

Agnieszka Wojciechowska

# From Amyrtaeus to Ptolemy

Egypt in the Fourth century B.C.

PHILIPPIKA

Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen

Contributions to the Study of Ancient World Cultures 97

Harrassowitz Verlag



# PHILIPPIKA

Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen  
Contributions to the Study  
of Ancient World Cultures

Herausgegeben von / Edited by  
Joachim Hengstl, Elizabeth Irwin,  
Andrea Jördens, Torsten Mattern,  
Robert Rollinger, Kai Ruffing, Orell Witthuhn

97

2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Agnieszka Wojciechowska

From Amyrtaeus to Ptolemy  
Egypt in the Fourth century B.C.

2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bis Band 60: Philippika. Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen  
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet  
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek  
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche  
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet  
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our  
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2016  
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.  
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission  
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies  
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage  
and processing in electronic systems.  
Printed on permanent/durable paper.  
Typesetting and Layout: Vera Peters  
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen  
Printed in Germany

ISSN 1613-5628  
ISBN 978-3-447-10655-9  
e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19534-8

# Contents

Introduction .....	1
Chapter I: Chronology .....	7
Chapter II: Egypt under native dynasties 404–340 B.C. ....	21
2.1 Situation in Egypt on the brink of independence .....	21
2.2 Amyrtaeus II and the liberation of Egypt. ....	22
2.3 The XXIX dynasty (399/398–381/380 B.C.).....	29
2.3.1 Nephherites I. ....	29
2.3.2 Akoris and Psammuthes. ....	31
2.3.3 Nephherites II. ....	38
2.4 XXX dynasty (381/380–340 B.C.).....	39
2.4.1 Nectanebo I and Tachos. ....	39
2.4.2 Nectanebo II. ....	52
Chapter III: Second Persian rule – XXXI dynasty .....	73
3.1 New kings of Egypt Artaxerxes III and Arses (Artaxerxes IV) .....	73
3.2 Khababash (338–336 B.C.).....	75
3.3 Darius III (336–332 B.C.).....	79
Chapter IV: From the Macedonian conquest to the coronation of Ptolemy I ...	83
4.1 Alexander the Great .....	83
4.2 Philip III Arrhidaeus .....	94
4.3 Alexander IV .....	97
4.4 Ptolemy I. ....	101
Catalogue of buildings .....	109
Bibliography .....	139
General Index .....	155
Index of sources .....	167



## Introduction

This book arises from a doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of Professor Krzysztof Nawotka at the University of Wrocław, Poland, and completed in 2008. Over these more than seven years since the public defense of my dissertation it has been re-written with some parts typical of a dissertation but not necessarily fit for a general reader eliminated and many new passages added.

The fourth c. B.C. was the age of great political instability in the Mediterranean with innumerable wars culminating in the conquests of Alexander the Great. In the history of Greece and the Western World in general, his reign is the traditional end of the classical age and the beginning the Hellenistic period. It was preceded by some sixty years of the resurgence of the Persian Empire whose kings, Artaxerxes II and Artaxerxes III reasserted their rule over provinces lost in the previous century, in that Egypt, once counted among the richest satrapies of the Achaemenid empire. For all failed attempts to reconquer Egypt over the period of two generations, Artaxerxes II and Artaxerxes III never gave up on restoring the ancestral borders of their empire. For Egypt the relations with the Achaemenid empire played the pivotal role from the end of the fifth c. B.C. when Egypt, newly independent under the energetic native pharaohs, became a thriving political hub of the Eastern Mediterranean frequently involved in assisting the enemies of Persia in the turbulent age of the first half of the fourth c. B.C. This period came to an end with the conquest of Artaxerxes III who turned Egypt anew into a Persian satrapy. The second Persian domination in Egypt was in turn terminated by Alexander the Great with whom began three hundred years of Macedonian rule.

This book, as many others, stretches the meaning of the word “century” a little bit: its narrative begins in 404 B.C. rather than in 400 B.C. to end in 305 B.C., not in 300 B.C., for important if different reasons. 404 B.C. is the year when the first Persian rule in Egypt ended while 305 B.C. is the most probable date of the coronation of Ptolemy I and thus the symbolic beginning of the Ptolemaic dynasty and the end of the fiction of unity of the Macedonian empire of the dynasty of Alexander the Great. There is no reason to continue the narration past the year 305 B.C. as the history of Egypt under Ptolemy I and in the Ptolemaic age in general has received ample coverage in modern scholarly publications, quite unlike the preceding period of the history of Egypt in the fourth c. B.C.

