the scribe Apollonius stopped copying his text when he discovered that it was moving away from what he was interested in: the dream and directly connected events that are featured in the frame. Apollonius was himself a *katochos* or temple dweller who was passionately interested in dreams: Koenen (1985) 193-4, and cf. Thompson (1988) 262-3. The Dream purports to tell of the king's incubation on the night of July 5 to 6, 343. The copy we possess probably dates to the 2nd century.

⁴⁰ Cf. Gruen (1998) 63-64, who on the basis of what he sees are positive characterizations of the Lepers/Shepherds argues for an original Jewish text. While I hesitate to agree, Gruen clearly also detects a comparable narrative reorientation.

Narrative II: The Story of Amenophis the Seer

Manetho's Narrative	Egyptian <i>Königsnovelle</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amenophis the Seer fears the punishment of the gods as a consequence of I (above). 2. He makes a prophecy: allies will assist the polluted and will drive out pharaoh, who will live abroad for 13 years. 3. The seer writes up his prophecy and then commits suicide. The story implies that the prophecy is delivered to the king. 4. The king despairs. 5. The historical narrative resumes, detailing the king's original intention to fight the invaders, then his flight from Egypt with the sacred animals. The people are treated impiously, cities and temples destroyed, the images of the gods mutilated, and the sanctuaries used as kitchens to roast the sacred animals. Finally, after 13 years, the king returns and is victorious in a final battle. 	<p>Introductory Frame:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amenophis the Seer fears the punishment of the gods as a consequence of I (above). 2a. He makes a prophecy. <p>The main story. The prophecy:</p> <p>2b+5+4. Allies will assist the polluted and will drive out pharaoh. (4) The king will despair, and live abroad for 13 years. (5) The people will be treated impiously, cities and temples will be destroyed, the images of the gods mutilated, and the sanctuaries will be used as kitchens to roast the sacred animals. Finally, after 13 years, the king will return and is victorious in a final battle (and initiate the restoration of divine and royal order).</p> <p>Final Part of the Frame:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The seer writes up his prophecy and then commits suicide. The story implies that the prophecy is delivered to the king.

The historicization of the prophecy takes place in the second panel, the one that centers on Amenophis the Seer. This privileging of the prophet/priest is common in the prophetic "Königsnovelle". The Oracle of the Lamb is a good example. Although the text is fragmentary, it seems that here the role of the king Bocchoris is limited to the closing frame, where we are told that it was on pharaoh's orders that the book of the priest Psinyris was preserved, and that the body of the prophetic lamb was buried in a golden coffin and made the object of cult (Col. III.7ff. [Zauzich 1983]). However, it is the priest Psinyris who creates the book in the first place: the Lamb forecasts doom for his children, and bids him to write down the prophecy of Egypt's future sorrows. The key element of royal initiative is completely absent.⁴¹ It

⁴¹ The colophon of the Oracle of the Lamb dates the work to August 4, 4 BC, though it was probably composed between the two Persian occupations, hence some time between 404 and 343. I owe this dating, and the observations on the Lamb's non-royal orientation, to L. Koenen in a paper entitled "Narrative Strategies in the Hellenized Königsnovelle" that he kindly let me read in advance of publication.

bears remembering in this context that the Oracle of the Lamb was itself cited in a version of the *Potter Oracle*.⁴² Even more important for our purposes, it was also certainly known to and probably quoted by Manetho himself.⁴³

Recent studies of the autobiographies of Egyptian priests who served under foreign kings have pointed to the growing importance of the priest himself at the expense of the figure of the monarch, although antecedents can be found in earlier texts like the Prophecies of Neferti (Lichtheim [1973] 139-45). Whereas earlier the priest would have stressed how the events of his life were but extensions of the life of pharaoh, these later texts often omit any mention of the ruling monarch.⁴⁴ This change in orientation is paralleled in other priestly spheres. At roughly the time Manetho was writing, the priests at Philae were subtly changing ancient Egyptian texts to new purposes; one of the aims was to emphasize the temple in its relation to the divine without the king as an intermediary. The monarchs are mentioned, even prominently, but the focus is on the enduring bond between the god (in this case, Isis) and her temple (Zabkar [1980]). Further, while the deification of a Ptolemaic queen, Arsinoe, is prominent, she is crucially not mentioned in the actual hymns to the god: they are only for Isis (Zabkar [1988] 12-15; cf. Vanderlip [1972]). Relatedly, while a text such as the Canopus Decree speaks of instituting a king as cotemplar of the gods in all the temples of Egypt, the priests in their synod were really conferring provisional legitimacy in an ongoing negotiation of power with the royal house, continuing a policy they had observed since the time of the Persian occupation.⁴⁵ Finally, a recent survey of Demotic narratives suggests that while these texts often center on the king and his court, they also concern priests; and what is more, that the indigenous priesthood of Egypt, being the only part of the population that was literate in Demotic, constituted the only readership for these stories.⁴⁶

Another noteworthy feature of Manetho's narratives that is connected to the issue of priests and prophecy is their apocalyptic orientation, especially in the Leper fragment. Two of the three narratives from Josephus deal with the conquest and humiliation of Egypt; in both the initial defeat of Egypt happens without a battle being contested; further, in the last one, the foreign rule is for a specified period of time. These features suggest a sense of divine ordination: resistance is futile, but domination is temporally circumscribed. Allied to these features is Manetho's repeated reference to "ancient religious knowledge" or "texts" that predict the foundation, or rather refoundation of Avaris, the Typhonic city.⁴⁷ But most convincing of Manetho's apocalyptic view is the desire of Amenophis the King "to be a beholder," or better "a voyeur of the divine": the text suggests that the wish is somehow inappropriate, desiring to see the divine when one ought not to. It has recently been advanced that this sentiment is peculiar when viewed from an earlier Egyptian standpoint. A pharaoh of the 18th Dynasty would have seen the divine everyday: the sun and moon were gods, and the priests in all the temples of Egypt would ritually open their inner *sancta* and "see the god" for him. No, this Amenophis lives in a time when the gods

⁴² P² Rainer 20, P³ Oxy. 31ff.; Koenen (1984) 10; cf. Potter (1994) 195-96.

