SOME ASPECTS OF THE EGYPTIAN REACTION TO HELLENISM

by

Panayotis N. Spanides

Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements
of the degree of Master of Arts
in the History Department of the
American University of Beirut
Beirut, Lebanon

1964

SOME ASPECTS OF THE EGYPTIAN REACTION TO HELLENISM

Spanides

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to express a debt of gratitude to Dr. William A. Ward of the Department of History, American University of Beirut. Dr. Ward has not only served as advisor for this work, but has also given invaluable encouragement and skilled counsel, making this thesis possible.

The author's thanks are also due to Dr. Burton B. Thurston and John P. Brown who read this thesis and made important suggestions and criticisms. Lastly he would take this opportunity to express his gratitude to Miss Lucie Barber who corrected the English of the first draft of this work.

PREFACE

With the establishment of Ptolemaic rule in the Nile Valley an epoch of drastic political and social upheaval began for Egypt. Ptolemy I, looking to the consolidation of his power, settled Greek and Macedonian veterans in Egypt. Hellenic occupation meant the oppression of native rule and kingship.

The intention of this thesis is to search for evidence of the Egyptian opposition to Ptolemaic imperialism; to discover its causes and the ways it was presented and justified by the Ptolemies; to point out what effect it had on Hellenism itself. The Egyptian reaction to Hellenism, as will be shown, was characterized by the attempt to re-establish native royalty and put an end to the exploitation of the Egyptians by their Ptolemaic oppressors. Only some of the most important aspects of the Egyptian resistance to Hellenism are treated, namely, those institutions that reflected Ptolemaic imperialism and became the foci of Egyptian opposition.

The thesis is divided into three chapters. The first chapter is an introductory account of pre-Hellenistic Graeco-Egyptian relations. The second chapter deals with the main forces and institutions of Ptolemaic imperialism and the native reaction to them. Occupation of Egypt by

an alien regime meant the abolition of native royalty and the economic explitation of Egypt. The native revolts that broke out after the battle of Raphia in 217 B.C. were an attempt at re-establishing native rule, ending economic and social degradation and expelling the Ptolemaic despots. The third chapter deals with the cult of Sarapis, an artificial deity that the Ptolemaic oikos endeavored to introduce in order to bring about a rapprochement between the two heterogeneous elements of the Ptolemaic domain. The cult failed primarily because of its artificiality and the traditional religious conservatism of the Egyptians.

The underlying themes giving unity to the whole are the fate of Hellenism in its Egyptian environment, the interaction between Egyptian and Hellenic characteristics and the gradual weakening and decay of the Hellenic element due to the Egyptian reaction and the Egyptianizing policy of the later Ptolemaic kings of the dynasty.

List of Abbreviations

AHR	American Historical Review.
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (ed. J.B. Pritchard), Princeton, 1950.
Bull. de l'Inst. d'Egypt	Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte
Bull. Inst. Franc. Arch. O.	Bulletin d'Institut Français d'Archaeologie Orientale.
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History, vols. i-xii.
CE	Chronique d'Égypte.
FGH	F. Jacoby, Die Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker, Berlin, 1923.
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 1914-.
JESHO	Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient.
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies, 1880-.
JNS	Journal of Near Eastern Studies.
OGIS	Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae (ed. W. Dittenberger), Leipzig, 1903-5.
P. Cairo Zen	Zenon Papyri (ed. G.C. Edgar), Cairo, 1925-31.
P. Col. Zen.	Zenon Papyri: Business papers of the third century B.C., dealing with Palestine and Egypt. Vol. I by W.L. Westermann, New York, 1934; vol. II by W.L. Westermann, G.W. Keyes, and H. Liebesny, New York, 1940.
P. Rev. Laws	Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus (ed. B.P. Grenfell), Oxford, 1896.

PSI	Papiri greci et latini (Publicazioni della Societa Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto) by G. Vitelli, H. Norsa, and others, Florence, 1912-.
P: Tebtunis	The Tebtunis Papyri (ed. B.P. Grenfell, J.G. Smyly, and E.J. Goodspeed) London, 1902-.
Pauly-Wissowa	Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1894.
Rostovtzeff, SEHHW	M.I. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, London, 1941.
Rev. Et. Anc.	Revue des Études Anciennes
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, IV-XIV, 1929-57.
Sel. Pap.	Select Papyri. Edited by A.S. Hunt and G.C. Edgar, London, 1934.
Wilcken U d P	U. Wilcken, Urkunden des Ptolemaenzeit, altere Funde, Berlin, 1922-7.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PRE-HELLENISTIC GRAECO-EGYPTIAN RELATIONS