Hence the focus here is on the last period of Egypt’s independence in the fourth c. B.C., both in terms of the foreign policy of the native pharaohs and their internal government. This book will try to gauge the strength of Egypt’s economy in this age, at least as much as can be assessed on the basis of monumental building projects, private documents surviving in papyri (sales deeds, marriage contracts etc.)



and coins issued by pharaohs. But of course a central issue is the Persian conquest of Egypt. An attempt will be made to identify the causes for Artaxerxes III finally succeeding after so many failed attempts to recover Egypt for the Achaemenid empire. Thus questions will be posed rather than answered as to the role of Greek mercenaries in this war, commonly extolled in classical authors. Even if the assessment of their role in the war in classical sources is over optimistic, the Greeks in fourth c. B.C. Egypt, not just Greek soldiers, need to be studied. Egypt of this age was not a homogeneous society. Apart from Greeks, also Jews of the Elephantine and Iranians, principally of Ayn Manawir in the Kharga Oasis, are attested and will be studied in this book.

It is a well-known fact that classical authors and modern scholars alike have painted a dim picture of the first Persian rule in Egypt. Here an effort will be made to analyse ancient accounts pertaining to the second Persian rule in Egypt to uncover to what extent the gruesome depiction of the rule of Artaxerxes III reflects historical reality and in what way it perpetuates topoi born in the Herodotean portrayal of madness and cruel tyranny of Cambyses. Clearly the conquest of Alexander the Great marks the new beginning both in the history of Egypt and in its representation in classical authors. Issues to be addressed here are the degree to which the early Macedonian kings of Egypt assumed the responsibilities of legitimate pharaohs and the perception of them among the local elite. Out of necessity the narrative will concentrate on Alexander the Great on the one hand and on Ptolemy (I) on the other. Ptolemy became Egypt's most prominent figure of his age long before assuming the royal title: he effectively ruled the country as satrap and this was *de facto* recognized in numerous papyri listing his name even under the last Argead kings.

So far Egypt in the fourth c. B.C. has not been covered thoroughly in any monograph but of course chapters on this age abound in major syntheses of the history of Egypt, including Wilkinson 2011, Lloyd 2010, Schlögl 2006, Lloyd 2002, Grimal 1988. Lloyd 2010 covers the history of Egypt from its prehistory to Roman times and further into the early Islamic age, as well as the reception of Egyptian culture in Europe. The history of the fourth c. B.C. follows in this book the established lines, well known from much earlier works. Schlögl 2006 limits his coverage of the fourth c. B.C. to a handful of pages, summarizing the pharaohs of this age in a few sentences each. Grimal 1988 is not only concise in his coverage of the fourth c. B.C. but also quite selective, giving more than half of the space to foreign policy matters, barely mentioning economy or the contentious issues of Egyptian coinage of this age.

The fourth c. B.C. is of course also covered in older syntheses of Egypt: Petrie 1906, Daumas 1973, Drioton 1970, Gardiner 1966. Among them Gardiner 1966 offers the most thorough treatment, although again concentrated predominantly on foreign policy, mostly of the native pharaohs, with less attention devoted to the second Persian rule and to Alexander the Great and other early Macedonian kings of Egypt. The coverage of economy, coinage or art in Egypt of the fourth c. B.C. is in this and most other books superficial at best.

Two more specialized books, concerned with the seventh through fourth c. B.C. offer more thorough coverage of fourth c. B.C. Egypt: Gyles 1959 and Kienitz 1953. Gyles 1959, six years later than the work of Kienitz and making frequent use of this book, is somewhat disappointing. For the promising title *Pharaonic Policies and Administration, 663 to 323 B.C.* it is surprisingly casual in fourth c. B.C. matters, including the administration of Egypt. A reader has to face a confusing structure of the book, partly chronological, partly organized by a subject matter. Although Gyles refers to Kienitz, his treatment of the fourth c. history is superficial with a passing remark on Khababash and no precise reference to Artaxerxes III as the conqueror of Egypt. To make things worse, Artaxerxes III is in the index to this book conflated with Artaxerxes II which may convey the impression that the earlier of Artaxerxeses retook Egypt for the Persian empire. And of course this 1959 book cannot make use of newly published and republished papyri and other artefacts, important for the administrative and economic history of Egypt. The book of Kienitz, older than that of Gyles, is in many respects superior, although again concentrated chiefly on foreign policy issues with much less attention paid to administration or art and with coinage and architecture related after now outdated works. Even if the fourth c. B.C. is but a part of this book, Kienitz 1953 is still a much usable book largely thanks to its clear structure and carefully quoted ancient evidence.

