



# THE SSEA JOURNAL

Volume XIII-No. 2  
Spring 1983



Published by  
BENBEN PUBLICATIONS  
for  
THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES  
Toronto, Canada

# THE DEMOTIC CHRONICLE

## AS A STATEMENT OF A THEORY OF KINGSHIP

JANET H. JOHNSON

The so-called Demotic Chronicle, which forms the recto of Papyrus Bibliothèque Nationale 215,<sup>1</sup> consists of a series of chapters<sup>2</sup> containing what appear to be oracular statements<sup>3</sup> plus explanations, or glosses, in terms of the (political) history of Egypt during the fourth (and early third?) century B.C. Each chapter forms a separate unit; although there are carryovers of theme between chapters, one can not

assume a chronological order between chapters or explain the political history of one chapter in terms of another. Both the beginning and the end of the papyrus are missing. Five full columns of text are preserved,<sup>4</sup> containing the end of Chapter 6 and all of Chapters 7 through 13.<sup>5</sup> Although it can not be proven, it seems quite likely that the chapters were originally set in a narrative framework,<sup>6</sup> i.e., that there was an accompanying

1. The verso of which contains the story of King Amasis and the sailor, the record of Darius' request that the laws of Egypt be compiled, the record of Cambyses's withdrawal of allotments from the temples, a set of priestly regulations, and short animal stories. The manuscript was acquired in Cairo by a member of Napoleon's expedition in 1801; it was purchased by the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1872 or 1873 from the family of the original owner at the recommendation of Maspero. The basic publication is W. Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris*, Demotische Studien, Vol. 7 (1914). G. Roeder gave a translation in *Altägyptische Erzählungen und Märchen* (1927), pp. 238-49; there is also a recent translation by E. Bresciani in *Letteratura e Poesia dell'Antico Egitto* (1969), pp. 551-60. All translations given in this paper are those of the author, based on a new translation and commentary to the text which will appear soon. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mlle. M. R. Seguy, of the Département des Manuscrits, Division des Manuscrits Orientaux, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, for providing excellent new photostats of this papyrus and for making the papyrus available for me for study when I was in Paris in August, 1979. I would also like to thank all those people who read and commented on earlier drafts of this paper, or the new set of translations on which it is based, including R. S. Bagnall, R. L. Jasnow, R. K. Ritner, M. J. Smith, E. F. Wente, and D. S. Whitcomb.

2. *Hwt*: cf. A. M. Blackman, "The Use of the Egyptian Word *ht* 'House' in the Sense of 'Stanza,'" *Orientalia* 7 (1938) 64-66; H. Grapow, *Sprachliche und Schriftliche Formung ägyptischer Texte*, LÄS, Vol. 7 (1936), pp. 35-36.

3. So identified by Spiegelberg because the statements are sometimes nouns or noun phrases, sometimes whole sentences, and because both the tense and the pronouns of reference vary from place to place "als ob hier ein Wahrsager in der Verückung - etwa wie die Pythie en Delphi - Wörter and Sätze hervorgestossen hätte, die auf Tafeln verzeichnet

wurden" (*Demotische Chronik*, p. 9). The switch from the normal third person pronoun to the first or second person can usually be seen as referring to the king whose reign is being discussed (e.g., 'Your one eye, there is not pain in it' is explained by the statement 'Your uraeus which is upon your head, it is not the thing which pains' [5/21] while 'O gardener, do your work!' is explained by the statement 'Pharaoh, do your work!', which is in turn glossed 'by which is meant Pharaoh Nectanebo' [5/18]). But in other cases this explanation seems unlikely (e.g., the oracular statement "'I prefer day 1 to day 30" is what he says' [5/1]; likewise, the oracular statement 'Let him open the ovens; I shall give to him the offering animals' [3/2], where the "him" should refer to the king and the "I" has usually been taken to refer to the High Priest of Harsaphes who is mentioned in 3/1). The "you"-singular of Chapter 13 could refer to the king being discussed, but the "you"-plural also found there may refer to the intended audience for the manuscript. Pronouns with unexplained antecedents also cause much trouble in trying to understand the Demotic Chronicle (e.g., the "he" of 5/20 [where 'Water the vines; let the large trees grow!' is explained by the statement 'It is the remainder of the other (tasks) which he said.']) has no antecedent and remains obscure; similarly, the "he" referred to in some oracular statements [5/1, 9, 17] and the "he" found in one formula introducing glosses [i.e., *iir-f d (n-im=)*] both are without explanation).

4. As are the ends of the lines of one earlier column and the beginnings of the lines of one later column.

5. The chapters which are fully preserved vary in length from seven to 32 lines, making it impossible to reconstruct how many columns are missing at the beginning of the text. There is no indication how many chapters the text originally contained and so no way to suggest how many columns are missing at the end.

6. Such a frame is assumed by P. Kaplony, "Demotische Chronik," *LdÄ* 1 (1975) 1057.

story giving the background for the chapters. Other Late Period prophecies, such as the Prophecy of the Lamb and the Potter's Prophecy, are set within such accompanying stories. Thus, in the Prophecy of the Lamb<sup>7</sup> the prophetic utterances of the lamb are heard and recorded by a man named Pasenhor who hurries to Pharaoh Bocchoris (Manetho's Dynasty 24) and reads the utterances to the king. The king immediately recognizes that the evils predicted by the lamb will come about. In the Prophecy of the Potter, which is known only from Greek copies but is assumed to be a translation of an Egyptian original, the people of the island of Helios-Re pull the potter's work out of the kiln, break it, and drag the potter before King Amenhotep. The potter defends himself before the king by predicting that just as his work has been destroyed so Egypt and Alexandria will be destroyed.<sup>8</sup>

The oracular statements which form the core of the Demotic Chronicle are largely a mixture of calendrical dates (days of the week, days of the month, months of the years), of ritual activities and festivals, and of references to various divinities and/or (holy) cities. There are also others which are more difficult to classify (e.g., the first five oracular statements in Chapter 12 run as follows: 'The packs of wild animals have marched [against] Egypt'; "'The crocodiles will seize them" is what he is saying'; 'O Gardener, do your work!'; 'O foreman of the garden,

make your hedge stand!; and 'Water the vines; let the large trees grow!' ([5/15-20]). W. Wessetzky<sup>9</sup> studied the contents of these oracular statements and concluded that all were mythological references to calendrical dates (using the lunar calendar) relating to the Nile inundation. Some of the explanations, or glosses, are straightforward (e.g., the equation of days one through six with kings one through six who ruled Egypt after the expulsion of the Persians at the end of the first Persian occupation [Chapter 6, 2/2-4]). The specific rulers who are named in the explanatory passages of the Demotic Chronicle run from Amyrtaios (Manetho's Dynasty 28), who claimed the throne of Egypt at the death of Darius II in 404 B.C., through Teos, the second king of Manetho's Dynasty 30, whose rule ended in 360 B.C.<sup>10</sup> Teos is treated throughout the text as the 'reigning' Pharaoh;<sup>11</sup> when later rulers are mentioned,<sup>12</sup> they are not identified by name and events in their reigns are presented as prophecy.

