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The outcome of the second Persian invasion on Egypt under Artaxerxes III is described by Diodorus of Sicily (allegedly taking his information from Ephoros of Cyme) in Book 16 of his Library of History as follows: “King Nectanebo, however, who spent his time in Memphis watching the cities’ eagerness to surrender, did not dare to risk a battle for his supremacy. Renouncing his kingship, he took the greatest part of his possessions and fled to Ethiopia” (Diod. XVI. 51.2; translated by T. Eide, FHN II: 502, no. 84a). It is certain that “Ethiopia” in this passage must be a denotation of the lands to the south of the Nile First Cataract, i.e., in modern historical notions, a part of the Meroitic oikumene. This evidence by Diodorus is the only historical one which gives at least some details about the end of the last native king of Egypt Nectanebo II; hence one would expect it to be the object of very careful scrutiny. However, this expectation is hardly justified. Most of the scholars who noted this evidence took its truthfulness for granted; Fr.K. Kienitz went even further and supposed that after his downfall Nectanebo II had sought the protection of Lower Nubian chieftains (Kienitz 1953: 107; cf. later Lloyd 1983: 340-341). Actually, the only scholar who cared to discuss Diodorus’ evidence as such was László Török. At the inspiration of P.M. Fraser (1972: I, 508-509; II, 952, note 34), he compared Diodorus’ statement with Manetho’s narrative about the flight of Pharaoh Amenophis to Ethiopia fleeing enemies who had seized dominion over Egypt (Ios. Flav., Contra Apionem I 26, §§ 232-251 = FGH: no. 609 [Manetho], F.10 = Waddell 1980: 119-133, fr. 54); hence came the conclusion that Diodorus’ evidence is merely a projection of this topos onto the end of Nectanebo’s reign and has therefore no historical value. The explanation for the appearance of this topos, according to Török, was the idea of Kush being a preserver of Egyptian tradition and an enemy of the foreign conquerors of Egypt (Török 1986: 43-44; Török 1988: 145; Török 1989: 70). This position was questioned immediately by S.M. Burstein (1989: 225-226); eventually, W. Huß, who assembled the most evidence on the middle of the second Persian domination in Egypt, also doubted such a radical rejection of Nectanebo’s flight (Huß 1994: 107, note 72); and in due course Török admitted the possible historicity of the evidence, though without abandoning the allusion to Manetho’s story of Amenophis (FHN II: 502, no. 84a; Török 1997: 391, note 257). Although doubted in a way by its author, Török’s view expressed in his publications of the 1980s stands as the only motivated approach to the subject in question. Alternative views on Nectanebo’s action remain unmotivated and the alleged parallel between Diodorus’ and Manetho’s statements stands undisputed (Burstein 1989: 225-226, merely suggested, in a way designed to avoid controversy, that the piece of Manetho on Amenophis is actually a reinterpreted description of Nectanebo’s flight!). To fill this vacat is in fact the aim of the present paper. It should be said in advance that, with one exception, no enlightening new sources have come to the fore and the study is methodologically based mostly on a reexamination of what is already known. Nevertheless, the subject is well worth the effort, as is the objective to understand better the circumstances under which an independent Egyptian state ceased to exist.

Since Török formulated his judgment loud and clear in the 1980s, it is natural to start with determining whether Diodorus’ statement can really be considered a topos paralleling Manetho’s story of Amenophis. Turning to this story reproduced by Josephus Flavius, one is easily assured that, if it is indeed a topos, it is by no means restricted to a mere statement of the Pharaoh’s flight to Ethiopia. Actually, it consists of a number of integral parts, each indispensable to the whole story. First, Pharaoh Amenophis “conceives a desire to behold the gods” and, following the advice of his court wizard Amenophis son of Paapis, sends 80,000 lepers and diseased people to forced labor east of the Nile (Ios. Flav., Contra Apionem I 26, §§ 232-233). Second, the wizard is afraid of the gods’ revenge for this iniquity and lets the Pharaoh know that in
due course the lepers will become allied with some foreign enemies of Egypt who will control the country for 13 years. The Pharaoh falls into despair and grants the lepers in compensation the former Hyksos domain of Avaris, where they establish a sort of autonomous community (§§ 236-240). Third, the leader of the lepers sends an embassy to Hierosolyma/Jerusalem to the descendants of the real Hyksos ‘Shepherds’; he succeeds in convincing them to join him in an attack on Egypt from the base at Avaris (§§ 241-243). Fourth, Amenophis has no doubt that this attack is the gods’ revenge: he gathers a huge army and sends his son Setos Ramesses to a friend (the king of Ethiopia?), but does not even try to stand up to the invaders. He orders the sacred animals to be taken from the temples and seeks asylum in Ethiopia, the king of which “in gratitude for a service, had become his subject” (§§ 244-247).