Egypt in the fourth c. B.C. is also a part of a major picture in monographs of the Persian empire, of Alexander the Great, of the Hellenistic age. Olmstead 1978 which shaped much of the discussion in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. paints a dim picture of the Persian rule in Egypt. His views of the Persian empire were in turn successfully challenged among other by Briant (1996 and 2003) and Wiesehöfer (1996). The most precise and best documented through written and archaeological evidence modern account of Egypt within the Persian empire is in Briant 1996. Ruzicka 2012 discusses the relationships of Egypt with Persia from the invasion of Cambyses to the conquest of Alexander the Great. Its focus is clearly the political situation of Egypt and wars waged by the native pharaohs and Persian kings in the fourth c. B.C.

Among the plethora of new books on Alexander the Great, I have followed most often Nawotka 2010, certainly the best documented modern biography of Alexander. Ptolemy I and his dynasty have been receiving modern scholarship's constant attention, to mention only the classic book of Bouché-Leclercq (1903), known for its penchant for political issues and more balanced modern works: Ellis 1994, Hölbl 2000, Huß 2001. Fourth c. B.C. features in specialized monographs of the Hellenistic age in Egypt: on Alexandria (Fraser 1972), Memphis (Thompson 1988), on Greeks (Mallet 1922, Barns 1973) and on Jews in Egypt (Mélèze-Modrzejewski 2000). I owe much to the lucid presentation of the social history of Egypt in Trigger, Kemp, O'Connor, Lloyd 1992.

A much discussed issue of history of Egypt is coins and coinage, with most attention going to the coins Ptolemy I as king in the fourth and third c. B.C., and much more rarely to the issues and hoards dated to the Argead kings. For coinage

the most important are: Von Reden 2007, Duyrat, Picard 2005, Le Rider 2003, Hazard 1995, Howgego 1995, Mørkholm 1991, while every numismatist will find Thompson, Mørkholm, Kraay 1973 indispensable in its complete coverage of coin hoards found in Egypt or related to Egypt. Coin series of Egypt have been discussed profusely among others in Barclay Head 1886, Jungfleisch 1935, Jongkees 1950, Buttrey 1982, Lipiński 1982, Van Alfen 2002, Duyrat 2005, Hardwick 2006, while some important papers are concerned with particular coins as well: of Artaxerxes III (Mørkholm 1974, Vleeming 2001), of Nectanebo II (Bolshakow 1992), of Alexander the Great (Nash 1974, Nicolet–Pierre 1979) and coin dies (Jongkees 1950, Buttrey 1982, Meadows 2011). But for this wealth of numismatic publications, no complete coverage of Egypt's coinage in the fourth c. B.C. exists, with a very important book of Duyrat, Picard 2005 being in fact a collection of papers rather than a comprehensive narrative. To complete this overview one needs to mention books devoted to economy and religion of Egypt in this age (Łukaszewicz 2006, Manning 2003, Stambauch 1972).

Architecture, especially the temples of Egypt, have always attracted the enormous interest of scholarship (e.g. Favard-Meeks 2003) and publications frequently result from archaeological excavations (Jenni 1998, Niederberger 1999). In most cases, fourth c. B.C. architecture is a part of a more comprehensive account, e.g. in Ross 1931, Wolf 1957, Westendorf 1968, Smith 1981, Schäfer 1986, Romano 1989, Gay 2000. The architecture of the fourth c. as a topic of an academic book is still quite rare (e.g. Manassa 2005); more often it is embedded into an account of the art of the Late Period and the Hellenistic age (Brady 1935, Josephson 1997, Josephson, O'Rourke 2005, Tomoum 2005). Single structures, their fragments, inscriptions, reliefs and other artefacts of the fourth c. B.C. have been discussed in innumerable papers, to mention only Lefebvre 1924, Gunn 1926, Jelinková–Reymond 1956, Bakry 1964, Gabra 1981, Devouchelle 1982, Moussa 1985, Perdu 1985, Jasnow 1994, Defernez 2004. The XXX dynasty has generated most academic interest, in part due to a large number of attested buildings and artefacts dated to the long reign of Nectanebo I and Nectanebo II. Two important works (Spalinger 1978, Burstein 2000) deal with a remarkable piece of evidence for the late fourth c. B.C., the Satrap Stele, in conjunction with other sources associated with the pharaohs of the second half of the fourth c. B.C.