Palaeographically, Papyrus Bibliothèque Nationale 215 appears to be early Ptolemaic<sup>13</sup> and of Lower Egyptian, probably Memphite, origin.<sup>14</sup> The grammar and vocabulary of the oracular statements are not significantly different from those of the explanatory passages, which are written in standard Ptolemaic demotic.<sup>15</sup> There is no evidence for a long gap between the time when the oracular statements were made and the time the explanations were

7. Preserved in Vienna Nationalbibliothek D10.000, a demotic text dated to year 33 of Augustus. Photographs and translation of columns 2-3 were published by J. M. A. Janssen, "Over Farao Bocchoris," in *Varia Historica aangeboden aan Professor Doctor A. W. Byvanck* (1954), pp. 27-28 and pl. 3-4.

8. See L. Koenen, "Die Prophezeiungen der 'Toppers', *ZPE* 2 (1968) 193-209; *idem*, "The Prophecies of a Potter," in *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Papyrology*, American Studies in Papyrology, Vol. 7 (1970), pp. 249-54; A. B. Lloyd, "Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt," *Historia* 31 (1982) 50-54.

9. "Zur Deutung der 'Orakels' in der sogenannten Demotischen Chronik," *WZKM* 49 (1942) 161-71.

10. Cf. F. K. Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende* (1953), p. 175.

11. He is called *nsw.t pr-3* rather than simply *pr-3*; cf. E.

Meyer, "Ägyptische Dokumente aus der Perserzeit," *SPAW* 16 (1915) 295 and n. 2.

12. E.g., Nectanebo II in 4/18-19.

13. This date is suggested both by the script which, despite a few archaisms, shows distinctively Ptolemaic forms, and by the fact that the demotic is a palimpsest over a Greek text which has been dated palaeographically "sicher nicht spätptolemäisch und nicht vor Philadelphos;" see the discussion by Spiegelberg, *Demotische Chronik*, p. 4 with n. 7.

14. Based on the date and place of purchase of the papyrus and the character of the script; cf. *ibid.*, p. 3 and n. 3.

15. See *ibid.*, pp. 6-7. There are, however, a few minor differences. For instance, future tense sentences using the 'r of futurity' which have noun subjects are written *r Noun r sdm* in oracular statements but simply *Noun r sdm*, or even *Noun sdm*, in glosses; "archaic" *sn-nw* 'second' in an oracular statement (2/20) is replaced by the more "modern" *mḥ-2* in the gloss.

written.<sup>16</sup> Thus the text was probably composed early in the Ptolemaic period.<sup>17</sup> If, as I argue elsewhere,<sup>18</sup> some errors in the preserved manuscript are the result of transmission errors, then this manuscript cannot be the original. However, given the suggested date of composition of the text, this copy would have been made shortly after composition.

### The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Document

When historical statements made in the Demotic Chronicle can be checked with external sources, the facts presented in the Chronicle are seen to be quite reliable. For example, the order of the succession of the kings of Dynasty 29 given in the Demotic Chronicle corresponds to the order found in contemporary records<sup>19</sup> whereas the preserved variants of Manetho list two of these kings in the reverse order. Similarly, the lengths of the reigns of the three kings of Dynasty 30 are given in the Demotic Chronicle as 19 years for Nectanebo I, one year for Teos, and 18 years for Nectanebo II. The difference between the Demotic Chronicle and Manetho in this case is the result of a slightly different system of reckoning, the Demotic Chronicle evidently attributing partial years to the earlier king, Manetho attributing them to the later ruler.<sup>20</sup> Because of the general historical reliability of the Demotic Chronicle, and since there are few contemporary records of Dynasties 28-30, the Demotic Chronicle has been used as a basic source for the history of this period.<sup>21</sup> But, many of the explanations

are nearly as unclear as the original oracular statements, which led Meyer to characterize the text as "einem sehr dunkel gehaltenen Kommentar zu noch dunkleren Prophezeiungen."<sup>22</sup>

Thus, although the explanations clearly refer to events which occurred during this period in Egypt, the exact meaning of many of them remains ambiguous. For instance, the glosses in Chapter 11 have Pharaoh Naktnebef (Nectanebo I, the first king of Dynasty 30) saying, 'I have appeared in the golden crown; it will not be removed from my head' and 'My coronation robes are on me; they will not be removed' (5/6-8). Later in the same chapter a gloss has this king say, 'the office of ruler is in my hand; it will not be removed from me; the sword is the office of ruler, which is the appearance as falcon' (5/9-10). These lines seem to be a clear statement that Nectanebo I is a legitimate king, having undergone the appropriate coronation rituals and possessing the appropriate emblems of office.

In each of the glosses quoted, however, it is stressed that the regalia will not be removed from him. Why this is so is unclear. It may be a reference to the fact that Nectanebo I had taken the throne by force from Neferites II, the last, ephemeral, king of Dynasty 29. If so, then the Demotic Chronicle has Nectanebo I emphasizing his claim to the throne and denying that he will ever lose it, to any heir of Dynasty 29 or to any other claimant. However, Nectanebo I at the end of his reign elevated his son Teos to be his coregent.<sup>23</sup> Thus, one might interpret this pas-

16. Meyer, *SPAW* 16 (1915) 302, suggested that the oracles may even have been composed at the time the "explanations" were written.

17. Because the text is anti-Persian, not anti-Greek (see my article in the forthcoming *Festschrift* for E. Lüddeckens), it is possible, however, that it was written during the second Persian occupation and then "updated" by including references to the Greeks.

18. In my forthcoming retranslation of the text; see above, n. 1.

19. See the recent comprehensive survey of the history of Dynasty 29, and a compilation of contemporary sources, by C. Traunecker, "Essai sur l'histoire de la XXIXe dynastie," *BIFAO* 79 (1979) 395-436.

20. See J. H. Johnson, "The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source," *Enchoria* 4 (1974) 13-16.

21. For the general reliability of the historical statements made in the Demotic Chronicle, see *ibid.*, pp. 6-10, especially nn. 28-29, and Kienitz, *Geschichte*, Chapter 11 "Die Demotische Chronik" as Geschichtsquelle." For a comparison of this type of structure with Hebrew, and especially Essanian, exegesis in terms of recent political developments, cf. Meyer, *SPAW* 16 (1915) 294; F. Daumas, "Littérature prophétique et exégétique égyptienne et commentaires esséniens," in *A la rencontre de Dieu, Memorial Albert Gelin* (1961), Vol. 8, pp. 203-21, who noted the long exegetical and prophetic traditions in Egypt; and J. Z. Smith, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic," in *Map is Not Territory, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, Vol. 23 (1978), pp. 77-87.