Fifth, after 13 years of the lepers’ and ‘Shepherds’/Solymites’ control over Egypt Amenophis and his son, called Ramases here, return to Egypt and take power again (§§ 248-251). Yet it has been overlooked that much the same story, with only the omission of the lepers’ embassy to Hierosolyma, was told by Josephus with reference to Chaeremon of Alexandria and that his evidence was independent from that of Manetho (Ios. Flav., Contra Apionem I 33, §§ 288-292 = FGH: no. 618, F.1; on this Graeco-Egyptian author of the 1st century AD, see Burstein 1996: 601-602, with relevant bibliography).

It is not the place here to consider whether the story of Amenophis and the lepers has any historical background or not (although this option should certainly not be rejected without serious consideration). The more important question is whether there are any affinities to all the five important points of the story in the evidence concerning Nectanebo II. Actually there is, but not in Diodorus’ account!

Another Classical text with a narration built on the alleged flight of Nectanebo from his country is the Alexander Romance. Its first chapters feature Nectanebo as a magician who used all his skills to oppose foreign invasions on Egypt. On one occasion, he proceeded with his practices when he learned about a new foreign advance against his kingdom. When he saw that the inimical ships heading for Egypt were piloted by Egyptian gods, he seized as much of his wealth as he could and fled for good. After Nectanebo’s flight the god Hephaestus in Memphis told the Egyptians to ask about his fate ‘the invisible god of Sinopa’ (i.e., Sarapis), who predicted that in due course this “old” king would come back to Egypt rejuvenated (νέως, το γηραίον ἄνθρακων τύπον εἶδος) and will subdue its enemies (PsCall. I 4.5). This finally came true with the advent of Alexander, portrayed in this story as Nectanebo’s son (PsCall. I 1-4, 34.5). Another text, the Dream of Nectanebo (the so-called version of Apollonios in Greek, P.Leiden I 396 = UPZ 81; Gauger 2002; its Demotic versions, to which we will come, are unimportant now), is considered to be one of the sources for the Alexander Romance. It implies that there was some unintended wrongdoing by Nectanebo, probably a dismissive attitude towards the building of a temple of Onuris in his native town of Sebennytos, for which the gods were revenged eventually by bringing about a foreign invasion and causing him to lose his kingdom. As for the image of Nectanebo in the Alexander Romance, no wrongdoing is incriminated to him directly, but he is presented as a cunning man, capable of intrigue and fraud (his stealing of a part of the country’s treasury before his flight, his deceiving of queen Olympias of Macedon, etc.), so the gods take their revenge not unreasonably. Incidentally, there is a minor but significant parallel between the Dream of Nectanebo (I, 10–II, 20) and the story of Amenophis in Chaeremon’s version (§ 289): in both cases the discontent of the gods is revealed to the Pharaoh by the goddess Isis (and Chaeremon says that it was a major fault on Amenophis’ part that he neglected a temple of Isis during the war!). There are certainly points of divergence between the stories of Amenophis and Nectanebo: Nectanebo goes not to Ethiopia/Nubia, but to Macedon and returns to Egypt not personally, but incarnated as his son Alexander; nevertheless one can say that the Dream of Nectanebo and the first chapters of the Alexander Romance taken together reproduce all the elements of the Amenophis story rather faithfully. One can also see that Chaeremon’s version of the Amenophis story has more affinities with the Nectanebo legend than with Manetho’s narrative. Students of the Alexander Romance agree that its Greek prototype in the Nectanebo legend, which legitimated the rule of Alexander and his successors in Egypt, must have taken on form in Alexandria not later than the mid-3rd century BC. Hence, the topos of the ‘Pharaoh’s flight and return’ must have already been applied by this time to the end of Nectanebo’s reign.