⁴³ *FGrHist* 609 F 2 (Syncellus): Βόχχωρις Καίτης ἔτη ς, ἐφ' οὗ ἀρνίον ἐφθέξατο, ἔτη ϸϵ. Koenen (1984) 10-11 n.9 observes that this number originally read 900 years, not 990.

⁴⁴ Griffiths (1988) esp. 100-101; cf. Hermann (1938) 22-24. See also Lichtheim (1980) 5 on the autobiographical inscriptions of priests; see also her prefatory remarks on the stela of Somtutefnakht (41) and the dossier of inscriptions from the tomb of Petosiris (44): no kings are mentioned in any of these texts.

⁴⁵ Cf. Quaegebeur (1989) and Koenen (1993b) 54; Thompson (1994) encourages a view that focuses not on "Greek imposition" and "Egyptian collaboration", but on "mutual interest". Note e.g. *OGIS* 56.19ff: the beginning of the section dealing with the divine honors conferred comes *after* the section detailing all of the royal benefactions, many having to do with the maintenance of Egyptian cult by the Ptolemaic rulers: does this suggest *quid pro quo*? See also Nock (1930/1972) 213-14, esp. for the concept of the human cotemplar of the god (κόλληος θεός), and the dating of synods to the Persian period.

⁴⁶ Tait (1994) 207. Note that Tait in his Chicago conference paper stressed that *performance* of these texts was also possible, and hence the "audience" of these texts could have been significantly larger than their readership *stricto sensu*.

⁴⁷ The description "Typhonic" recalls the *Potter Oracle* where the ζωνοφόροι are characterized as Τυφωνικοί or Τυφώνιοι (P² [Rainer] 14f., 27f; P³ [Oxy.] 25f., 49). Alexandria is the city of the ζωνοφόροι (P² 32; P³ 55), hence of the Typhonians; and the times are those of the Typhonians (P² 3; P³ 15).

have fled Egypt; hence, when he desires to see them, it is the precedent of Or he cites, which is to say, the god Horus as mythical pharaoh and overseer of the cosmic order (*Ma'at*).⁴⁸ A restoration of this order and a return of the gods are what are really being aimed at by Amenophis, and in this quest he fails because Egypt is in some sense destined to experience years of suffering before it can again know prosperity and stability (Podemann Sørensen [1992] 168-70).

Intriguing in this connection is Josephus' own reaction to Amenophis' wish; indeed, it is the very first item he attacks in his critique of the narrative (*CAp.* I.254-5), though this is probably due to the fact that it is the first detail of the story. Josephus does not really understand Amenophis' wish, and his difficulty with it is revealing. He does not see that the story is driven by a sense of historical necessity that is simply more important than other features of Egyptian life and culture that may render the wish improbable, i.e. animals representing the divine, and thus the gods being available for Amenophis to see, this being one of Josephus' criticisms. Josephus is simply unaware that the absence of the gods is required of texts like the Leper fragment.

The importance of priests in Manetho and this strong apocalyptic component come together if we recall Jonathan Z. Smith's definition of apocalypticism as "wisdom lacking a royal patron" (Smith [1978] 81). To be sure this is overly schematic, and furthermore the texts in question are not strictly apocalyptic but rather deal with cyclic renewal (cf. Koenen [1970]). Nonetheless, Smith does recognize that an important element in apocalyptic texts is the primacy of the native priest together with the absence of the native king. It is useful to recall in this connection that the pharaoh was the source of all religious authority in Egypt (in fact he was the one true priest), and without him there could be no legitimate priests.⁴⁹ Hence, the shift from an almost exclusive focus on the monarch in earlier biographies and religious texts towards a privileging of the priests is a highly significant narrative development, and one that no doubt had several causes. One fairly obvious one is of direct relevance here. Whereas the tendency in priestly autobiographies had already started to move away from the monarch in the Late Period, it is surely no accident that this process was accelerated during periods of the foreign domination of Egypt. The scribe-priest takes over at least some of the attention that heretofore had belonged to the native king when that figure no longer was available. Correspondingly, the Egyptian wisdom texts became increasingly apocalyptic when a native king was no longer available to secure the cosmic order. This does not necessarily mean that the priests saw themselves as oppositional figures in relation to their Persian, and then their Macedonian overlords. Rather, they became the crucial intermediaries who helped the new dynasts secure the backing of the indigenous clergy and therefore also access to whatever influence they continued to exercise throughout Egypt.⁵⁰ An example of precisely such a person, though from a later period, is Hor: this priest who was from the same place as Manetho (Sebennytos) communicated a vision he had (albeit in a dream) to the "pharaohs" Ptolemy IV Philometor and his