22. Quoted by Spiegelberg, *Demotische Chronik*, p. 5.

23. See Johnson, *Enchoria* 4 (1974) 13-16.

sage as showing that, despite the coregency, Nectanebo I is rejecting the possibility that he “abdicate” in favor of the younger ruler.

Later in the same, short, chapter the oracular statement ‘Apis, Apis, Apis’ is glossed ‘Ptah, Pre, and Harsiese, who are the lords of the office of ruler’ (5/12). The same explanation goes on to say, ‘You have forgotten about them, thinking about acquiring wealth’ (5/12). Since the “I” of the first part of the chapter is identified as Nectanebo, the “you” should refer to someone else. The most likely candidate is Teos who, following the advice of the Athenian general Chabrias, devised schemes for exacting money from the temples and the people of Egypt to finance his war in Syria against the Persians.<sup>24</sup> The use of first and second person pronouns in the oracular statements and explanations in this chapter, rather than the much more common third person pronouns,<sup>25</sup> may also reflect the fiction that Teos was the king reigning at the time the Demotic Chronicle was written.

However, elsewhere in the Demotic Chronicle the name Nakhtnebef is used not to refer specifically to Nectanebo I but rather to the dynasty he founded. Thus, in Chapter 10, the explanation for the oracular statement in 4/4 says, ‘the one who is ruler today, i.e., Nakhtnebef—he is the one who gave property of Egypt and all the temples to acquire money; it means the “dynasty” name Nakhtnebef, which is a family(?) name, (which is) like saying, “He was not the first of his time.”’ (4/4-5). This complicated passage becomes clear when one realizes that the dynastic name Nakhtnebef is being used to refer to a later member of the dynasty, specifically the avaricious king Teos.<sup>26</sup>

If the reference to Nakhtnebef at the beginning of Chapter 11 is to the dynasty, not the individual ruler, then there is also a third possible interpretation of this passage. As already noted, one gloss (5/10) equates the ‘office of ruler’ with the ‘appearance as falcon’. Although this is a very general, mythologically based concept, there is one king from this period who seems to have stressed his identification or association with the Horus falcon—Nectanebo II. A major cult into the early Ptolemaic Period is that of Nakhthorheb (i.e., Nectanebo II) *p3 bik* ‘the falcon’,<sup>27</sup> using the same word for falcon as is used in the Demotic Chronicle. Nectanebo II, a nephew of Nectanebo I and cousin of Teos through his father,<sup>28</sup> ousted Teos from the throne while Teos was in Syria fighting his war against the Persians. If the “I” of Chapter 11 may be interpreted as Nectanebo II, rather than Nectanebo I, then Nectanebo II is stressing his (legitimate) possession of the throne after removing the impious Teos. Thus, although the Demotic Chronicle has been used as a basic source for the history of the last “native” Egyptian dynasties, often our (very limited) knowledge of the history of this period is insufficient to interpret with certainty the references being made in the text.<sup>29</sup>

#### The Purpose for the Composition of the Demotic Chronicle

The portion of the Demotic Chronicle which has been preserved includes no statement of authorship. If there was a narrative framework explaining the background to the oracular statements and explanations, it has been lost (as noted above). However, internal evidence suggests that the motivation behind the composi-

24. These measures are described by various Greek historians, especially Pseudo-Aristotle. See E. Meyer, “Zur Geschichte der 30. Dynastie,” *ZÄS* 67 (1931) 69-70; Kienitz, *Geschichte*, pp. 119-21 (with references); Johnson, *Enchoria* 4 (1974) 12-13 and nn. there. For an explanation of the system behind the measures described by the Greek authors, see E. Will, “Chabrias et les finances de Tachôs,” *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 62 (1960) 254-75. There is another reference to Teos’s greed and impiety in Chapter 10 of the Demotic Chronicle; see below.

25. See above, n. 3.

26. Chapter 10 also uses the name Neferites to refer to

Dynasty 29, founded by Neferites (I) (cf. 4/3).

27. Cf. H. de Meulenaere, “Les monuments du culte des rois Nectanébo,” *CdE* 35 (1969) 92-107; J. Yoyotte, “Nectanebo II comme faucon divin?” *Kemi* 15 (1969) 70-74; and T. Holm-Rasmussen, “On the Statue Cult of Nectanebos II,” *Acta Orientalia* 40 (1979) 21-25 (the last called to my attention by M. J. Smith).

28. Cf. H. de Meulenaere, “La famille royale des Nectanébo,” *ZÄS* 90 (1963) 90-93.

29. Misunderstandings of the text have led to some faulty conclusions about the historical content of the text; cf. Johnson, *Enchoria* 4 (1974) 17, n. 88.

tion came from Herakleopolis. The prophetic sections of the text predict that a ruler will come into being in Herakleopolis after the Greeks. One of the glosses in Chapter 8 states, 'Harsaphes is the one who will give commands to the ruler who will come into being; it is said, "A man of Herakleopolis is the one who will rule after the foreigners and the Greeks."' (2/24-25). The following oracular statement 'Take joy, o High Priest of Harsaphes!' is explained by saying, 'The High Priest of Harsaphes will rejoice after the Greeks; that means coming into being by a ruler in Herakleopolis' (3/1).<sup>30</sup>

The stages in the rebellion of this man of Herakleopolis are presented in Chapter 9, the first four lines of which run as follows (oracular statement first, followed by gloss): 'The third month of Inundation—conception', i.e., the ruler who will come into being (in) Herakleopolis will rebel (in) the third month of Inundation. 'The fourth month of Inundation—giving birth', i.e., he will muster (followers) in the fourth month of Inundation. 'The first month of Winter—nurturing', i.e., he will equip (his followers) (with) weapons of war (in) the first month of Winter. 'Cry out against me! I shall cry out against you in the second month of Winter', i.e., the warrior will do battle with his opponent (in) the second month of Winter. 'A titulary (is given) to me (in) the third month of Winter', i.e., he will be revealed and he will appear in glory in the crown of gold in the third month of Winter; that means his acting as ruler in the third month of Winter. (3/7-10)

But this orderly progression, month by month, through the stages leading to legitimate kingship seems too regular to correspond to the development of a real rebellion.<sup>31</sup> In addition, this king is never identified by name and there is no confirmation of his existence from sources

outside the Demotic Chronicle. Thus, although the text might have been written to justify a rebellion which was in progress,<sup>32</sup> it is just as likely that it was preparing the way for one which had not yet begun.<sup>33</sup>

In either case, the suggestion<sup>34</sup> that the text was written by, or on behalf of, the High Priest of Harsaphes in Herakleopolis seems quite plausible. The religious background of the text is apparent from the content of the oracular statements (as discussed above). It has been suggested that the explanation of the oracular statements in terms of the history of the last "native" Egyptian rulers was done in order to imply an association between the ruler who will come into being in Herakleopolis and these former rulers who, according to Chapter 6 (2/4),<sup>35</sup> were also associated with the city of Herakleopolis. It is further suggested that it was because this implicit association with, and comparison to, these kings who drove out the Persians and ruled over an independent Egypt would magnify and justify the coming ruler that these rulers are mentioned.