The observations on the stories of Amenophis and Nectanebo in the versions discussed are summed up in the table below.

One can hardly deny that the most important part of this topos, actually its raison d’être, is not the Pharaoh’s flight, but his return and the restoration of Egyptian independence. To this effect the compilers of the Alexandrian legend of Nectanebo had to invent a totally anachronistic and fantastic story of his going to Macedon and
seducing Olympias to give birth to Alexander. It does not matter whether Diodorus and/or the author of his source knew this plot or not: Diodorus’ expected audience would not have gone for it anyway. As we know, he says that Nectanebo went to Ethiopia. Török thought this was an original part of the topos introduced by its Egyptian authors and paralleled accurately in the story of Amenophis. However, the version of this story told by Manetho makes it very clear: the reason why Amenophis sought refuge with his army in Ethiopia was its ruler’s well-established allegiance to him (§ 247)! It must have been considered just as natural for Amenophis of the story to go to Ethiopia as for Churchill to go to Canada in the event of Unternehmen Seelöwe’s success: this was an Egyptian dominion where the Pharaoh could gather his forces and prepare for a comeback to Egypt. Nothing of the kind can be said or even speculated for Nectanebo facing the Persian invasion: to have him go to Ethiopia would have been quite illogical from the very nature of the topos presuming his or his successor’s return. The only other reason to ascribe to Nectanebo this direction of flight was, as Török proposed, the help which Egypt could have expected from Nubia because of their traditional ties. However, the real Late Egyptian

Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>AMENOPHIS</th>
<th>NECTANEBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MANETHO (AFTER IOS. FLAV., CONTRA APIONEM I 26)</td>
<td>CHAEREMON (AFTER IOS. FLAV., CONTRA APIONEM I 133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pharaoh’s wrongdoing</td>
<td>A. conceives a desire “to behold the gods”; to that effect on wizard’s advice he sends 80,000 lepers and impure of Egypt to forced labor (§§ 232-235)</td>
<td>A. destroys a temple of Isis during war; the goddess comes to A. in a dream with reproaches about this (§ 289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The prodigy of revenge to the Pharaoh</td>
<td>Upon his prodigal dream, A. learns from wizard that nothing will menace him, if he banishes the impure; so he does with 250,000 of them (§§ 289-290)</td>
<td>Isis comes to N. in a dream; Onuris tells her of injury (Dream II 6ff.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Invasion of foes</td>
<td>A. grants to the impure the region of Avaris; they send an embassy to its former ‘Shepherds’ (Hyksos) residents to Hierosolyma and launch a joint attack on Egypt (§§ 237-243)</td>
<td>The banished ally themselves with some invaders stopped before at the Egyptian border by A. (§ 291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pharaoh’s flight</td>
<td>A. avoids the battle with his foes and sends away his son; he escapes to Ethiopia and stays there for 13 years, while Egypt is under the impure and the ‘Solymites’ (§§ 243-250)</td>
<td>A. escapes to Ethiopia leaving his pregnant wife; she gives birth to a son named Ramesses (§ 292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pharaoh’s and/or his successor’s return</td>
<td>A. with his son Ramesses is restored in Egypt (§ 251)</td>
<td>On becoming an adult Ramesses drives away foes (called explicitly Jews) and brings his father back from Ethiopia (§ 292)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dream: nothing