Archaeological reports are a real trove of evidence indispensable for any serious study of Egypt of the Late Period. In the first place one needs to list those published by the venerable *Egypt Exploration Society* in the series begun in the late 19<sup>th</sup> c. in which each volume covers either a site or a part of a large building complex and which counts among its authors many of the leading authorities on the archaeology of Egypt, among them W.M.F. Petrie, R. Mond, O.H. Myers, E.A. Gardner, E. Naville, H.S. Smith, S. Davies. For the purpose of this book the papers published in *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* devoted to the cult of the Apis Bull in Saqqara have been very useful. The excavations in Ayn Manawir in Kharga Oasis, published in the *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo*,

document, among other things, the thriving Iranian diaspora in Egypt, active not only during the First Persian Rule but much longer, under Artaxerxes III and later kings. This in a way parallels the archaeological data attesting the Greek presence in Egypt before Alexander, principally in Naucratis.

No ancient history work, and this book is no exception to this rule, can do without electronic resources. I would like to acknowledge here the excellent data bases of the Packard Humanities Institute: TLG and epigraphic and papyrological data base (PHI #7). The web site [www.trismegistos.org](http://www.trismegistos.org), created in Leuven and Cologne by a dedicated group of scholars with participation of M. Depauw contains plethora of data (papyri, ostraca, Egyptian stelae) with dates and useful information about their standard editions.

In this book (outside of the introduction) all dates are B.C., unless stated otherwise. The names of classical authors and titles of their works are abbreviated after *Oxford Latin Dictionary* oraz Liddel, Scott, Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*. The titles of scholarly journals are listed in the system of *L'Annee Philologique*. I have tried to approach the perennial problem of the rendition of ancient names, Egyptian in particular, by following the established *usus* wherever possible. Otherwise, I use the form of an Egyptian name which appears in a source edition. In the case of names which are transliterated only in source editions, I leave them as they are, not attempting to translate into a modern rendition. This would have been too risky on account of the consonant-only nature of the Egyptian writing which makes supplementing vowels very risky in little-known names.

I have a very pleasant duty to acknowledge the assistance of many people and institution which I enjoyed over the long process of writing, first the doctoral dissertation and then the book which springs up from it. My doctoral studies and related research were founded by the University of Wrocław in Poland through a scholarship and two research grants which allowed me to visit Cairo and London. Then I spent ten very profitable months in Cairo thanks to a scholarship of the Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology of the University of Warsaw. A scholarship of the De Brzezic Lanckoroński Foundation allowed me to conduct research in Oxford. Later my research was supported by a grant from the National Science Centre. Over the course of my doctoral study I made use of a number of libraries and museums, everywhere greeted by friendly staff and scholars established in these places of research. Apart from the libraries of my home university in Wrocław, I would like to acknowledge the amicable services of the libraries of the University of Warsaw and in particular the libraries of the Departments of Papyrology and Assyriology (Egyptian section). I have fond memories of the excellent Oxford libraries (Sackler, Bodleian, Oriental Institute, Ashmolean), of the British Museum, Petrie Museum and the British Library in London, of the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge. While in Cairo, I could always rely on the friendly assistance of the colleagues from the Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology who put their library resources at my disposal. I am particularly indebted to its Director Dr. Zbigniew Szafrński who, while on Deir el-Bahari

excavations, patiently introduced me to the archaeologist's field work. A large part of my research was conducted in the Egyptian Museum, in the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, in the Institut Français d'Archéologie Oriental, in the American Research Center in Egypt, all in Cairo, and in the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria. During these ten months in Egypt I was afforded the opportunity to see most of the places about which I write in this book and the hands-on experience in topography of Egypt proved very helpful during the course of my mostly library-based research.

On all stages of my work I could count on the advice and friendly criticism of many experts on ancient Egypt, classical sources and Greek history. I would like to acknowledge the endless hours which Prof. Adam Łukaszewicz, Prof. Andrzej Niwiński, Prof. Włodzimierz Godlewski, Prof. Wiktor Daszewski, Prof. Gościwit Malinowski, Dr. Neal Spencer, Dr. Julie Renee Anderson spent discussing the fourth c. B.C. Egypt with me. I experienced enormous support and amiable encouragement from Dr. Małgorzata Możdżyńska-Nawotka. My greatest thanks go to Prof. Krzysztof Nawotka, my dissertation supervisor, and now my friend and colleague at the University of Wrocław for his patience, inspirational efforts and tremendous assistance on all stages of writing and revising this book.