It has also generally been assumed that the Demotic Chronicle is an anti-Greek tract because the king being replaced by the man from Herakleopolis is a Greek (demotic *Wynn*).<sup>36</sup> Given this assumption, the rulers of Dynasties 28-30 are assumed to be the last rulers considered to have been legitimate. But the kings of Dynasties 28-30 are not all presented in the explanatory passages as good rulers, as rulers to be emulated. And although the Demotic Chronicle is clearly anti-Persian, it is not so clearly anti-Greek. There is not time here to discuss the anti-Greek attitude which has been attributed to the Demotic Chronicle, and to Egyptians of the Ptolemaic period in general, but my recent study of this question indicates that the amount of anti-

30. Chapter 7 also mentions a new ruler in juxtaposition with Herakleopolis.

31. Although a change in dynasty is also associated with the change from the second to the third month of Winter, i.e., the half-way point in the calendar year, in Chapter 7 (2 8-9).

32. As Spiegelberg, *Demotische Chronik*, p. 6.

33. As Meyer, *SPAW* 16 (1915) 297.

34. Spiegelberg, *Demotische Chronik*, p. 5, n. 8; Wessetzky, *WZKM* 49 (1942) 167-70.

35. And in contrast to Manetho, who associated Dynasties 28-30 with Sais, Mendes, and Sebennytos, respectively.

36. See most recently Lloyd, *Historia* 31 (1982) 42.

Greek feeling among Egyptians and in Egyptian literature has been vastly exaggerated.<sup>37</sup>

#### The Second Purpose of Writing The Demotic Chronicle

If the Demotic Chronicle was not written as a nationalist tract, and the ruler who will arise in Herakleopolis is not presented as an Egyptian hero driving out the hated Greeks, we must look to see what other purpose underlay the composition of the Demotic Chronicle. A careful reading of the text as a whole makes it clear that the Demotic Chronicle contains a statement of, even a definition of, legitimate kingship. In this context, the rulers of Dynasties 28-30 are used as examples illustrating both the good and the bad king and their resultant fates. The clearest statement of this is found in Chapter 10, where the fates of different rulers of Dynasties 28-30 are dependant on the manner in which they governed.<sup>38</sup> Thus, of Amyrtaios, the sole ruler of Dynasty 28, is said, 'The first ruler who came after the foreigners, who are the Medes, (i.e.) Pharaoh Amyrtaios, when violation of the law was done (in) his time, he was caused to make the movements (of) yesterday; there was no rule by his son after him' (3/18-19). What the 'movements (of) yesterday' are is unclear here. The phrase may have been used simply to echo the oracular statement which this passage is explaining, which reads 'Yesterday is what passed by' (3/18). The fate of Amyrtaios is specified even more clearly later in the same chapter when the oracular statement 'first' is explained as 'the first who came after the Medes, when he ordered violation of the law, the things which were done for him were seen; his son was not allowed to

succeed him; but, instead, he was caused to remove himself (from) upon his throne while he was alive' (4/1-2).

A very similar statement is found later in the same chapter where the two-part oracular statement 'the third—he was deposed' is explained as 'the third ruler who came into being between the Medes, when he abandoned the law, he was caused to be succeeded while he was alive' (4/6). This same sentiment also underlies the passage describing the fate of the son and successor of Neferites I of Dynasty 29: '(Only) a few days are what were given to him, himself, because of numerous sins which were done in his time' (3/21). A slight variation is the statement concerning Neferites II of Dynasty 29, 'Because the law was abandoned under his father, a crime was made to reach his son after him' (4/12).<sup>39</sup>

By contrast, long rule and succession by one's son result from proper behavior by the king. The clearest example is the explanation of the oracular statement 'the fifth—he completed' as 'the fifth ruler who came after the Medes (i.e., Achoris, Repeater of Appearances), whose days of rule were caused to be complete, i.e., when he was beneficent to the temples' (4/9-10). The same standard is found applied to Neferites I of Dynasty 29, 'When he did what he did conscientiously,<sup>40</sup> his son was allowed to succeed him' (3/20-21). A general statement of this theory is found in Chapter 12, 'The ruler who will be beneficent is the one whom it [i.e., the uraeus, which was mentioned earlier in the explanation] will love' (5/22).

Another duty of a good king is to protect Egypt from foreign invasion. The first part of Chapter 12 advises Nectanebo to protect Egypt

37. See my article in the forthcoming *Festschrift* for Lüdeckens.

38. The same tradition is also found in Hebrew texts (cf. Meyer, *SPAW* 16 [1915] 299 and 304-5; Daumas, "Littérature prophétique," pp. 203-21; Lloyd *Historia* 31 [1982] 42-44 and n. 37 to p. 45) and in the Hellenistic Babylonian New Year's Festival Ritual (cf. Smith, "Wisdom," pp. 72-73).

39. Similar analysis occurs elsewhere in the Demotic Chronicle; e.g., the oracular statement 'Herakleopolis, Herakleopolis, Herakleopolis' is explained with the statement 'the one

who went (to) Herakleopolis while abandoning the law, they made... Herakleopolis; crime was made to reach him; crime was made to reach his son' (2/16-17). That the gods are the active agents who ensure that this system (good succession; evil—deposed) works is indicated by the statement 'It is by (means of) the above-named gods [who these are is, unfortunately, lost because this is the first full line of the text preserved in the manuscript] that the fulfillment of the oracles(?) which will be done will come about' (2/1).

40. Lit., firmly, securely.

from a Persian invasion. The oracular statement 'The packs of wild animals have marched (against) Egypt' is explained 'The foreigners who are upon the east and west of the country are the ones who have marched (against) Egypt; they are the Medes' (5/15-16). Later in the chapter the commands 'O gardener, do your work!' and 'O foreman of the garden, make your hedge stand! are glossed 'Pharaoh [there is a pun here between *k3m* 'garden' and *Km.t* 'Egypt' and between *hry* *k3m* 'foreman of the garden' and *Hry Km.t* 'master of Egypt', i.e., Pharaoh], do your work! (By which is meant Pharaoh Nectanebo, his work of devouring)' and 'The remainder (of) the other (task) is to make stand a hedge outside his property (against) theft' (5/18-19). Whether Nectanebo here is Nectanebo I or II<sup>41</sup> (both faced attacks by the Persians, Nectanebo I being successful, Nectanebo II not), it is clear that one responsibility of a good ruler is to protect the country from invasion. The following oracular statement 'Water the vines; let the large trees grow!' (5/20) indicates that once the king has driven the foreigners out of Egypt, and kept them out, it is his further responsibility to make the country flourish.