A. The Earliest Greek Contacts with Egypt

"Throughout all its lengthy course ancient Egyptian history reveals the simultaneous existence of two opposing tendencies: a disruptive one, which can be attributed to the country's length, and a centralizing one, arising from the single river, the conditions it creates, and the organization enforced by its presence."[1] Egyptian history, from its remotest phase was characterized by a movement towards unity. About 3000 B.C., at the dawn of recorded history, we find two antagonistic kingdoms: the one in the north, covering the enormous Delta with an outlet in the Mediterranean, was open to intercourse and interchange with the other cultures of the Near East. The southern kingdom was more enclosed within Africa and drawn into African civilization.

At the threshold of history the two realms were united by the great legendary ruler Menes[2] whose historical

---

[1]Sabatino Moscati, The Face of the Ancient Orient, trans. Valentine Mitchell, (London, 1960), p. 99.

[2]F. Jacoby, FGH, III, No. 609, 2.6; 3b-15 sq. See alsoHerodotus II.99.

identity is still in the question. The absolute power of the new state concentrated itself in the hands of the Egyptian sovereign, who stood at the summit of a bureaucratic pyramid, while the life of the community derived its origin and significance from him. From the Fifth Dynasty onward a slowly developing crisis led to the establishment of a feudal state, thus undermining the Pharaoh's supreme authority. About 2200 B.C., the first period of decadence 'the first illness,'[1] appeared bringing disunity and disintegration to the kingdom. A telling picture of the internal collapse and anarchy of the Egyptian state can be drawn from the literary writings of the age, especially from the prophecies of Ipuwer. State unity and authority were restored by the Pharaohs of the Eleventh Dynasty. This period was marked by a vigorous military policy which carried Egyptian arms into Nubia and Palestine. Noteworthy was the intercourse of Egypt with Byblos[2] which is evidenced by archaeological discoveries. Statues of Pharaohs and scarabs have been found at Byblos and Ugarit. About 1700 B.C. came the Second Intermediate Period that brought anarchy and disunity to the Pharaonic

---

[1] J.A. Wilson, The Culture of Ancient Egypt (Chicago, 1963), p. 104.

[2] A recent account of the relations between Egypt and Byblos is that by W.A. Ward, "Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean from Predynastic Times to the End of the Old Kingdom " JESHO 6 (1963), 1-57.

state; this state of affairs was aggravated by Hyksos[1] domination. After the overthrow and the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt a great new era came into being, lasting approximately from 1600-1100 B.C. This period was marked by a conflict of rival powers in the Eastern Mediterranean; as a result of the fluctuating balance of power there was for centuries a varied and fruitful intercourse and interchange of cultural elements.

Herodotus[2] claims that the Greeks were the first people of a different language who settled in Egypt. This does not represent a true historical picture, however, since there is adequate evidence that the Libyans had settled there centuries before.[3] Also, the foreign Hyksos[4] (1680-1580), having inflicted a great blow upon Egyptian pride, dominated the country for about a century before they were

---

[1]For the derivation of "Hyksos" according to later tradition, see Manetho (Jacoby FGH 609, frag. 8 par. 82 = Josephus c.Ap. 1. 82). Manetho's explanation for this term as indicating "Shepherd Kings" is incorrect. What is really involved is an ancient title "Ruler of a foreign country" (ḥ K^{c} ḫ^{3} St) given to foreign princes in Egyptian records as early as the Twelfth Dynasty; cf. P. Montet, Le drame d'Avaris. Essai sur la pénétration des Sémites en Egypte (Paris, 1941), pp. 11 ff.

[2]Herodotus II. 154.

[3]Wilhelm Holscher, Libyer und Ägypter (Ägyptologische Forschungen, 4; Gluckstadt, 1955), Chapter III.

[4]For the rise to power of the Hyksos see: A. Alt, Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht (Berlin, 1954); Z. Mayani, Les hyksos et le monde de la bible (Paris, 1956).

driven off by the Pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty (1580-1350). These invaders adopted Egyptian usages and even names, but to the native Egyptians they were the "accursed," and Herodotus seems to have heard nothing of their rule in Egypt.