⁴⁸ I might further add that Manetho's phrasing of this crucial sentence, "this [king] desired to be a voyeur of the gods" (τοῦτον ἐπιθυμῆσαι θεῶν γενέσθαι θεατήν), is oddly structured around the noun "voyeur", when more standard Greek would have expressed the idea with a verb, i.e. "this king desired *to observe* the gods," as in fact we see in Amenophis the seer's response to the king's communication (*CAp.* I.233), and in Josephus' own critique later (I.254). It might of course be the case that the wording is due to Josephus, whose own Greek was not of the highest order (cf. his need for assistance in managing the Greek language, *CAp.* I.50: note, however, that some believe the *CAp.* to be so artfully composed as to be largely not the work of Josephus, e.g. Schwartz [1990] 23). Significantly, however, Greek can render active verbal concepts with a form of the verb "to become", together with an agent noun, rather than a simple verb of action: Schwyzler II pp.384-5, Smyth no.1710. It is an expression that draws notice: see, e.g., Alcman 1.89 (*PMG*), Aeschylus *Ch.* 246, Sophocles *Aj.* 1092, Thucydides 3.2. I owe the second example to I. Rutherford. Parallel in sense with Manetho's passage is a very late text, Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 5.305, describing Actaeon looking at Artemis bathing: θηητήρ δ' ἀκόρητος ἀθηήτοιο θεαίνης. Of course, the concept of seeing the gods when one is not supposed to is common in Greek myth and literature: cf., e.g., Callimachus *Hymn* 5.78, of Teiresias: εἶδε τὰ μὴ θεμιτά. But note here the more typical reliance on the verb to carry the weight of the idea.

⁴⁹ Winter (1978) 147-48; Koenen (1993b) 39 and n. 35.

⁵⁰ The literature on this issue is vast: the best recent treatment is Thompson (1994). See also Peremans (1987), Thompson (1990), and Huss (1994).

brother, just as Amenophis the Seer did in the Leper fragment (Ray [1976] 18, Text 2). What is more, he was at the same time an ardent advocate of his temple (the Ibis-cult).⁵¹

IV. Conclusion: Egyptian Narrative History

The most important, and at the same time most difficult question relating to Manetho's writing can be simply put: what led him to write a narrative history of Egypt, something that was not part of the Egyptian tradition? The answer, or rather answers to this question take up the threads of all that has been argued above, and so form a fitting conclusion.

To take up the Greek side first, it seems highly probable that the work of Greek historical writers who had by Manetho's time combined indigenous chronologies with indigenous narrative traditions were decisive in helping him shape his own *Aegyptiaca*. We know he read Herodotus, and read him closely (at least on Egypt). Further, it is widely believed that Hecataeus of Abdera was also influential;⁵² indeed, he may have even shown Manetho the way when it came to the placement of the Hyksos within a historical narrative: Hecataeus, too, dealt with them (*FGrHist* 264 F 6).⁵³ Inasmuch as testimonia link both Hecataeus and Manetho to the court of Ptolemy Soter, it is perhaps fair to assume some contact between them.⁵⁴ At the same time, however, I think that an argument based entirely on Egyptian texts can be made that also provides a reason why this particular priest elected to do what no other like him had done before.

In the Demotic tale of Ptolemaic date often called *Setne I* the hero of the inset narrative, Naneferkaptah, is described at one point as walking in the desert of Memphis "reading the writings that were in the tombs of the pharaohs and on the stelae of the scribes of the House of Life and the writings that were on [the other monuments, for his zeal] concerning writing was very great" (Lichtheim [1980] 128). At this point an old priest accosts him and laughs at him. When Naneferkaptah demands to know why the priest is laughing at him, the old man replies "I am not laughing at you. I am laughing because you are reading writings that have no [importance for anyone]. If you desire to read writings, come to me and I will take you to the place where that book is that Thoth wrote...". It is easy to imagine Manetho in the place of Naneferkaptah. Indeed, some scholars have even asserted that some of Manetho's information came from his readings of stelae at Memphis, in much the same way Naneferkaptah is described as doing in *Setne I* (Redford [1986] 226). However, it is the older priest's evaluation of the old writings and the Book of Thoth that is important here.

The passage reflects an attitude towards the records of Egypt's past that is ambivalent: the deeds of the pharaohs, while well chronicled and no doubt even containing proofs of Egypt's once glorious past, were nonetheless impotent when set beside the Book of Thoth. Hence, we can conclude in the first place that there were Egyptian texts that were thought of as powerful, power that was magical and secret. In-

⁵¹ Ray (1976) 123. He notes that Hor is a good representative of the Egyptian priests who send "appeals to the monarch," and cites Bernand (1969) 188-91 for examples in the Greek language.

⁵² See e.g. Murray (1970) 168 and Dillery (1998) 256-57. One should note that while Hecataeus has gods, demigods, and then humans rule Egypt in a scheme that is sometimes misleadingly called euhemerist, as well as Manetho, in the case of the latter this tripartite division in all likelihood is derived from Egyptian King Lists that have the gods ruling in the earliest periods. See also Hdt. 2.144.2. It is distinctly possible that Manetho was himself aware of this convergence. Cf. Helck (1956) 4-8 on the "Götterdynastien".

⁵³ Compare Momigliano (1975) 92 on Hecataeus providing a pattern for Jews to follow in treating their own history.