Another aspect of legitimate kingship is proper coronation.<sup>42</sup> The first three oracular statements in Chapter 11, which was discussed at the beginning of this paper, run: "'I am clothed from my head (to) my feet" is what you are saying'; 'My cloth band is on me'; and "'The sword is in my hand" is what he is saying.' They are explained with the statements 'I have appeared in the golden crown; it will not be removed from my head'; 'My coronation robes are on me; they will not be removed'; and 'Are you, perhaps, considering that the office of ruler is in my hand? It will not be removed from me; the sword is the office of ruler, which is the appearance as falcon; for the strong sword is what will be said' (5/6-10). The general theme that legitimacy of rule depends on undergoing the appropriate rituals and possessing the royal

regalia is clear in this chapter no matter which individual king is being described here. If the "you" of the statement later in the chapter that 'you have forgotten about them [i.e., Ptah, Pre, and Harsiese, who are the lords of the office of ruler], thinking about acquiring wealth' (5/12) is interpreted as Teos, and if Nectanebo II is the king who is speaking in the first part of this chapter (as was suggested as the third possible discussion above), then Nectanebo II is further claiming a legitimate right to the throne because he has replaced a king who did not act correctly to the gods and temples. In this case, this chapter would be reinforcing this position that a good king cares for the temples and gods but that a king who does not do so is a bad king, who should and will be replaced very quickly.

Not only past rulers were judged by the criterion of appropriate behavior, for the ruler prophesied to come from Herakleopolis is bound by the same rules of conduct. Thus, after the stages in the rebellion of this man are described, one of the glosses explains 'that means the heart of the unique one (i.e., Isis, who is the lady of Aphroditopolis [mentioned in the accompanying oracular statement]) will be content concerning the ruler who will come into being while he will not abandon the law' (3/15-16). That proper conduct of the temple ritual is part of the duty of the king is clear from another explanation referring to this coming ruler from Herakleopolis: 'The ruler who will come into being will open [the doors] of the temples; he will cause that divine offerings be given (to) the gods' (3/2-3).

In Chapter 9 one stage of the rebellion which will be led by this man who will come into being in Herakleopolis is his legitimization: 'A titulary (is given) to me (in) the third month of Winter' is explained by saying, 'He will be revealed and he will appear in glory in the crown of gold in the third month of Winter; that means his acting as ruler in the third month of Winter' (3/10). This

41. See above, pp. 64, on Nectanebo as a dynastic name.  
42. Cf. H. W. Fairman, "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt," in

*Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, ed. by S. H. Hooke (1958), pp. 74-104.



ruler will found a legitimate dynasty: the following oracular statement 'They will give a seat to Pe'<sup>43</sup> is glossed 'His eldest son will be put on his seat (i.e., [the seat of] the ruler who will come into being in Herakleopolis); that means he will be similar to Harsiese' (3/11). Harsiese is, of course, the archetypal good king who avenged his father's death and succeeded him on the throne.<sup>44</sup> The following sections of the same chapter also stress the legitimate status of this ruler since he will be recognized in Dep as well as Pe and Isis will stop grieving (for her slain husband Osiris) because the legitimate successor (Harsiese) has taken the throne and avenged the death of his father.<sup>45</sup> This use of mythological references as part of the justification for the ruler whose coming is being predicted reflects the mythological underpinnings of Egyptian kingship as a whole.<sup>46</sup>

#### The Concept of Kingship in Contemporary Egyptian Records

The concept of legitimate kingship presented by the Demotic Chronicle, thus, includes proper coronation and proper behavior—being *mnḥ* 'excellent, beneficent' to the temples and gods (4/10, 5/22, 6/3), maintaining ritual, carrying out the law, and protecting Egypt from invasion. This concept is not confined to this text.

Rather, it is completely consistent with the "native" Egyptian (usually priestly) presentation of kingship found throughout the Ptolemaic Period. Several texts reflect this concept; for instance, in the Prophecy of the Lamb, part of the lamb's prophecy states, 'Evil (*bf3*) toward the god will bring evil (*bin*); beneficence (*mnḥ*) toward the god will bring beneficence (*mnḥ*)' (3/2).<sup>47</sup> The "Dream of Nectanebo" is known only from a Greek text but is generally accepted to be a translation from a demotic original.<sup>48</sup> In it, Nectanebo II realizes, as the result of a dream, that he will lose his throne because he has failed to finish building and decorating a temple for the god Onuris. Although Nectanebo undertakes to complete this project, fate, in the form of a boozing and wenching stone carver, seems against the king. The end of the story is lost, but it probably justified Nectanebo's loss of the throne to Artaxerxes III because of his lack of piety, i.e., his lack of generosity to the god Onuris and his temple.<sup>49</sup> Note also that the wisdom of 'Onchsheshonqy includes the statements, '[When] Pre is angry at a land, its ruler will abandon the law (*h3' p3 hp*); when Pre is angry at a land, he will cause law to cease (*lg s hp*) in it.'<sup>50</sup> *Hp* 'law' in both 'Onchsheshonqy and the Demotic Chronicle is the equivalent of earlier *m3'.t* 'truth, justice, (cosmic) order', whose maintenance was one of the responsibilities of earlier kings.<sup>51</sup> In private tomb biographies of the Late Period<sup>52</sup> and in

43. The ancient capital of Egypt; there is an intentional pun between *p* 'seat, throne' and the city Pe.

44. The image of the king as Harsiese occurs in the Satrap Stela (Urk. II, 17/16-18/1 and 19/9) and the Decrees of Raphia and Memphis, all discussed below, pp. 69-71. On the importance of Harsiese to the Ptolemaic rulers, cf., *i.a.*, R. K. Ritner, "Khababash and the Satrap Stela—A Grammatical Rejoinder," *ZAS* 107 (1980) 137, and the references there.

45. Thus the oracular statement 'They will give bread to Dep' is glossed 'Bread will be given (to) the ones (i.e., it is his people; army [*m3'*]) who are in Dep' while the oracular statement 'The widow of the *dl*-column (i.e., Isis), her descendant was received' is explained by the statements 'The widow is joyful; she stopped grieving; Isis will be happy of heart with the ruler who will come into being' (3/12-14).

46. Cf. Fairman, "Kingship," pp. 74-104, and E. Blumenthal, "Zur Göttlichkeit des regierenden Königs in Ägypten," *OLZ* 73 (1978) 533-41.

47. Janssen, "Bocchoris," p. 29 and pl. 4.

48. See B. E. Perry, "The Egyptian Legend of Nectanebus," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological*

*Association* 97 (1966) 327-33; A. Spalinger, "The Reign of Chababash: An Interpretation," *ZAS* 105 (1978) 145-46.

49. As suggested by Perry; see n. 48.

50. S. R. K. Glanville, *The Instructions of 'Onchsheshonqy' (British Museum Papyrus 10508)*, Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum, Vol. 2 (1955), 5/2-3.