## Chapter I: Chronology

Establishing the precise dates of fourth-century B.C. pharaohs is often difficult but nonetheless crucial for dating other events in history of Egypt of this age. A key point in the puzzle of the Egyptian chronology of the fourth c. B.C. is the beginning of the second Persian rule. In the second half of the fourth c. B.C. Artaxerxes III conquered Egypt anew, giving origin to the XXXI dynasty unrecorded by Manetho and later added to his king-list. The puzzle of the precise date of this conquest is compounded by the fact that Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* is known only from fragments and testimonies in much later authors: Julius Africanus, Eusebius, Syncellus, Jerome and in the Armenian rendition of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. Before delving into the minutiae of their rendition of Manetho, a short account of Egyptian and Babylonian calendars may shed some light on the dates listed by ancient epitomizers of Manetho. The dates surviving in their works and sometimes ultimately derived from the Babylonian time-reckoning methods need to be correlated with the Gregorian calendar to make them readable to modern readers.

The Babylonian calendar was in official use throughout the Achaemenid empire, on evidence of papyri also in the Jewish colony in Egyptian Elephantine.<sup>1</sup> At the same time Egypt enjoyed a different calendar with the year of 365 days divided into three seasons *akhet*, *peret*, *shemu*, and each of them consisting of four months of thirty days each (Thoth, Phaophi, Athyr, Choiak, Tybi, Mechir, Phamenoth, Pharmouthi, Pachon, Payni, Epiphi, Mesore) with five extra days, so-called *epagomenae*. Even with these extra days the Egyptian year was ca.  $\frac{1}{4}$  a day shorter than the astronomical year, every four years pushing the beginning of the year (1 Thoth) one day back in reference to the solar year. To make up for this obvious shortcoming of the official calendar, both for everyday life purposes and in religious rituals the Egyptians were also using a lunar calendar with months of 29 and 30 days. A fixed point in the Egyptian calendar was the helical rising of Sirius at the daybreak of 19 July. The helical rising of Sirius should ideally coincide with the beginning of the inundation of the Nile and with the first day of the New Year, 1 Thoth.<sup>2</sup> Apart from the difference in defining a year, there was also a fundamental difference between the Babylonian and Egyptian ways of counting years of a king's rule. In the Egyptian system the year one of a king was the period from his intronization to the first New Year in his rule. His second year coincided with next full year in the Egyptian official calendar. In Babylonia on the other hand the period from the beginning of the actual rule until the end of the

---

1 Bickerman 1969, 24–25.

2 Bickerman 1969, 40–41; Grzybek 1990, 16–17; Depuydt 2008, 47.

civil year was referred to as the “the beginning of the reign.” The year one of the king began on the first 1 Nisanu in his rule, so that his first year coincided with the first full civil year in his rule.<sup>3</sup>

The conquest of Egypt by Artaxerxes III is usually dated now to 343/342 B.C., although a few competing dates were also propounded by the modern scholarship. Until the book of Wiedemann (1880) the prevailing view held in the academic writing was 340 B.C. Wiedemann tried to reconcile Diodorus who assigned the expedition of Artaxerxes III to the archonship of Apollodoros (summer of 350 B.C.) and Eusebius with the date within the 108 Olympiad (summer 353 to summer 352 B.C.) coming up with the conclusion that the Second Persian Rule in Egypt started in 350 B.C.<sup>4</sup> E. Bickermann, whose voice for a long time dominated the debate of chronology of Egypt in the fourth c. B.C., first dated the Persian invasion in the second half of 343 B.C., later to re-date it to the beginning of 342 B.C. These dates gained additional following in the scholarship once they were adopted by Kienitz and Briant.<sup>5</sup> Ancient Egyptian, Babylonian and Greek sources do not list a precise date of this event. Modern dating is usually based on the combined interpretation of Diodorus, Isocrates, Didymus’ commentary to Demosthenes and on the letter of Speusippus to Philip II. The commentary of Didymus, surviving in a second c. A.D. papyrus from Hermopolis, mentions a Persian embassy dispatched to Athens in the archonship of Lykiskos (summer 344 – summer 343 B.C.). This calls to mind a passage in Diodorus concerned with the Persian efforts to gather allies against Egypt of Nectanebo II: “(Artaxerxes III) dispatched envoys to the greatest cities of Greece requesting them to join the Persians in the campaign against the Egyptians.”<sup>6</sup> Most modern scholars assume that both authors refer to the same embassy of 344/343 B.C. and, in spite of the Athenian refusal to provide troops to the Persian army of conquest, the date known from Didymus has been fundamental in calculating the date of the campaign of Artaxerxes III. In Bickermann’s opinion the great army of Artaxerxes III could not have stayed idly for too long because of the insurmountable burden of covering expenses of many thousands of Greek mercenaries and therefore the invasion had to begin in the autumn of 343 B.C.<sup>7</sup> But there is of course an inherent weakness in this reconstruction as there is nothing in our sources to estimate how much time really passed between dispatching embassies to Greek states and the actual invasion of Egypt.<sup>8</sup>