⁵⁴ *FGrHist* 264 T 4: Hecataeus is among those who accompany Ptolemy to Egypt. *FGrHist* 609 T 3: Manetho and the Eleusinian Timotheus assist in the interpretation of Serapis, following a dream of Ptolemy. Although it was unusual for native persons to be members of the monarch's circle of "friends" (φίλοι), Manetho may well have been an exception (cf. Habicht [1958] 5-6, Peremans [1962] 135, Walbank [1984] 69-70; see in general Mooren [1977]). It is tempting to add to this circle Demetrius of Phalerum, who we know wrote history based on chronography (archon list: *FGrHist* 228 F 1-3 [Wehrli F 149-154]), as well perhaps as a history of Egypt (F 52), though Jacoby doubts this (*Kommentar* ad loc., the Demetrius in question seems to be the so-called Chronographer; see however Wehrli F 202). Of course Demetrius too was closely associated with the court of Soter (*FGrHist* 228 T 1; the spurious *Letter of Aristaeus* connects him to Philadelphus, but this is improbable).

deed, the old priest goes on to describe the book: it contains two extremely powerful spells, one that enables the reader to charm the entire cosmos and learn the secrets of the language of birds and reptiles, and another that will permit its user to see the fish of the deep and to behold Re, the sun god, and his companions, the Ennead, as well as the Moon.⁵⁵ In other words, the book of Thoth enables its reader to control his world, learn timeless secrets, and see the divine, this last action being of course the very thing that king Amenophis wanted to do in the Leper fragment of Manetho (cf. Podemann Sørensen [1992] 170-71). But this same scene from *Setne I* also implies that the records of Egypt's past, the very texts that presumably provided Manetho with the chronological frame for his *Aegyptiaca*, do not possess the power that the Book of Thoth does. They are important and worthy texts, but they are also impotent. This evaluation of Egypt's recorded past from *Setne I* helps us understand the orientation of Manetho's history: the *Aegyptiaca* is precisely a text that has been made powerful, combining as it does the authoritative but powerless (lists) with texts that are potent (legendary material such as the Leper text). In the process, it could be said that the Egyptian record of the past became historical, combining chronology with narrative.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that this scene from *Setne I* reflects two different social strata from which the different texts emanate, the Hieroglyphic records on the one hand, and the Demotic narratives on the other. Only one percent of the population of Egypt was able to read or write in any of the native scripts (Ritner [1993] 204). The statement of Diodorus (1.81.1-6), writing in the first century, that Egyptian priests taught their sons sacred writing (that is, Hieroglyphic or Hieratic) as well as Demotic, has been accepted as fundamentally correct;⁵⁶ further, we know that the ability to read the Hieroglyphic or Hieratic writing systems was still being taught at least into the second century AD as a skill preliminary to membership in the priesthood.⁵⁷ All this is to say that the same people who were literate in Hieroglyphic or Hieratic were also the ones literate in Demotic. Hence, the Demotic narratives, even if orally composed and transmitted, and hence more widely known, at some point were written down by the same native elite who were able, probably with difficulty, to read and write Hieroglyphic or Hieratic. It was precisely the narratives which were written in Demotic that acted as vehicles for the expression of Egyptian pride and nationalism: texts such as the so-called Demotic Chronicle and the Oracle of the Lamb.⁵⁸

A glance at the end of the Canopus Decree helps to illuminate the consequences of the situation outlined above. In the Greek version the instructions for writing down the document are as follows:

ὁ δὲ ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἱερῶν καθεστηκῶς ἐπιτάτης καὶ ἀρχιερεῦς καὶ οἱ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἰ γραμματεῖς ἀναγραφάτωσαν τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην ἢ χαλκὴν ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς (Bernard [1970]; *OGIS* 56.74-75).

It is probably not without significance that the term used here for "Demotic" is "Egyptian": it seems that the writing system that was thought to contrast with "Greek" was Demotic, not Hieroglyphic, at least in relation to this text. In the famous Rosetta decree of Ptolemy V, in the equivalent portion of the text dealing with the method of inscription, the term used for Demotic is "native" (ἐγχωρίοις).⁵⁹ While

⁵⁵ Lichtheim (1980) 128-9; cf. Fowden (1993) 59-60. Note, too, the beginning of the *Alexander Romance* I.1.1 (Kroll), οἱ σοφώτατοι Αἰγύπτιοι, θεῶν ἀπόγονοι, γῆς μέτρα καταλαβόμενοι, θαλάσσης κύματα ἡμερωκάμενοι, ποταμὸν Νεῖλον διαμετρησάμενοι, οὐρανοῦ ἀστροθεσίαν διαψηφισάμενοι, παραδεδώκασι τῇ οἰκουμένη ἐπικράτειαν ἄλκην ἰ λόγου, εὐρεσιν μαγικῆς δυνάμεως. Following this description of Egyptian wisdom we are shown Nectanebo engaging in a form of λεκανομαντεία (1.3). Cf. Frankfurter (1998) 242.

⁵⁶ Gardiner (1938) 159; Fowden (1993) 61. Cf. Tait (1997).

⁵⁷ Fowden (1993) 61, on the basis of *P.Tebt.* 291.40-48.

⁵⁸ Obviously this statement runs counter to Johnson's view (1984) 121 that "the Demotic Chronicle is not nationalistic, anti-Greek or anti-Ptolemaic as such." While I agree with her view that the text is not "anti-Greek" (see discussion immediately below), its anti-Persian elements, which Johnson details at some length, must I think be construed as broadly nationalistic or expressive of Egyptian views. Cf. Mendels (1990).

⁵⁹ *OGIS* 90.55, seen by Dittenberger, n. ad loc.; cf. Depauw (1997) 21.

it is no doubt true that the written Egyptian Greeks most frequently encountered was probably Demotic, if they took note of it at all, for most Greeks before the Ptolemaic period the quintessential Egyptian writing system had been Hieroglyphic. So, for example, while Herodotus knew of both Demotic and Hieroglyphic (he seems not to know Hieratic, 2.36.4), it was a Hieroglyphic inscription that drew his special notice (Hdt. 2.106.4). Perhaps even more significant is a passage from Euhemerus. When he imagines a text written in Egyptian on his utopia of Panchaea, it is written "in writing which the Egyptians call sacred" (τὰ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἱερὰ καλούμενα, *FGrHist* 63 F 3, Diod. 5.46.7).