51. Lloyd, *Historia* 31 (1982) 43, who points out also that the term *hpw nḥ m3'.t* occurs in New Kingdom texts. See also P. Derchain, "Le rôle du roi d'Égypte dans le maintien de l'ordre cosmique," in *Le Pouvoir et le Sacré*, Annales du Centre de Religion, Vol. 1 (1962), pp. 61-73; D. Lorton, "Towards a Constitutional Approach to Ancient Egyptian Kingship," *JAOs* 99 (1979) 463. The Canopus Decree has Ptolemy III institute a leap year once every four years in order to keep the festivals in their proper seasons and in order to keep the "movements of heaven" fully in order (Canopus, A/11-12; see W. Spiegelberg, *Die demotischen und hieroglyphischen Texte der Dekrete von Kanopus 239/8 v. Chr. und Memphis (Rosettana) 197/6 v. Chr.* [1922]).

52. E. Otto, *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, Probleme der Ägyptologie, Vol. 2 (1954), Chapter 7.

Greco-Roman temple inscriptions<sup>53</sup> the ideal king is presented as merciful, just and powerful, the guarantor of world order—*m3't*. In both types of inscriptions, the conflict between this ideal king and the actual king is resolved by inserting a god or gods one step higher in the chain of command, above the ruling king.<sup>54</sup> This god one step above the King is also found in the Demotic Chronicle: e.g., one gloss contains the sentence 'Harsaphes [i.e., the god of Herakleopolis] is the one who will give commands to the ruler who will come into being [in Herakleopolis]' (2/24). Similarly, the first fully preserved explanatory passage in the Demotic Chronicle says, 'It is by (means of) the above-mentioned gods<sup>55</sup> that the fulfillment of the oracles(?) which will be done will come about' (2/1).

Similarly, an image common to the Demotic Chronicle and much contemporary Egyptian literature is that of (walking) on 'the path of (the) god' (Demotic Chronicle 4/7; 'Onchsheshonqy<sup>56</sup> 23/12). The only other example in which the image refers to a king is found in the Satrap Stela erected by Ptolemy in the name of the young King Alexander IV, in which Ptolemy quotes the earlier king Khababash<sup>56</sup> as asking to be put 'on the path of his majesty [i.e., Horus], on which a

god lives' (Urk. II, 18/10-11).<sup>57</sup> In wisdom texts *mi.t* 'path' is frequently used to mean the '(proper) way, path'.<sup>58</sup> In the Late Period private biographical inscriptions the 'path of life' or 'path of god' indicates the manner in which one ought to conduct one's life.<sup>59</sup> Earlier Egyptian parallels for the phrase are discussed by J. D. Ray in his publication of the "archive" of Hor of Sebennytos from Sakkara.<sup>60</sup> Otto argues that, as ruling kings of the Late Period less and less approached the ideal of kingship, moral claims on the king became very strong. He sees the Demotic Chronicle, applying the same ethical standards to kings as to other mortals, as the high point in the development of Egyptian ethics: the identity of ethic and kingship, faith in the visible manifestation of the will of god in the person of the king, the pre-stabilized harmony between might and morality.<sup>61</sup>

The view that kingship involved maintenance of ritual and generosity toward the temples is also found, combined with the duty of protecting Egypt from outsiders,<sup>62</sup> in official royal decrees from the early Ptolemaic period. Thus, the so-called Satrap Stela notes the return to Egypt of divine images, temple furniture, and holy books belonging to the temples of Upper

53. E. Otto, *Gott und Mensch*, AHAW, Vol. 1 (1960), pp. 65-76; cf. Derchain, "Le role," pp. 61-73; J. G. Griffiths, "Egyptian Nationalism in the Edfu Temple Texts," in *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt, Studies in Honour of H. W. Fairman*, ed. by J. Rufflé, G. A. Gaballa, and K. A. Kitchen (1979), p. 178; E. Winter, *Untersuchungen zu den ägyptischen Tempelreliefs der griechisch-römischen Zeit* (1968). Otto (*Gott und Mensch*, pp. 65-76) also argues that in the temple inscriptions the king derives some of his legitimacy from acting as priest, the partner of the god, performing the proper ritual; he also stresses the king's adoption of priestly titles. See also C. Onasch, "Zur Königsideologie der Ptolemäer in den Dekreten von Kanopus und Memphis (Rosetana)," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976) 139. For an index of Ptolemaic and Roman temple inscriptions, see J.-C. Grenier, *Temples Ptolémiques et Romains, Répertoire Bibliographique*, BdE, Vol. 75 (1979).

54. See references 52-53, above; A. Spalinger, "The Concept of the Monarchy during the Saite Epoch—an Essay of Synthesis," *Orientalia* 47 (1978) 12-36; P. Kaplony, "Bemerkungen zum ägyptischen Königtum, vor allem in der Spätzeit," *CdE* 46 (1971) 260-61. For the ultimate development, where the human incumbent of the office of Pharaoh becomes secondary to the (animal) image, cf., i.a., M. Alliot, *Le Culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées*, BdE, Vol. 20 (1954) pp. 674-76.

55. Who these are is, unfortunately, lost because this is the first full line of text preserved in the manuscript.

56. Cf. my discussion in the *Festschrift* for Lüddeckens and the references there.

57. Cf. Ritner, *ZAS* 107 (1980) 136.

58. Cf. F. Lexa, *Papyrus Insinger* (1926), Vol. 2, p. 41, #177.

59. Cf. B. Couroyer, "Le chemin de vie en Egypte et en Israel," *Revue Biblique* 56 (1949) 412-32, as noted by M. J. Smith.

60. *The Archive of Hor*, Texts from Excavations, Vol. 2 (1976), pp. 62-63, n. c. to the translation of O. Hor 16/4-5. Ray also notes that a similar concept is found in New Testament and Qumran materials; cf. Couroyer, *Revue Biblique* 56 (1949) 412-32.

61. Otto, *Biographischen Inschriften*, pp. 116-18. See also Lloyd, *Historia* 31 (1982) 43-44 and n. 34; Derchain, "Le role," pp. 62-68 and n. at bottom of p. 73; Spalinger, *Orientalia* 47 (1978) 12-36.