A support argument is drawn by some from the *Letter to Philip II* of Speusippus, an Athenian philosopher usually dated to ca. 410–339 B.C. The last paragraph of it

3 Bickerman 1969, 66; Grzybek 1990, 16–17.

4 Wiedemann 1880, 365–367; Depuydt 2010, 197–198.

5 Bickermann 1934, 77–83; Kienitz 1953, 104–105, 181–185; Lloyd 1994, 349; Briant 2002, 685–687; Depuydt 2010, 194–195.

6 D.S. XVI 44.1 (trans. Oldfather, Loeb); Isoc. 4.161; D. 10.34, 12.6; Did. 8.5–17; Bickermann 1934, 80–81; Beloch, 1922, 534–535; Hall 1927, 152

7 Bickermann 1934, 81; Depuydt 2008, 270.

8 Depuydt 2010, 220.

contains information about the shortage of papyrus in the market caused by the Persian conquest of Egypt. Bickermann, followed by Kienitz, noticed that the letter must have been written after Artaxerxes had conquered Egypt, in Bickermann's view in the beginning of 342 B.C. Of course all hinges upon the authorship of the letter by Speusippus and not by some later writer. To Bickermann and Kienitz the letter is the authentic work of Speusippus, while a detailed study of Natoli leads to the conclusion that the letter is probably authentic.<sup>9</sup> Bickermann attempts to strengthen his argument by referring to the passage in the *Letter to Philip II* which mentions Heracles slaying the tyrants of Ambrakia. In it Speusippus, Bickermann writes, alludes to Philip II, a descendant of Heracles who was planning to take over Ambrakia. This, in Bickermann's view, further supports the date of the *Letter* soon after the conquest of Egypt by Artaxerxes III in 342 B.C. But even if the *Letter* is authentic nothing indicates that the time span between the expedition of Artaxerxes III and Philip's planned conquest of Ambrakia was as short as Bickermann wanted. There is reason, therefore, to date this letter to 342 B.C.<sup>10</sup>

Manetho's or Ps.-Mantho's list of pharaohs of the XXXI dynasty is known from later authors.<sup>11</sup>

Julius Africanus	Syncellus	Eusebius (Armenian version)		Jerome	
			Ms. L	Mss. PN	Ms. B
<b>Artaxerxes III</b> Conquest of Egypt in the 20 <sup>th</sup> year of his rule	<b>Artaxerxes III</b> Conquest of Egypt in the 20 <sup>th</sup> year of his rule	<b>Artaxerxes III</b> Conquest of Egypt in the 20 <sup>th</sup> year of his rule	<b>Artaxerxes III</b> Conquest of Egypt in 107 Olimpiad; Nectanebo II flees to Ethiopia	<b>Artakserxes III</b> Conquest of Egypt in the 15 <sup>th</sup> year of his rule 108 Olimpiad	<b>Artakserxes III</b> Conquest of Egypt in the 20 <sup>th</sup> year of his rule
Ruled for two years	Ruled for six years	Ruled for six years			
<b>Artaxerxes IV (Arses)</b>	<b>Artaxerxes IV (Arses)</b>	<b>Artaxerxes IV (Arses)</b>			
Ruled for three years	Ruled for four years	Ruled for four years			
<b>Darius III</b>	<b>Darius III</b>	<b>Darius III</b>			
Ruled for four years	Ruled for six years	Ruled for six years			

The principal late authors writing about the conquest of Egypt by Artaxerxes III and Julius Africanus and Eusebius quoted by Syncellus and known from the Armenian version of his *Chronicle*. In all probability their ultimate (direct or indirect) source

<sup>9</sup> Bickermann and Sykutris 1928, 29–30, Kienitz 1953, 170–171.

<sup>10</sup> Speus. 8–10, 12; Bickermann 1934, 83–84; Depuydt 2010, 224–225.