Just as we ought not to assume that the Demotic texts were the products of the oppressed under-classes of Egypt, separate from the world of its native elite who were collaborating with the Ptolemies, so too we ought not also to assume that Demotic material is axiomatically "anti-Greek".⁶⁰ And this caveat ought to extend to Manetho as well. As already mentioned, he was closely associated with court of Ptolemy Soter and was even instrumental in helping establish the Serapis cult along with the Eleusinian Timotheus. It would be inherently unlikely to find such a figure taking up an openly hostile position against the new Greco-Macedonian government. On the other hand, it is probably not fair to see Manetho only as "collaborator" either (cf. Lloyd [1982b]).

The priestly autobiographies from the Persian and Alexander periods point the way for us, illustrating the complex world in which Manetho also operated: while not resistors of the "foreign king", indeed in some cases actually assisting him, the priests also provided the new pharaoh with an important link to the religious life of Egypt and lent him legitimacy, as long as he was properly respectful of native cult. On the other hand, the relationship between the native priesthood and the new (foreign) king was a two-way street, for the king granted authority to the priesthood (cf. Koenen [1993b]). As Udjahorresne put it in a testimonium dating to the period of Cambyses, this Persian king performed religious obligations to his goddess Neith "because I had let his majesty know how every beneficence had been done in the temple by every king" (Lichtheim [1980] 39). The implication is clear: the new king was to follow the examples of the old, as provided by the priesthoods. Udjahorresne was acting as an advocate of his own cult, winning the patronage of the new king in return for the legitimacy he was able to confer through his priestly office. The description of a figure such as this as "collaborator" misses the mutual dependence of the relationship between foreign dynast and native priest. It was the eminent sociologist Arthur Stinchcombe's observation that legitimacy is brought about when different power-holders grant it to one another in chains of interdependent activity, rather than being granted by the people over whom that power is exercised (Stinchcombe [1968] 150-51). The native, priestly elite of Egypt was precisely looking for ways to maintain its own status, and secured it through granting legitimacy to the new rulers of their land.

In keeping with this understanding of the Egyptian priest under the Ptolemies, we ought to look not for evidence of opposition or collaboration, but for places where the priest saw the convergence of ideas from the two cultures in which he had to live, the Egyptian and the Greek. A case in point: co-regency. If we look carefully at the remains of Manetho's work, we find that he spent a good deal of attention on the rulers of the famous 12th Dynasty who were important in the early years of the Middle Kingdom period. This should not surprise us since the literature associated with the 12th Dynasty (chiefly the testament of Amenemhet I, the autobiographical account of Sinuhe, and the Prophecies of Neferti) became the classic statements of royal ideology that were then used in subsequent periods (e.g. Grimal [1992] 161). It is fitting for this reason alone that the Ptolemies too should look back to this period.

But of particular interest for the early Ptolemies would have been the fact that the first rulers of the 12th Dynasty, Amenemhet I and Sesostri, are the first clearly attested coregents from pharaonic times (Murnane [1977] 1-2). It should be remembered that Ptolemy Philadelphus also ruled as coregent with

⁶⁰ See esp. Johnson (1984); cf. *eandem* (1983) and Préaux (1978) I 395-6.

his father Soter from 284-282.⁶¹ The Ptolemaic coregency, the first of many (cf. e.g. Chauveau [1997]), was a handy expedient: Soter needed a way to insure the succession of the younger Ptolemy, son of Berenike, over his older half-brother Ptolemy, son of Eurydike, later known as Keraunos. Perhaps the best known pharaonic coregency was used as a way to justify this procedure. Of course, this is all speculative. If, however, Manetho did discuss the issue of coregency prominently in his history, it may have served two overlapping or convergent purposes. The 12th Dynasty was, in fact, the first to employ this procedure, a fact that was duly noted in Manetho's account; but he may also have been motivated by a wish to confer some degree of legitimacy upon the monarch by demonstrating that the precedent for the selection of a coregent in the lifetime of the reigning pharaoh was unimpeachable by Egyptian standards.

An issue related to the coregency is the matter of Ptolemy Soter's choice of a praenomen in his Egyptian titlature. The traditional titlature of a Pharaoh consists of five names, of which the last two provide the individual name of the king. Usually each of them is included in a cartouche. The fourth name, the Sedge and Bee name (*Suten Bat*) that signifies pharaoh as "King of South and North", contains pharaoh's "praenomen", while the fifth name, the Son-of-Re (*Si-Re*) name is his secular name. In his king lists Manetho identifies the kings by their fifth name, but other king-lists like the *Table of Abydos*, employ the fourth name (*Suten Bat*).⁶² As a matter of course, the fifth name of Ptolemy Soter was reserved for his name Ptolemy, but his fourth name, the *Suten Bat*, offered the opportunity for a political statement. It was *Kheper-Ka-Re*. The same *Suten Bat* name was used by Nectanebo, and, before him, by Sesostris I (*Senwesret*).⁶³ Thus, by the choice of his "praenomen", Ptolemy I was conveniently linked both to the last native ruler of Egypt (Nectanebo) and to the most powerful pharaoh of Egyptian memory and legend (Sesostris). Kurt Sethe recognized long ago that this was surely no accident.⁶⁴ Who was a more logical individual to have helped in the choice of this name than Manetho himself, a man who clearly had access to Soter and was respected by him (as the story of the foundation of the cult of Serapis tells us, *FGrHist* 609 T 3), and who was also at the same time an authority on Egypt's past, in particular, the king lists themselves?⁶⁵