Dream: nothing
evidence not only fails to support this idea, it refutes it quite strongly. There is, for instance, the Demotic cycle about Setna Khaemuas and his son Si-Osiri: as we know, the second story of the cycle depicts an encounter between the Egyptian Pharaoh and a Kushite messenger (cf. Simpson 2003: 476-477). The ruler sending him holds a strong position in the story, allowing him to menace the Pharaoh; the way he does it by facing the Pharaoh with a difficult task (to read a sealed papyrus) at the pain of falling into his power resembles the New Egyptian story of Apopi and Seqenenre (cf. Simpson 2003: 69-71), the Kushite taking the place of the Hyksos ruler. Notably, this plot is recorded by Plutarch who reports an exchange of riddles between the Ethiopian king and Amasis (Plut., Moralia 151b). Given all this, we may conclude that hostility, not traditional ties or expectations of friendship, formed Late Egypt’s standard image of the Nubian kingdoms; and this image must have been particularly strong, considering that it entered into Plutarch’s writings at a later time than the works of Manetho and even Chaeremon. The origin of this standard image is clear enough: it goes back probably to the Egyptians’ moral resistance against Nubian domination during the Twenty-fifth Dynasty. Another example of the kind can be found in a recent observation by M. Ayad concerning Theban scenes of the Nubian age, which transfer royal functions from the Pharaoh to the God’s Wives of Amun (Ayad 2004), probably in order not to depict unwelcome rulers as ritual kings. Anyway, there is no reason to believe that this standard image was abandoned under Nectanebo or in the following decades; and this makes ascribing to him a flight to Nubia in order to find help there quite implausible.

Given all this, Nectanebo’s flight to Ethiopia cannot be an Egyptian invention within the topos of the ‘Pharaoh’s flight and return’. Should we pursue the idea that Diodorus’ statement derives from it, we would have to assume that this topos was, to say the least, strongly modified by historical reality. This possibility is deflated however by the simple question: Why? A look at Diodorus’ account of the second Persian invasion in Egypt (XVI 40-51) makes it clear that the writer’s aim was to give a pragmatic description based on good sources. Diodorus must have surely used accounts of definitely Egyptian origin where possible. For instance, he said that the Persians seized treasure and sacred books from the Egyptian temples; these were later sold back by Bagoas (Diod. XVI 51); symptomatically, however, he omitted the picturesque and unreliable evidence of Artaxerxes’ sacrilegious acts in Egypt, which were widely known even much later (Schwartz 1949: 68-69, 75; Ladynin 2005: 103-104). To believe that Diodorus took an alien and unreliable topos, modified it so as not to confront reality and inserted in his pragmatic account, is a most improbable train of thought.

On the other hand, the very idea of Nectanebo’s flight is strong in the most famous tradition about him present in the Alexander Romance. This tradition could have had no other aim, but to give a fictitious Egyptian descent to the new Macedonian rulers; thus, its Alexandrian Greek prototype of the mid-3rd century BC must have had earlier and definitely native Egyptian antecedents (cf., e.g., Jasnow 1997, with relevant bibliography). The recent discovery of Demotic versions of the so-called Dream of Nectanebo (Ryholt 2002) fully supports this idea. Nonetheless, Nectanebo is repeatedly shown in a number of sources, first of all by Manetho (Waddell 1980: 179-185, frs 73-74) and in the Demotic Chronicle (P. dem. Bibl. Nat. 215 recto IV/21; Felber 2002: 83), as the very last native king of Egypt; hence the history of his reign and especially its end must have been highlighted, particularly in the decades following the second Persian invasion, when the romantic tradition about Nectanebo was taking form. Thus, it could have been believed that he fled Egypt only if it was common knowledge that he had not been put to death by the invaders nor had he died of natural causes during their domination or after the advent of Alexander. If this were the case, then the tradition concerning him would have been built around it. But if so, then one is justified in asking what other fate was left to him but to actually leave his kingdom after the Persian conquest? His empty sarcophagus found in Alexandria (Jenni 1986: 4-6) seems to confirm this supposition. As for his destination, Diodorus says that Nectanebo was still in Memphis when the Persians advanced as far as Bubastis, i.e., the southern Delta; thus, he could not have gone north and the only remaining option was to flee south. Therefore, Diodorus’ evidence correlates quite neatly with historical reality.