There had already been active contact between the land of the Nile and the Aegean World before the cultural renaissance and the great colonizing movement of Hellas had begun. With Crete, Egypt had developed a very close intercourse. This Creto-Egyptian relationship is confirmed by archaeological evidence, that is, Egyptian objects have been found in the Cretan palaces and Cretan objects in Egyptian tombs.[1] After the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt relations with Crete became very close indeed. But towards the end of the 15th century Minoan power terminated in a sudden and widespread but rather mysterious disaster. What was the cause of this catastrophe? Was it brought about by foreign or by natural causes such as earthquakes? Sir Arthur Evans,[2] after considering the possibility that the great Cretan catastrophe might have been brought about by an invasion from the mainland, has rejected this idea,

---

[1] J.D.S. Pendlebury, "Egypt and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age," JEA XVI (1930), 83.

[2] Sir Arthur Evans, The Palace of Minos at Knossos (London, 1928), II, p. 319. Evans supports the importance of the seismic factor in the history of Minoan Knossos.

attributing the overthrown of Knossos to a terrible earthquake. Pendlebury[1] attributes the destruction of the Minoan empire to a great organized effort, since at the time of its downfall Crete shows no weakness. He maintains that the downfall of Crete was due, not to a wild barbaric raid with mere aimless looting and destruction as its object, nor to a colonizing impulse on the part of the Mainland. Rather, he feels it was due to the powerful Cretan colonies in the Aegean and their desire to control the rich commerce with Egypt.[2] It appears that until the collapse of Crete, Egypt had strong relations with the Minoans; this is supported by the interpretation of the Egyptian term Kftiw, "Keftiu", usually considered to be Crete.[3] Vercoutter has exhaustively studied the Keftiu question from the standpoint of the Egyptian records and infers that the term indicates "une partie au moins du monde égéen, seule region méditerranéenne, riche en îles, située au Nord-Ouest de l'Égypte."[4] This connection was indirect in that commercial links with Aegean appear to have been via Byblos.[5] Moreover, the eclipse of

---

[1]Pendlebury op.cit., p. 90.

[2]Ibid., p. 92.

[3]Jean Vercoutter, Essai sur les relations entre Egyptiens et Prehllenes (Paris, 1954), pp. 63-72.

[4]Jean Vercoutter, l'Égypte et le monde égéen préhellénique (Cairo, 1956), p. 119. The Amarna letters make no mention of the Keftiu. This strong connection was broken by the overwhelming catastrophe that overtook Crete.

[5]W.A. Ward, "Egypt and the East Mediterranean in the Early Second Millenium B.C.," Orientalia 30 (1961), 35.

the Minoan empire as a political and commercial entity in the Eastern Mediterranean world coincides with the opening of an active intercourse between Egypt and the Greek islands and Greece proper. The inhabitants of the Aegean islands and of the Greek mainland were called by the Egyptians the 'Peoples of the Isles in the midst of the Sea', and thought of as being subject to the Minoans. Pendlebury[1] states that the subjects of Minos banded themselves together and with the bulk of their fleets set out to overthrow the Cretan power, and open up the way to Egypt. This attack, I am inclined to believe, could not have been caused by economic motives, since there is no evidence of any direct trade between Egypt and Crete in any period.

The Third Late Minoan period (1250-1200) was one of incessant disturbance, very different from the comparative peace of the great Minoan days. The whole basin of the Eastern Mediterranean seems to have been a seething turmoil of migrations, wars and piracies, started first by the Mycenean conquest of Crete and then intensified by the two distinct raids of the Peoples of Sea upon Egypt in the thirteenth and early twelfth centuries.[2] This was the greatest national danger that Egypt had experienced since the

---

[1]Pendlebury, op.cit., p. 90.

[2]Battle of Piari in Egypt in 1232 B.C., and battle of Pelusium in 1184 B.C.

invasion of the Hyksos. The catastrophe is recorded in the inscription of Rameses III: 'The Isles were restless, disturbed among themselves at one and the same time...'[1] Both invasions were smashed and Egypt was troubled no more. These raids had an effect upon Egyptian sentiment and attitude towards foreigners and possibly does much to explain their exclusiveness, frequently noted by classical writers.

In their thrust for new homes the Peoples of the Sea damaged irreparably the balance in the ancient Orient and brought new and significant forces into being in Europe. In the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C., Egypt possessed a powerful empire and the Hittites became the chief competitor in Syria. By the end of the thirteenth century, the Egyptian and Hittite empires were destroyed, Assyria was moving to salvage the wreckage, the Hebrews and Philistines were taking possession of Canaan, the Phoenician city-states were moving towards new maritime power, and the Greeks could be discerned in their historical homes.[2] The invasions of the Peoples of the Sea mark the end of a period in the history of the Eastern Mediterranean World. Henceforth Egypt was a 'broken reed'.[3] The 'broken reed' continued to vacillate

---

[1]Edgerton and Wilson, Hist. Rec. Ram. III, pp. 35 ff.