It is often assumed that only the "winners" get to write history. But Manetho of Sebennytus proves that this is not always the case. His history of Egypt, like that of Babylon by the priest-historian Berossus, has a complex orientation: while not strictly an oppositional work, it is not a product of collaboration either. It was a narrative history of Egypt constructed out of a traditional method of preserving the past that had existed for millennia (the King List). It also contained narratives that offered another way to present the history of Egypt, one that concerned both the past and the future, and which privileged the role of the native priest (prophetic texts, biographies, etc.); this element also made Egypt in some sense powerful again in a world where its standing had in fact been greatly diminished. But

⁶¹ Murnane (1977) 95; cf. Koenen (1977) 43, *eudem* (1993b) 73: sole ruler from Dystros 25, 282. On the date of the change from Philadelphus' count of his regnal years from years of his sole kingship to those of his coregency, see Hazzard (1987).

⁶² Gardiner (1961) 50-51 and cf. *eudem* (1957) 73f. For the use of the Egyptian titlature for Ptolemaic kings in documents issued by Egyptian temples (the Decree of Raphia and the Rosetta Stone) see Thissen (1966) 27-42, Koenen (1983) 152-170 and *eudem* (1993b) 48-50 and 57-61. In general consult also Onasch (1976).

⁶³ Wallis Budge (1908) I 53 (Sesostris), II 103 (Nectanebo), and 111 (Ptolemy Soter). Note that Soter also had, atypically, another *Suten Bat* name: *Setep-en-Ra-meri-Amen*.

⁶⁴ Sethe (1900) 24; cf. Murray (1970) 163.

⁶⁵ It is worth noting in this connection that Alexander is linked to precisely the same two figures in the *Alexander Romance*: I.3.4, 34.3-6 (Kroll) Alexander and Nectanebo; I.33.6-7 Alexander and Sesostris (Sesonchosis). For these pharaohs' places on Manetho's King List, see *FGrHist* 609 F 2 (Syncellus) pp.30, 52. If this linking of Alexander to Sesostris and Nectanebo dates to the time of Alexander himself, it could of course be argued that Ptolemy Soter was following the practice of Alexander.

though the Egyptian antecedents of the *Aegyptiaca* are clear, the incentive to write the work, indeed perhaps the model itself of the combined King List and narrative, evidently came from the Greek world. It is surely no accident that a similar history of Egypt, was not produced in Aramaic, the official language of the Persians, during the roughly two hundred years of Persian occupation.⁶⁶ Within fifty years of the Greco-Macedonian conquest, the ancient world was treated to the first of several histories of Egypt written by Egyptians in the Greek language.⁶⁷

Bibliography

- Adler, W. (1989) *Time Immemorial. Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington D.C.).
- Armayer, O.K. (1985) "Herodotus' Influence on Manethon and the Implications for Egyptology", *Classical Bulletin* 61, 7-10.
- Assmann, J. (1997) "Exodus und Amarna. Der Mythos der Aussätzigen als verdrängte Erinnerung der Aton-Religion", in *Ägypten-Bilder*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 150, E. Staehelin and B. Jaeger eds. (Freiburg and Göttingen) 11-34.
- Aziza, C. (1987) "L'utilisation polémique du récit de l'Exode chez les écrivains alexandrins (IV^eme siècle av. J.-C.--Ier siècle ap. J.-C.)", *ANRW* II.20.1. 41-65.
- Bernand, A. (1969) *Les Inscriptions Grecques de Philae*, Paris.
- Bernand, A. (1970) *Le Delta égyptien d'après les textes grecs: Les confins libyques*, III (Cairo), Greek text of Canopus decree, 989-1036.
- Bickerman, E. (1975/1980) "The Jewish Historian Demetrios", in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, II (Leiden) 347-58. Originally published in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith* III. I cite the former.
- Bickerman, E. (1988) *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Bingen, J. (1952) *SB Beiheft 1* (Göttingen), re-edition of P. Rev. Laws.
- Bohak, G. (1995) "CPJ III, 520. The Egyptian's Reaction to Onias", *JPJ* 36 (1995) 32-41.
- Burkert, W. (1995) "Lydia Between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus", in *The Ages of Homer. A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, J. Carter and S. Morris eds. (Austin 139-48).
- Burstein, S. (1995/94) "Alexander in Egypt: Continuity or Change?", in *Graeco-Africana. Studies in the History of Greek Relations with Egypt and Nubia* (New Rochelle) 43-52, *Achaemenid History* 8, 381-87.
- Burstein, S. (1996) "Images of Egypt in Greek Historiography", in *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and Forms*, A. Loprieno ed. (Leiden) 591-604.
- Chauveau, M. (1997) "Ères nouvelles et corégences en Égypte ptolémaïque", *Akten des 21. Int. Papyrologenkongresses Berlin 1995*, *APF Beiheft* 3, 163-71.
- Connor, W.R. (1993) "The *Histor* in History", in *Nomodeiktēs. Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, R. Rosen and J. Farrell eds. (Ann Arbor) 3-15.
- Depauw, M. (1997) *A Companion to Demotic Studies*, *Papyrologica Bruxellensia* 28 (Bruxelles).
- Dewald, C. (1987) "Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*", *Arethusa* 20, 147-70.
- Dillery, J. (1992) "Herodotus' Proem and Aristotle, *Rhetorica* 1409a", *CQ* 42, 525-28.
- Dillery, J. (1998) "Hecataeus of Abdera: Hyperboreans, Egypt, and the *Interpretatio Graeca*", *Historia* 47, 255-75.
- Dunn, G. (1988) "Syntactic Word Order in Herodotean Greek", *Glotta* 66, 63-79.
- Fowden, G. (1993) *The Egyptian Hermes* (Princeton).
- Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*, 3 vols. (Oxford).