Nevertheless, what has been said until now is rather speculative. Positive data permitting these historical possibilities to be checked comes from the chronology of Nectanebo’s reign and the evidence for the last years of his reign. The most accurate is a mention of the night from 21 to 22 Pharmouthi of his Year 16, with the remark that it was a full moon, which is found in the Dream of Nectanebo and which applies to the revelation given to the king (P.Leiden I 396 = UPZ 81, II, 1). The general agreement is that this dating corresponds to the night of 5 to 6 July 343 (Lloyd 1994: 358; for more details, with a discussion of
the calendar system used, see Spalinger 1992). Initially, calculations placed Nectanebo’s Year 1 in the Egyptian year starting in November 359; later on Fr.K. Kienitz discounted this date and, by antedating the beginning of the Thirtieth Dynasty, postulated that the reign of Nectanebo II started in 361/360 (Kienitz 1953: 175). However, A.B. Lloyd questioned this argument and demonstrated that the previously accepted chronology was not untenable (Lloyd 1994: 359; symptomatically, J. von Beckerath skipped the question in his recent compendium on Egyptian chronology: Beckerath 1997: 81-84). That the date of the Dream of Nectanebo should not be discounted is proved by the Demotic versions of the text discovered and published recently by K. Ryholt. Its copies in three papyri with scribal exercises, which all seem to preserve the beginning of the text with date, show Year 16, though without giving the exact day (P. Carlsberg 424, 499, 559, l. 1; cf. Ryholt 2002: 229, Pls V-VII); Year 18 in another Demotic copy, which seems to be a close parallel to the Greek text, (P. Carlsberg 562, l. 1; cf. Ryholt 2002: 223), must be a mistake, which can be explained rather easily. We should take into account that the date of the Dream does not apply either to the end of Nectanebo’s reign or directly to the Persian invasion — it is merely the dating of a prodigy (the dream which gave name to the text) which preceded it! Another date which stands equally strong is Year 18 of Nectanebo II, considered to be the last of his reign: we find it in Manetho (Waddell 1980: 183-185, fr. 74a: eighteen years of his reign according to Africanus in fr. 74a, with 344/343 BC leaves no doubts as to the chronology of his reign and of the Thirtieth Dynasty commonly accepted before Fr.K. Kienitz; and if so, it is the most important result of Ryholt’s publication. Following this chronological system Nectanebo’s Year 18 must be November 342 to November 341 BC. At the same time the conquest of Egypt by Artaxerxes III is placed definitely, and rather independently of Egyptian dates, before the middle of 342 BC (Lloyd 1994: 359 and note 108; Briant 1996: 704; Manetho’s epitomizers say that Artaxerxes III conquered Egypt in his Year 20, which is the Babylonian year 339/338 BC: Waddell 1980: 184-187, fr. 75; it was suspected that the date refers to the year when Egypt was subdued completely and Artaxerxes ultimately recognized as its ruler: Lloyd 1994: 359, note 109; however J. von Beckerath suggested plausibly that the epitomizers confused Greek figures ‘20’ – &kappa; and ‘16’ – 16, the latter variant giving the Babylonian year 343/342 BC, which fits perfectly: Beckerath 1997: 82). This gives an overlap between Nectanebo’s reign and the start of Persian rule in Egypt for a year or even more: assuming that Kienitz’s chronological corrections were not valid, A.B. Lloyd estimated the minimal gap between the start of the invasion and the beginning of Nectanebo’s last year as ten months. It has already been suggested that this overlap can be explained by the fact that after leaving Memphis Nectanebo’s still retained authority over southern Egypt for a time (Lloyd 1994: 359; HHN II: 502); in this case, the late dating from the temple of Edfu might actually not be accidental. This rump state under Nectanebo’s sway was ill fated from the start: Persian pressure must have caused it to collapse sometime in his
Year 18, upon which the Pharaoh must have chosen to leave for Nubia/’Ethiopia’. Making sure that Diodorus’ evidence on this is not a topos and the chronological data are corroborative, we can assert it with much more certainty than before.