62. Cf. Onasch, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976) 141, n. 33. Kaplony's (*CdE* 46 [1971] 260-65) "might makes right," which does not appear in the Demotic Chronicle, evidently applies only to Egyptians fighting barbarians/foreigners, although he applies the image to his suggested rivalry between Herakleopolis and Sebennytos; see his pp. 258-60.

and Lower Egypt found in Asia (Urk. II, 14/9-11)<sup>63</sup> and records "Egyptian" victories in both Syria and Cyrenaica (*Irm*) (Urk. II, 15/2-17). But the main purpose of the text is to record the donation, in perpetuity, of the far northern marshlands (*pḥw*) named 'The Land of (the Goddess) Wadjyt' to the divinities of Pe and Dep. Thus is recorded on the stela the order to carve a stela saying, '(I) Ptolemy, the satrap, (as for) the Land of (the Goddess) Wadjyt, I shall give it to Horus who has avenged his father, the Lord of Pe, and to Wadjyt, (the Lady) of Pe and Dep from today (on), forever, together with all its cities, all its towns, all its people, all its lands (lit., arouras), all its water, all its oxen, all its birds, all its small and large cattle, everything which came forth in it and was therein formerly together with what was added to it . . . , its short-horn cattle being for the great gods, its long-horn cattle in the presence of the Lady of the Two Lands, its long-horn bulls being for the living (Horus-) falcons, its milk for the noble youth [i.e., Horus], its birds for the one who is in the midst of the papyrus thicket [i.e., Horus] . . . , everything which comes forth from its arable land being on the altar of Horus himself, Lord of Pe, and Wadjyt, who is on the head of Ra-Horakhty, forever' (Urk. II, 19/7-20/16).<sup>64</sup>

Similar concepts underly the so-called trilingual decrees issued by priestly synods honoring various Ptolemies. The first of these, the Decree of Canopus, was issued in year 9 of Ptolemy III

(238 B.C.); the second, dated year 6 of Ptolemy IV (217 B.C.), commemorates the Battle of Raphia; the third, the Rosetta Stone, also called the Decree of Memphis, dates from year 9 of Ptolemy V (196 B.C.).<sup>65</sup> Although the format of the decrees is Greek, the form was adapted by the Egyptian priests<sup>66</sup> to fit their audience (the decrees were to be set up in all major Egyptian temples<sup>67</sup>). The earliest of the decrees, that in honor of Ptolemy III, portrays an all-powerful king being honored by the priests for, among other things, preventing famine in a year of low Nile. The text records the deification of Ptolemy III's deceased daughter and his addition of a new phyle of priests, interfering, in effect, in the clerical power structure.<sup>68</sup>

The growing prestige and power of the "native" Egyptians, which is regularly attributed to the role of the Egyptian contingent in the army of Ptolemy IV at the Battle of Raphia,<sup>69</sup> is reflected in the fact that the synods now began meeting in Memphis, the traditional capital, and in the inclusion, for the first time, of the traditional five-part Egyptian titulary, translated into Greek, in the Greek part of the Decree of Raphia.<sup>70</sup> It is also reflected in the portrayal of Ptolemy IV himself: since Ptolemy had given gifts to the temples, as a result of his concern for the divinities, therefore the gods and goddesses of Egypt went before him and protected him when he fought Antiochus III at Raphia. The traditional mythological association of the king

63. The identical theme of returning to their proper temples divine statues and temple furnishings stolen by the Persians and recovered in Syria is found in the Decree of Canopus (in honor of Ptolemy III) and in the decree in honor of Ptolemy IV following the Battle of Raphia. In those cases, too, the action is cited as one more example of the king's care and concern for the gods, their temples, and the rightful property of the temples. See the discussion by H.-J. Thissen, *Studien zum Raphiadekret*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Vol. 23 (1966), pp. 59-60.

64. Cf. also P. Jougeot, "La politique intérieure du premier Ptolémée," *BIFAO* 30 (1931) 513-36, who discusses Ptolemy I's actions intended to win himself support from the Egyptian populace and important Egyptian families.

65. See Spiegelberg, *Canopus und Memphis (Rosettana)*, and H. Gauthier and H. Sottas, *Un décret trilingue en l'honneur de Ptolémée IV* (1925). The royal ideology underlying these decrees has recently been studied by Thissen (*Studien*; he includes a bibliography of the various fragments of the

Raphia Decree, pp. 7-8) and Onasch (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-35 [1976] 137-55). The decrees in honor of Ptolemy V from Philae should also be included in this genre even though the intended Greek version was never carved; see Urk. II, 198-230; W. M. Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, Vol. 3, *The Bilingual Decrees of Philae* (1920); and K. Sethe, "Die historische Bedeutung des 2. 'Philä-Dekrets' aus der Zeit des Ptolemaios Epiphanes," *ZAS* 53 (1917) 35-49.

66. See Thissen, *Studien*, p. 80, and Onasch, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976) 140, 148.

67. According to Canopus, A. 20, and Rosetta, 32, the stela of stone or copper was to be inscribed by the priests in hieroglyphs, demotic, and Greek and set up in an open court of every temple of rank 1, rank 2, and rank 3.

68. Onasch, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976) 143-44.

69. See Thissen, *Studien*, p. 80.

70. *Ibid.*, pp. 27-42, 80-81.

with Harsiese is also stressed.<sup>71</sup> By the time of the Decree of Memphis, Egypt had suffered years of rebellion throughout the country and Ptolemy was faced with the presence of a rival "native" dynasty located in Thebes.<sup>72</sup> For this reason, Ptolemy V used the Rosetta Stone to win approval by the powerful Egyptian priesthood for his own rule.<sup>73</sup>

But all three of the decrees, regardless of the relative positions of the king and clergy, clearly show that it is the proper duty of the king, and the basic characteristic of a good king, to honor the gods and their temples (i.e., to make generous gifts to the temples and their priests). Thus, even in the Decree of Canopus, where the relative power of the king is at its height, Ptolemy III is portrayed as honoring various (animal) cults, including returning from Asia statues of the gods stolen by the Persians,<sup>74</sup> Ptolemy IV not only returned stolen cult statues, but he also gave extensive booty to the temples in acknowledgement of the help given him in the Battle of Raphia by the gods. Note also that one of the praiseworthy things mentioned about Ptolemy IV is that he was 'on the path of', i.e., conducting his life in the manner of, a pious man (*rmt-ntr*).<sup>75</sup> Although in the Rosetta Stone the list of good deeds for which the king is being honored includes rewards to the army and amnesty (for participants

in the rebellions), what is stressed are Ptolemy V's extensive donations to the temples and numerous reductions in taxes and duties, to the benefit of the temples (since the gods had helped put down the rebellion).<sup>76</sup> It seems to me significant that the same concepts underly these decrees issued in the name of, or on behalf of, specific, individual rulers and not just in the temple and private inscriptions which dwell on an ideal or "mythic" king.

This concept of the king and kingship is clearly based on earlier Egyptian concepts of kingship.<sup>77</sup> Otto<sup>78</sup> argues, however, that the divine character of the king and the royal family in the Ptolemaic period, although superficially similar to the earlier divinity of the king, is actually different, being based not on spontaneous "Verklärung und Beseelung" but on an act of state, a decree and a foundation. Likewise, Greek papyrologists tend to see Ptolemaic divine kingship as based on the Hellenistic concept.<sup>79</sup> Onasch<sup>80</sup> argues that the divinization of the deceased daughter of Ptolemy III in the Canopus Decree reflects both Greek and Egyptian concepts of divinization.<sup>81</sup>

Some have argued that Greek-speaking rulers would not have been aware of concepts expressed in Egyptian language texts.<sup>82</sup> But

71. See above, n. 46, and Thissen, *Studien*, pp. 2, 55, and 68. That Ptolemy IV received an oracle in a dream is also typically Egyptian (*ibid.*, pp. 52-53). However, portrayal of the king as a warrior on horseback is quite un-Egyptian (*ibid.*, pp. 71-73, 84). For a general discussion of the Greek and Egyptian elements in the Decree of Raphia, see *ibid.*, pp. 80-84.