⁶⁶ It is interesting to compare Herodotus at 2.36.4 (a passage mentioned earlier in this discussion): while he notes erroneously that the Egyptians had two writing systems, Hieroglyphic and Demotic, he leaves out not only Hieratic but also the Aramaic of the Persian rule..

⁶⁷ So e.g. Ptolemaeus of Mendes (*FGrHist* 611), Chaeremon (618: see van der Horst [1984] ix-xi), and Apollonides (661: see Sijpesteijn [1980] and Parsons [1974] 155-6).

- Frankfurter, D. (1998) *Religion in Roman Egypt* (Princeton).
- Fraser, P. (1972) *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols. (Oxford).
- Gardiner, A. (1938) "The House of Life", *JEA* 24, 157-79.
- Gardiner, A. (1957) *Egyptian Grammar* 3rd ed. (Oxford).
- Gardiner, A. (1961) *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Oxford).
- Gelzer, H. (1885) *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, II (Leipzig).
- Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus* (New York).
- Grenfell, B.P. (1896) *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford).
- Griffiths, J.G. (1970) *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride* (Cambridge).
- Griffiths, J.G. (1988) "Intimations in Egyptian Non-Royal Biography of a Belief in Divine Impact on Human Affairs", in *Pyramid Studies and Other Essays Presented to I.E.S. Edwards*, J. Baines, T. James, A. Leahy, A. Shore eds. (London) 92-102.
- Grimal, N. (1992) *A History of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford).
- Gruen, E. (1998) *Heritage and Hellenism. The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley).
- Gutschmid, A. von (1893) "Vorlesungen über Josephos' Bücher gegen Apion", in his *Kleine Schriften* IV, F. Rühl ed. (Leipzig) 336-589.
- Habicht, C. (1958) "Die herrschende Gesellschaft in den hellenistischen Monarchen", *Sozial- und Wirtschafts-geschichte* 45, 1-16.
- Hazard, R.A. "The Regnal Year of Ptolemy II Philadelphus", *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 140-158.
- Helck, W. (1956) *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten* (Berlin).
- Hermann, A. (1938) *Die ägyptische Königsnovelle*, Leipziger ägyptologische Studien 10 (Glückstadt, Hamburg, New York).
- Huss, W. (1994) *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 85 (Stuttgart).
- Immerwahr, H.R. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland).
- Johnson, J. (1983) "The Demotic Chronicle as a Statement of a Theory of Kingship", *Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 13 (1983) 61-72.
- Johnson, J. (1984) "Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?," in *Grammata Demotika. Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983*, H.-J. Thissen and K.-Th. Zauzich eds. (Würzburg) 107-24.
- Kassel, R. (1976) *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica* (Berlin and New York).
- Koenen, L. (1968) "Die Prophezeiungen des 'Töpfers'", *ZPE* 2, 178-209. To this edition must be added Koenen's subsequent additions and corrections: *ZPE* 13 (1974) 313-19; 54 (1984) 9-13.
- Koenen, L. (1977) *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste*, *Beitr. z. Klass. Phil.* 56 (Meisenheim am Glan) .
- Koenen, L. (1983) "Die Adaption ägyptischer Königsideologien am Ptolemäerhof", in *Egypt in the Hellenistic World*, *Studia Hellenistica* 27, E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht eds. (Louvain) 143-190.
- Koenen, L. (1970) "The Prophecies of a Potter: A Prophecy of World Renewal Becomes an Apocalypse", *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*, *ASP* 7 (Toronto) 249-54.
- Koenen, L. (1985) "The Dream of Nektanebos", *BASP* 22, 171-94.
- Koenen, L. (1993a) "Der erste Satz bei Heraklit und Herodot", *ZPE* 97, 95-96.
- Koenen, L. (1993b) "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure", in *Images and Ideologies. Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, A. Bulloch, E. Gruen, A. Long, A. Stewart eds. (Berkeley) 25-115.
- Koenen, L. (1994) "Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the Catalogue of Women", *TAPA* 124, 1-24.
- Kühner, R. and B. Gerth (1904) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* 2.2 (Hannover).
- Lichtheim, M. (1973 and 1980) *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, I and III (Berkeley).
- Lloyd, A. (1982a) "Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt", *Historia* 31, 33-55.
- Lloyd, A. (1982b) "The Inscription of Udjahorresnet. A Collaborator's Testament", *JEA* 68, 166-80.
- Lloyd, A. (1988) *Herodotus Book II Commentary* 99-182 (Leiden).

- Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
- Mendels, D. (1990) "The Polemical Character of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*", *Studia Hellenistica* 30, Purposes of History, H. Verdin, G. Schepens, E. de Keyser eds. (91-110).
- Momigliano, A. (1931) "Intorno al *Contro Apione*", *RFIC* 59, 485-503.
- Momigliano, A. (1975) *Alien Wisdom* (Cambridge).
- Mooren, L. (1977) *La hiérarchie du cour Ptolémaïque*, *Studia Hellenistica* 23 (Louvain).
- Morgan, T (1997) "Teaching Literature in Greco-Roman Egypt", *Akten des 21 Int. Papyrologenkongresses Berlin 1995*, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beiheft* 3 (738-43).
- Murnane, W. (1977) *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (Chicago).
- Murray, O. (1970) "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship", *JEA* 56, 141-71.
- Murray, O. (1972) "Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture", *CQ* 22, 200-13.
- Nock, A. (1930/1972) "Cύνναος Θεός", *HSCP* 41, 1-62, repr. in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World II Z.* Stewart ed. (Oxford) 202-51. I cite from the latter.
- Norden, E. (1918) *Die Antike Kuntsprosa* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Onasch, C. (1976) "Zur Königsideologie der Ptolemäer in den Dekreten von Kanopus und Memphis Rosettana", *APF* 24/25 (1976) 137-55.
- Otto, W. (1908) *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*, 2 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Parsons, P. (1974) "Ulpius Serianus", *CE* 49, 135-57.
- Peremans, W. (1962) "Égyptiens et Étrangers dans l'Égypte Ptolémaïque", *Grecs et Barbares*, Fondation Hardt 8, 121-55.
- Peremans, W. (1987) "Les Lagides, les élites indigènes et la monarchie bicéphale", *Le système palatial en Orient, en Grèce et à Rome*, E. Lévy ed., Leiden, 327-43.
- Podemann Sørensen, J. (1992) "Native Reactions to Foreign Rule and Culture in Religious Literature", in *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*, *Studies in Hellenistic Civilization III* P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle eds. (Aarhus) 164-81.
- Potter, D. (1994) *Prophets and Emperors* (Cambridge Mass.).
- Préaux, C. (1978) *Le Monde Hellénistique*, 2 vols. (Paris).
- Quaegebeur, J. (1989) "The Egyptian Clergy and the Cult of the Ptolemaic Dynasty", *AncSoc* 29, 93-116.
- Ray, J. (1976) *The Archive of Hor* (London).
- Redford, D. (1986) *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books* (Mississauga).
- Redford, D. (1993) "Osarseph", *Alexandrian Studies in Memoriam Daoud abdu Daoud*, *BSAA* 45, 136-60.
- Reymond, E. (1983) "Demotic Literary Works of Graeco-Roman Date in the Rainer Collection of Papyri in Vienna", *P. Rainer Cent.* (Vienna) 42-60.
- Ritner, R. (1993) *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice* (Chicago).
- Rutherford, I. (1997) "Kalasiris and Setne Khamwas: A Greek Novel and some Egyptian Models", *ZPE* 117, 203-209.
- Ryholt, K. (1998) "A Demotic Version of Nectanebos' Dream (P. Carlsberg 562)", *ZPE* 122, 197-200.
- Schäfer, P. (1997) "Die Manetho-Fragmente bei Josephus und die Anfänge des antiken 'Antisemitismus'", in *Collecting Fragments*, Glenn Most ed. (Göttingen) 186-206.
- Schwartz, S. (1990) *Josephus and Judaeae Politics* (Leiden).
- Sethe, K. (1900) *Sesostris, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens* 2.1 (Leipzig).
- Sijpesteijn, P.J. (1980) "The Historian Apollonides Alias Horapios", *Mnemosyne* 33, 364-66.
- Smith, J. (1978) *Map is Not Territory. Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden).
- Spiegelberg, W. (1922) *Der demotische Text der Priesterdekrete von Kanopus und Memphis (Rosettana) mit den hieroglyphischen und griechischen Fassungen und deutscher Uebersetzung nebst demotischem Glossar* (Heidelberg).
- Sterling, G. (1992) *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden).
- Stinchcombe, A. (1968) *Constructing Social Theories* (Chicago and London).

- Tait, W.J. (1994) "Egyptian Fiction in Demotic and Greek", in *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context*, J. Morgan and R. Stoneman eds. (London and New York) 203-222.
- Tait, W.J. (1997) "Aspects of Demotic Education," *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyruskongresses, Berlin 1995*, APF Beiheft 3 (931-38).
- Thissen, H.-J. (1966) *Studien zum Raphiadekret*, Beiträge z. klass. Philologie 23 (Meisenheim am Glan).
- Thissen, H.-J. (1980) "Manetho", *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, III, 1180-81.
- Thissen, H.-J. (1987) "Der Name Manetho", *Enchoria* 15, 93-96.
- Thompson, D. (1988) *Memphis Under the Ptolemies* (Princeton).
- Thompson, D. (1990) "The High Priests of Memphis under Ptolemaic Rule", in *Pagan Priests. Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, M. Beard and J. North eds. (Ithaca) 97-116.
- Thompson, D. (1994) "Literacy and Power in Egypt", in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, A. Bowman and G. Woolf eds. (Cambridge) 67-83.
- Thompson, S. (1957) *Motif-Index to Folk Literature* (Bloomington).
- van der Horst, P. (1984) *Chaeremon. Egyptian Priest and Stoic Philosopher* (Leiden).
- Vanderlip, V. (1972) *The Four Greek Hymns of Isidorus and the Cult of Isis*, ASP 12 (Toronto).
- Walbank, F. (1984) "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas", *CAH²* 7: 62-100.
- Wallis Budge (1908) *The Book of the Kings of Egypt*, 2 vols. (London).
- Winter, E. (1978) "Der Herrscherkult in den ägyptischen Ptolemäertempeln", in *Das ptolemäische Ägypten*, H. Maehler and V. Strocka eds. (Mainz) 147-60.
- Yoyotte, J. (1963) "L'Égypte ancienne et les origines de l'antijudaïsme", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 163, 133-43.
- Zabkar, L. (1980) "Adaptation of Ancient Egyptian Texts to the Temple Ritual at Philae", *JEA* 66 (127-36).
- Zabkar, L. (1988) *Hymns to Isis in Her Temple at Philae* (Hanover and London).
- Zauzich, K.-T. (1983) "Das Lamm des Bokchoris", *P. Rainer Cent.* (Vienna) 165-74.