Now comes the last controversial point of the discussion. It has been said that Kienitz suspected a rather good reason for Nectanebo seeking protection from the chieftains of Lower Nubia (Kienitz 1953: 107) rather than from the metropolis of the Meroitic kingdom. Nubian engagement in the political situation of Upper Egypt in epochs of decentralization is well-attested from the beginning of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty down through the anti-Ptolemaic seditions of late 3rd–early 2nd centuries BC (when the Meroitic kings launched their building projects at Philae and in the temples of Lower Nubia: Winter 1981: 509-513; Török 1988: 146, 148; 1989: 72-73). Hence, it is no wonder in itself that Nectanebo sought protection in the adjacent region to the south. However, several years later, during the interregnum after Artaxerxes III and before Darius III (i.e., around 337-336 BC, Ladynin 2005: 100, note 42), Egypt recognized as Pharaoh a ruler named Chabbash whose descent remains obscure (Huß 1994). His name is evidently non-Egyptian; A. Spalinger thought it possible to compare it with the Libyan name of the Meshwesh (Spalinger 1978: 147, notes 4-5), though a number of scholars believed him a Nubian. Among them, Kienitz was the first to propose the identity of Chabbash with Kembesuden (KnhswnH), a defeated enemy of the Meroitic king Nastasen mentioned in his stela (FHN II: 485-486, no. 83, ll. 39-40); later Fr. Hintze postulated the phonetic transition of Knhs into Hbšt and of the Egyptian formula di ‘nh into wāḥ (Hintze: 17-20). Despite objections (Katznelson 1966; Spalinger 1978: 147), the identification of Chabbash with Kembesuden remained in force until at least the 1980s (cf., e.g., studies by L. Török). The 1990s raised more doubts about it (Morkot 1991: 330-331; FHN II: 500), which is good, for this identity might be true or it might not; the only certain thing is that it is not completely proved. Should it be true, however, then Kembesuden/Chabbash’s engagement in Egyptian affairs has a good explanation. When accepting the identity of these two figures, Török spoke strongly against the possibility that Chabbash was a Nubian, arguing that he was welcomed in Thebes and Memphis as a legitimate Pharaoh, which would not have been possible for a Nubian intruder; hence, his origin from inside Egypt, perhaps from the Delta, is more likely (Török 1988: 145; 1989: 70). However, Chabbash’s Egyptian regalia hardly contradict his foreign descent: one wonders, indeed, how else any intruder wishing to be accepted as Pharaoh could position himself, especially if coming from an area of Egyptian cultural influence. The evidence for Chabbash is concentrated in Thebes and especially in Memphis, with a good hint from the dates that his power expanded from the south to the north (Kienitz 1953: 189). The only evidence from the Delta mentioning Chabbash — the Satrap Stela from Buto — speaks of him only inspecting the mouths of the Nile in the event of a Persian attack (Sethe 1904: 16-18); no other connection of Chabbash with the Delta is attested, and his residence, as indicated by most of his evidence and stressed by the specifics of his fourth royal name Sun-mn ss-n-PtH “Image of [Ta]tenen, chosen by Ptah”, was in Memphis (cf. Huß 1994). Finally, if his identity with Kembesuden is true, but he was only an occasional ally of some Nubian chieftain, as Török presumed, Nastasen’s emphasis on seizing lands, cattle and other wealth belonging to him (FHN II: 486) would seem rather strange. Given all this, together with the improbability of any other non-Egyptian origin for Chabbash (the Libyan tribes were at the time not a good base for taking over Egypt, Asia was Persian and Chabbash’s origin from the Mediterranean is really not worth discussing), it would be reasonable to assume that he came from Nubia.

In view of the latter argument, the Nubian origin of Chabbash is probable even independently of his identity with Kembesuden. One might reconsider Kienitz’s idea that Chabbash’s interference in Egypt was stimulated by Nectanebo’s flight (Kienitz 1953: 189). Should it be presumed that Chabbash was among the chieftains of Lower Nubia who acted as host to Nectanebo, he could have arrogated the right to interfere in Egyptian affairs when both Nectanebo and Artaxerxes III were dead and the situation in Egypt highly uncertain. One might recall in this connection an enterprise by a Macedonian soldier-of-fortune Amyntas several years later, around 333 BC, which involved an attempt to take Egypt with a small force in the belief that Egyptian disenchantment with Persian rule and the absence of any strong authority would make it easy (Curt. IV 1, 28-33; 7, 1). However, if Chabbash’s identity with Kembesuden is true, his strengthening in Egypt must have been dangerous both for the Persians and for his probable Meroitic sovereigns: once established in Egypt, he could have claimed authority over the entire Nubian Nile valley. We will never know whether he was crushed first by Darius III in Egypt and then by Nastasen in his homeland or by both of them at the same time; the latter option however is by no means excluded.
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