[2]Wilson, op.cit., p. 244.

[3]Isa. 36:6.

for centuries in successive crises and recoveries. Egypt's power deteriorated and her forces became largely mercenary. She was overrun by the Ethiopians from the south and by the Assyrians from the north under Esarhaddon (670 B.C.).

Thebes was captured by Assurbanibal in 661 B.C. The Assyrian policy consisted in encouraging the Egyptians of the Delta to expel the Ethiopians from the southern territories. The outcome of this policy gave rise to the Saïte Dynasty which ruled Egypt from 663 to 525 B.C. The Saïte Dynasty expelled the Ethiopian invaders from Egypt and ultimately gained independence from the declining power of Assyria. Under the native Pharaohs of the XXVIth Dynasty, Egypt enjoyed a century and half of prosperity and was brought into contact with the Western World, the Greeks in particular. But the two peoples were very different from each other. One was a merely artificial revivification of an Egypt long passed away, the other was a natural re-florescence of civilization in a shape very different from the Aegean culture of ancient days.

Before opening the new chapter of Graeco-Egyptian relations that began about 650 B.C., we should take a brief glance at the Egyptian attitude towards the Greeks.

Greek knowledge of Egypt before Alexander's time was quite limited, coming mostly from the experience of occasional travellers like Herodotus, traders, and numerous mercenary soldiers who saw service in Egypt between 640 and

340 B.C. Fragments of the so-called wisdom of the Egyptians found in Greek writers show no real knowledge of Egyptian life or literature, and even a keen observer like Herodotus reported nothing but external appearances and superficial talk.[1] One thing these visitors learned was that the Egyptians liked to communicate a feeling of the primacy of their civilization over the Greek. This Egyptian exclusiveness has been revealed to us by Herodotus, who was told such things and dutifully reported them upon his return. He began by stating that the Egyptians believed themselves to be the most ancient of mankind,[2] and regarded all other people as barbarians. They thought of their institutions as being unique and they avoided Greek and other foreign customs.[3] They practiced circumcision,[4] an unfit and ugly religious rite, they always drank from washed cups, wore newly cleaned linen, and, in short, were fastidious beyond moderation.[5] Herodotus further observed the actual religious antipathy which hampered relations between Egyptians and Greeks, the refusal to kiss on the mouth,[6]

---

[1] J.C. Milne, "Egyptian Nationalism under Greek and Roman Rule," JEA 14 (1928), 226.

[2] Herodotus II.2.

[3] Ibid., II. 91.

[4] Ibid., II. 37.

[5] Ibid., II. 35-41.

[6] Ibid., II. 41.

to use a Greek's knife or any of his eating utensils, and the avoidance of Greek customs.

Pendlebury[1] states, that Egypt, having escaped the peril of the Sea Peoples, shut herself off; her ports were closed, and the appearance of a sail in the horizon was a call to arms. Strabo maintains that "there was a strong bias against the Greeks for, owing to scarcity of land of their own, the Greeks were ravagers and coveters of that of others."[2] At another point Strabo asserts, that "according to Eratosthenes, the expulsion of foreigners is a custom common to all barbarians, and yet the Egyptians are condemned for this fault because of the myths which have been circulated about Busiris in connection with the Busirite nome."[3] This attitude of the native Egyptians towards Greeks runs throughout ancient accounts of Graeco-Egyptian relations, down to the time of Herodotus.

B. The Need for Foreign Help under the Saite Dynasty

By the end of the eighth century B.C. the great

---

[1]Pendlebury, op.cit., p. 92.

[2]Strabo, 17:1.6.