<sup>11</sup> Man. Hist. *FGrH* 609 F 2–3C; Waddell 1940, 182–185.



was Manetho and they all state that Artaxerxes conquered Egypt in the 20<sup>th</sup> year of his rule. There is no hint what chronological system was used in Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* to record the 20<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes. A contemporary Babylonian tablet attests that Artaxerxes III took over the Persian throne between 25 November 359 B.C. and 10 March 358 B.C., so his actual 20<sup>th</sup> year in power was sometimes between the end of 339 and early spring of 337 B.C. If his regnal years were calculated according to the Egyptian system, the 20<sup>th</sup> year would begin on 16 November 340. If the Babylonian system was applied, the 20<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes lasted between 12 April 339 and 31 March 338.<sup>12</sup> No matter what system of counting regnal years of Artaxerxes III was used by Manetho, his 29<sup>th</sup> year did not begin before November 340 B.C.

Then we have information about the length of rule of Persian kings of Egypt of the XXXI dynasty. Julius Africanus differs from Eusebius both in Syncellus' version and in the Armenian rendition listing two years of Artaxerxes III against their six years. An independent early Imperial sources, *Ptolemy's Canon*, speaks of 21 years of Artaxerxes (between 25 November 359 B.C. – 10 March 358 B.C. and 27 August – 25 September 338 B.C.) and from another Babylonian tablet we learn that his son Arses (Artaxerxes IV) ascended the throne on 25 September 338 B.C.<sup>13</sup> Therefore one has to agree with Lloyd and Depuydt that the version of Julius Africanus is most probably the rendition of Manetho as the conquest of Egypt in the 20<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes and his two years as pharaoh add up to some 21 regnal years known from the *Ptolemy's Canon*.<sup>14</sup>

Upon his death on 25 September 338 B.C. Artaxerxes III was succeeded by his sons Arses (Artaxerxes IV) who reigned three years according to Julius Africanus or for four years according to Eusebius, and to Syncellus and Jerome who rely on Eusebius.<sup>15</sup> An Aramaic papyrus from Wadi Daliyeh mentions Month 12 (Adar) Day 20 "Year 2 (of Arses), accession year of Darius (III)", or 19 March 335 B.C. This means that the reign of Arses (Artaxerxes IV) certainly ended prior to 19 March 335 B.C., i.e. before 1 Nisanu which in 335 B.C. fell on 29 March. Therefore his second year, as defined by the Babylonian method of counting years of a king, lasted from 1 Nisanu in 336 B.C. to the day of his death.<sup>16</sup> And indeed the *Ptolemy's Canon* lists two years of Artaxerxes IV. Perhaps the number of years of Artaxerxes IV listed by Julius Africanus and Eusebius results from conflating two dating systems: Babylonian and Egyptian. A part of the period from the actual intronization of Arses to 1 Nisanu counted in the Babylonian system as the accession year (we may say year zero) and in the Egyptian system as his year one could be entered as

12 Parker and Dubberstein 1956, 19; Depuydt 2006, 281; Depuydt 2008, 37, 39; Depuydt 2010, 202.

13 Depuydt 2006, 281; Depuydt 2010, 202.

14 Lloyd 1988, 154–156; Depuydt 2010, 202.

15 Lloyd 1988, 154.

16 Depuydt 2008, 41; Depuydt 2010, 227.

year one of Arsēs in the sources of Julius Africanus (Manetho) and Eusebius resulting in three years attributed to Arsēs.<sup>17</sup>

In Ps.-Manetho's king-list known from Julius Africanus the length of rule of Darius III as king of Egypt is four years. Eusebius gives him six years, noticing that afterwards Darius III was killed by Alexander the Great. Jerome lists the same length of reign making, however, Darius son of Arsames and the fourteenth king of the Persian empire.<sup>18</sup> Obviously these dates reflect different ways of counting regnal years of Darius: Julius Africanus gives the length of his actual rule in Egypt while Eusebius and Jerome must refer to the overall length of his reign as Great King.<sup>19</sup>

The chronology of the Persian kings of Egypt gives us the most securely established dates in fourth-c. B.C. history of Egypt before the Macedonian conquest. The chronology of the native pharaohs has to be reconciled with the dates established for Artaxerxes III, Artaxerxes IV and Darius III. Hence we have to begin with Nectanebo II, the pharaoh who immediately preceded Artaxerxes III. The version of the events known from the *Chronicle* of Eusebius in the Latin rendition of Jerome differs again from that of Syncellus, Julius Africanus and the Armenian text of Eusebius. In Jerome's text the 18<sup>th</sup> year of Nectanebo II coincided with the 16<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes III (343/2 B.C.) and not with his 20<sup>th</sup> year. Then, in various manuscripts, the conquest of Egypt is dated to the 14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes III. Obviously the manuscript tradition is much confused due to scribal errors and/ or to efforts of mediaeval scribes to correct errors. Out of all accounts based on Manetho, the closest to the original seems to be that of Julius Africanus who reflects best the Egyptian chronological habit and the date quoted by him can be comparatively easily reconciled with known historical data.<sup>20</sup>