72. The final defeat of the Theban rebels is recorded in a decree found in Philae; see Sethe, *ZAS* 53 (1917) 35-49, and W. Clarysse, "Hurgonaphor et Chaonnaphris, les derniers pharaons indigènes," in "Notes de prosopographie Thébaine," *CdE* 53 (1978) 246-53. Here too Ptolemy V's victory is attributed to his care and concern for the temple and cult.

73. Cf. Thissen, *Studien*, pp. 3, 82; Onasch, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976) 139-40, 153. Note also that Ptolemy V was crowned at Memphis, following the traditional Egyptian ceremony; whether Ptolemy IV had been, also, is uncertain; cf. *ibid.*, p. 151, n. 101.

74. As noted above, n. 63. See *ibid.*, pp. 141-42. Ptolemy III's deceased daughter is to rest (*hnp*) with Osiris in the temple of Canopus, which is said to be not only among the first rank of temples but also 'among those which the king and all the people who are (in) Egypt honor' (Canopus,

A/14).

75. Raphia, 17. Cf. above p. 69.

76. See also the discussion by Onasch, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976) 150-51. One a more practical level, such rewards were for the continued loyalty of the priests; see my discussion in the *Festschrift* for Lüdeckens.

77. This is too large a topic to be treated here. Aside from the discussions mentioned in nn. 51-54, see Daumas, "Littérature prophétique," pp. 203-21. The reviews by Blumenthal (*OLZ* 73 [1978] 533-41) and Lorton (*JAOS* 99 [1979] 460-65) of W. Barta, *Untersuchungen zur Göttlichkeit der regierenden Königs*, MÄS, Vol. 32 (1975), are very useful. One must also note the classic study by G. Posener, *De la divinité du Pharaon* (1960).

78. E. Otto, "Zwei Bemerkungen zum Königskult der Spätzeit," *MDAIK* 15 (1957) 196.

79. E.g., C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique, La Grèce et l'Orient (323-146 av. J.-C.)* (1978), pp. 238-71; F. W. Walbank, *The Hellenistic World* (1982), pp. 214-17.

80. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976) 144-47.

81. See also Thissen, *Studien*, p. 83, for a discussion of the royal cults established by the "trilingual" decrees.

82. E.g., H. W. Fairman, *The Triumph of Horus* (1974), as noted by Griffiths, "Egyptian Nationalism," p. 175.

Lloyd has argued that the reason for translating into Greek what must have been an Egyptian original of the "Dream of Nectanebo" was "to present to the Graeco-Macedonian rulers of the country the Egyptian view of what a king ought to be."<sup>83</sup> Note also that the Alexander Romance, which became popular throughout the Mediterranean world (versions are known in Greek, Latin, Coptic, Syriac, Hebrew, Arabic, Armenian, and Ethiopic), includes a theogamus birth scene and a coronation scene based heavily on Egyptian traditions, implying that Egyptian concepts of kingship were not, or did not remain, entirely foreign to the Hellenistic world and its successors.<sup>84</sup> In addition, the same concept of kingship that is found in purely "Egyptian" texts (temple inscriptions, private biographical inscriptions, literary texts such as 'Onchseshonqy and the Demotic Chronicle) is found not only in the Satrap Stela but in the priestly decrees where the text appeared in Greek as well as in Egyptian. Such stelae were to be set up in Egyptian temples and were therefore directed mainly, although obviously not entirely, at Egyptian speaking audiences. But the king, or at least his high officials, must have approved the text of such stelae, even if they did not directly and officially "commission" them.<sup>85</sup> The concept of ideal king which the Ptolemies shared with their fellow Hellenistic kings was modelled on Alexander the Great.<sup>86</sup> It portrayed the king as an ideal citizen of a Greek city—a great and victorious warrior who liberated cities from other (oppressive) kings, a wealthy man who gave generous donations to the temples and cities under his control, a wise man who was a patron of letters and the arts and an arbiter in case of conflict.<sup>87</sup> These three functions of the Hellenistic king in no way conflict with the "native" Egyptian concept of kingship found

throughout the Ptolemaic period. The uniformity among the Egyptian sources shows that, at least as his public image, the Ptolemaic kings upheld the same theory as that presented in the Demotic Chronicle: maintenance of the law and proper behavior toward the gods and their temples.

In summary, the purpose behind the composition of the Demotic Chronicle was not merely to predict that a ruler would come (from Herakleopolis) but also to define what proper kingship is and how a good king acts. The theory that the quality, good or evil, of a king and his period of rule depends on the king's relations to the gods and temples underlies the Demotic Chronicle and is found in contemporary Ptolemaic Egyptian documents. References to rulers of Dynasties 28-30 in the Demotic Chronicle serve not merely to imply a connection between the prophesied ruler and these previous "native" rulers, but even more the earlier rulers are used as examples. Their reigns are used to illustrate legitimacy, proper and improper behavior, and the consequences of each. The ruler who will come into being in Herakleopolis will be judged by these criteria, just as were the rulers of Dynasties 28-30 and just as are the Ptolemies. To the extent that the Demotic Chronicle is antagonistic to the current ruler and dynasty, i.e., to the extent that it is serving as justification for a rebellion, the antagonism must be based on a (presumed) failure on the part of the current ruler to live and rule according to these precepts. Thus the Demotic Chronicle is propaganda<sup>88</sup> but propaganda based on the presentation of a theory of kingship solidly rooted in earlier Egyptian tradition.

Oriental Institute  
University of Chicago

83. *Historia* 31 (1982) 48, n. 48. Note also that L. Koenen ("ΘΕΟΓΙΣΙΝ ΕΧΘΡΟΣ. Ein einheimischer Gegenkönig in Ägypten [132 1a.]," *CdE* 34 [1959] 109 and n. 2) suggests that the royal names selected by the Ptolemies reflected Egyptian "Königsideologie" as well as Greek (as noted by R. K. Ritner). Onasch (*Archiv für Papyrologie* 24-25 [1976] 137) argues that, precisely because the "trilingual" decrees appeal to both Egyptian and Greek speakers, they may be taken as representative of Ptolemaic royal ideology.

84. Cf. Lloyd, *Historia* 31 (1982) 46-50.

85. On the motivation behind the decrees, and their manner of composition, cf. Onasch, *Archiv für Papyrologie* 24-25 (1976) 153-54.

86. Cf. Préaux, *Monde hellénistique*, pp. 181-82.

87. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 181-280; see also the discussion by Onasch, *Archiv für Papyrologie* 24-25 (1976) 138, 152-53.

88. As the term is defined and discussed by Lloyd, *Historia* 31 (1982) 33-55.