[3]Ibid., 17:1.19. Here mention is made of ξενηλασία ἀγερία of King Busiris. Busiris about whom Diodorus gives a lengthy discourse, is the mythical founder of Thebes for whom there is evidence from Egyptian records. The town Busiris was an ancient center for the worship of Osiris which may have given rise to a legendary king who once lived there, cf. Gardiner, Egypt and the Pharaohs (Oxford, 1961), pp. 5-6, W.B. Emery, Archaic Egypt (Harmondworth Middlesex, 1961), p. 123, Scharff and Moortgat, Agypten und Vorderasien im Altertum (Munich, 1950), p. 82. For the Greek view of the

colonial expansion of Greece had begun. The changing political conditions of the Greek states, the paucity and poverty of the Greek soil, and in Asia the obstacle of the foreign power of Lydia, drove thousands of colonists to seek homes in the barbarian lands which merchant adventurers had already reached and penetrated. The colonial impulse probably began earlier in the rich and prosperous Ionian city-states than in the comparatively poor Greek mainland.[1] So the Greeks, first the Ionians and then the continentals, were carried for the first time out of their own territories to make a greater Greece on the shores of the Euxine, the Ionian and Tyrrhenian seas and Cyrenaica.[2]

It is true that Egypt had been closed to Greek curiosity for several centuries, since the raids of the Peoples of the Sea, yet the Delta at least had been known

---

Egyptianssee the Caeretan Hydria of Heracles killing a crowd of small, negroid, white-robed priests: M. Robertson, Greek Painting (Lausanne, 1959), p. 76. Greek contemptuous attitude towards the Egyptians showed itself in comedies written around 350 B.C. See Eubolos: frag. 126 (T. Kock, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, ii. 209)=Athen. i. 23AB; Antiphanes: frag. 147 (Kock, ii. 71)=Athen. vii. 299E; Timocles: frag. 1 (Kock, ii. 300)=Athen. vii. 300 AB, cited by S. Eddy, The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism, 334-31 B.C. (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961) p. 260, n. 5.

[1] A.R. Burn, The Lyric Age of Greece (London, 1960),, pp. 69-89 thinks that Corith colonized before the Ionians. For the expansion of the Ionian trade and colonization see C.Roebuck, Ionian Trade and Colonization (New York, 1959) pp. 71-86, 131-37.

[2] The Greek colonization of Cyrenaica was coaeval with the penetration of Egypt. See Herodotus IV. 145 9. An important inscription about the colonization of Cyrene is the one in SEG ix (1938) No. 3. Modern literature includes: F. Chamoux, Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades (Paris, 1953) cited by Roebuck, op.cit., p. 139.

to the Greek world. Homer seems to have had some knowledge of Egypt since the island of Pharos is mentioned in the Odyssey.[1] Even 'Egyptian Thebes' with its hundred mentioned gates, is known both to the Iliad[2] and Odyssey.[3]

Greek trading settlements in Egypt were on a different footing, but were part of the same general expansion. The settlements in the Egyptian Delta were not colonies, but purely trading stations. The Milesian Greeks, despite the striking contrasts between the Egyptians and the Greeks and Egypt's mistrust of foreigners succeeded in the second half of the seventh century B.C., in founding a trading establishment, called the 'Fort of the Milesians'. This foundation was a death blow to Phoenician trade-dominance in the Eastern Mediterranean world. At the time of its foundation Egypt was powerless to oppose the Ionian infiltration. Circumstances (the fear of Assyrian invasion, the Delta was

---

[1]Odyssey iv. 355.

[2]Iliad ix. 381.

[3]Odyssey iv. 126. No satisfactory etymology for Greek Thebai has as yet been suggested. The most commonly accepted derivation is from * T3 - ipt, an unattested shortened form of the Egyptian name for Luxor; cf. A. Gardiner, Ancient Egyptian Onomastica (Oxford, 1947), II, pp. 24*ff. Much more acceptable phonetically is [T3] ḥwt 'Ipt "(The) temple of (the god) Opet." This is the Egyptian name for a small chapel in the western corner of the great Amon pricinct at Karnak; cf. P. Montet, Géographie de l'Egypte ancienne. Part II (Paris, 1961), p. 59.

ruled by the local princelings of Herodotus' dodekarchy)[1] had paralyzed the land internally and made Greek mercenaries indispensable. Herodotus[2] states that Psammetichus I, one of the twelve local kinglets in the Delta and the founder of the Saite Dynasty, in order to attain the crown of Egypt and expel the Assyrian invaders, hired some Ionian and Carian mercenaries, who, voyaging for plunder, were to put in on the coast of Egypt. Psammetichus developed the use of his 'brazen men' by establishing camps of them, one at Marea near Kanopus the other on the opposite eastern border of the Delta, the 'tents' which became the important Ionian settlement of Daphnae (the modern Tell Daphneh or Defeneh).[3] This was intended as a bulwark of defense against possible attack from Syria as well as a trading post, and served as a base for possible warlike expeditions into Palestine. Like Marea in the West, Daphnae in the East was a purely military camp in the Isthmus of Suez corresponding to Pelusium in the North. The forts and the formidable armour-clad garrison of Greeks, combined effectively with the gifts of Psammetichus to stop the flood of the Scythian invasion which between 630-625 overran Asia. According to Herodo-

---

[1]Herodotus II. 147.