The same late authors convey also the length of reign of pharaohs of XXX dynasty:

<b>King</b>	<b>Julius Africanus</b>	<b>Eusebius</b>	<b>Eusebius (Armenian version)</b>
Nectanebo I	18 years	10 years	10 years
Tachos	2 years	2 years	2 years
Nectanebo II	18 lat	8 lat	8 lat
All of XXX dynasty	38 years	20 years	20 years

When Artaxerxes III was making preparations for his final expedition, Egypt was ruled by the last pharaoh of the XXX dynasty Nectanebo II. Again the regnal years

<sup>17</sup> Lloyd 1988, 155.

<sup>18</sup> Lloyd 1988, 154.

<sup>19</sup> Lloyd 1988, 156.

<sup>20</sup> Lloyd 1988, 156–157.

ascribed to him in modern scholarship differ widely. According to Wiedemann (1880/1884 r.) it was 367–350 B.C. (in that 367–361 jointly with Tachos), to Judeich (1892) it was 361–343 B.C., to Petrie (1905) 359–342 B.C., to Kahrstedt (1910) 360–344/343 B.C., to Beloch (1923) 360–343 B.C., to Cloché (1919/1920) – 359–341 B.C. (and the last full year in power: 343/342 B.C.), to Hall 359–343/342 B.C., to Bickermann (1935/1936) 359/358–342/341 B.C.<sup>21</sup>

No extant standard Egyptian historical source illuminates the last days of Nectanebo II or his whereabouts after he lost Egypt to Artaxerxes III but indirect information can be gleaned from inscriptions and papyri. A much later hieroglyphic inscription from the temple of Horus in Edfu cut under Ptolemy IX Soter II mentions Nectanebo's gift to the temple offered in his 18<sup>th</sup> year.<sup>22</sup> The same year appears in the *Demotic Chronicle*: *rnpt 18 b ntj.jw.w dyt jr.f st* "it is 18 years that he will be allowed to complete"<sup>23</sup> and in a fragment of Julius Africanus quoted by Syncellus.<sup>24</sup> Another evidence is in an Egyptian novel the *Dream of Nectanebo* known principally in the Greek rendition surviving in a fragmentary papyrus of the first half of the second c. B.C. and in a still more fragmentary Demotic version. The Greek version of the *Dream of Nectanebo* mentions the full moon in the night of 21/22 Pharmuthi in the 16<sup>th</sup> year of Nectanebo. All these data allows modern scholarship to convert this date to 5 July 343 B.C. Three Demotic versions of the *Dream of Nectanebo* refer to the 16<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Nectanebo II and the fourth one to the 18<sup>th</sup> year.<sup>25</sup> Thus in the light of Egyptian Hellenistic sources there is little doubt that Nectanebo II ruled Egypt for no less than 18 years. Hence the number of Nectanebo's years in power given by Eusebius as eight is wrong and it may be attributed to a scribal error which occurred at some unknown point in the transmission of Eusebius' or Manetho's text.<sup>26</sup> Lloyd is even willing to attribute to Nectanebo II 18 full years of reign and dates the Persian to conquest to the following year: this unfinished (or barely begun) 19<sup>th</sup> year of Nectanebo II was allegedly assigned by Manetho to Artaxerxes III as his year one. This manner of counting regnal years was not unknown to *Ptolemy's Canon* and may have been earlier applied by Egyptian sources.<sup>27</sup>

We know the precise date neither of the beginning nor of the end of the rule of Nectanebo II. In Bickermann's reconstruction of events Egypt was conquered by Artaxerxes III in the 18<sup>th</sup> year of Nectanebo II, in the winter of 343/2 B.C., but the defeated pharaoh held to power in the south of the country for another 20 months.<sup>28</sup> This hypothesis was surely crafted under the influence of Diodorus who says that

21 Kienitz 1953, 166–167, with a thorough reference to earlier academic literature.

22 Bickermann 1934, 82; Meeks 1972, 19; Manning 2003, 246.

23 *Demotic Chronicle* IV.18; Depuydt 2010, 204.

24 Sync. *Ecl. Chron.*, 86.

25 Ryholt 1998, 197–198.

26 Man. Hist. *FGrH* 609 F3A; Depuydt 2010, 204.

27 Lloyd 1988, 158.

28 Bickermann 1934, 81; Briant 2002, 685.