[2]Ibid., II. 152. Besides Herodotus' account we now possess the Abu-Simbel inscriptions left by the Greek mercenaries of Psamtik II (594-89 B.C.) in his Ethiopian campaign. See M.N. Tod, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, (Oxford 1946), Vol. I, No. 4.

[3]H.R. Hall, "The Restoration of Egypt," CAH, III, p. 292, n. 1.

tus[1] the Camps of Daphnae continued to flourish till a civil war in the time of Apries, who had a bodyguard of 30,000 Ionians and Carians, put Amasis on the throne (566 B.C.). Meanwhile the Fort of the Milesians developed into the unique factory state of Naucratis.[2] It was not a colony, but a trading factory governed by its own magistrates, who were chosen by the different states which contributed to the common treasury and participated in the common city-hall, the Helleneion.[3] Naucratis, among all the other Hellenic colonies was the only instance of an international town, and the Greeks must have felt the tie of common Hellenism more strongly than anywhere else in the world. Throughout the reigns of Psammetichus I and II and Necho, Daphnae continued to prosper, though Egyptian national sentiment finally compelled Amasis to confine the Greeks to Naucratis, abolishing the settlement of Daphnae.

Naucratis became an outstanding commercial and religious center of the Greek communities in Egypt. Temples already existed there, those of Apollo and Aphrodite,[4]

---

[1]Herodotus II. 163, 169.

[2]Roebuck, op.cit., pp. 134-5.

[3]Hall, op.cit. pp. 292-3.

[4]For the temples in this earlier Naucratis see Petrie, Naucratis, Vol. I, pp. 11 *ff.*

together with all the political and religious institutions indispensable to the constitution of a Hellenic city. But the influx of immigrants was so large and rapid that after the lapse of a few years the entire internal organism and external aspect of the city changed. The great temenos, the Helleneion, was erected at public expense by nine Aeolian, Ionian, and Dorian cities of Asia Minor[1] to serve as a place of assembly, storehouse and sanctuary. Its supreme magistrates were called timuchoi. The inspectors of the emporia and markets could be elected only by the citizens of the nine towns. A prytanaeum was open to all comers where assemblies and banquets were held on feast-days. Amasis made the city a free port and granted many privileges to its citizens.[2]

Cook[3] has some interesting remarks to make on the date of the foundation of the city of Naucratis and the traditional reconstruction of the Hellenic policy of Amasis. He holds that the foundation of Naucratis has wrongly been put back to the middle of the 7th century B.C. and Herodotus'

---

[1]The nine towns were the following: Chios, Teos Phocaea, Klazomenai, Rhodes Knidos, Hallicarnassos, Phaelis Mytilene. (Herodotus II. 178).

[2]On the organization of Naucratis see C. Roebuck, "The Organization of Naucratis," C.Ph. 46 (1951), 212-220; G. Maspero, Passing of the Empires, trans. M.L. McClure (London, 1900), pp. 647-8.

[3]R.M. Cook, "Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt," JHS 57 (1937), 227-30.

statement that Amasis removed the Ionian and Carian mercenaries from Daphnae to Memphis does not fit in with the archaeological evidence. He states, relying mostly on archaeological evidence, that Naucratis was probably founded about 615-610 B.C. His view is confirmed by the proportion of East Greek pottery and by the nationalities of the dedicators (the most prominent being the Chiots). Herodotus, Cook says, depicts Amasis as a half-legendary figure. The Egyptian records[1] represent Amasis as having risen to power at the head of an anti-Greek movement, being the nominee of a fervid nationalist party. The account of the text of Herodotus makes no definite statement of the nationalist attitude of Amasis. It seems that Herodotus deliberately or from ignorance has not recorded this. Furthermore, although there is a conflict between the Egyptian records and the conventional interpretation of Herodotus, we must rely on archaeological information for the reconstruction of the vague statements of Herodotus.

Herodotus is our chief source for the archaic Greeks in Egypt. But his account of Greek contact with Egypt during the reign of Amasis is very unreliable. The points that

---

[1] 'The Stele of the Death of Apries' (Recueil de Travaux Relat. Philol. Egypt. xxii (1900), quoted by Cook, op.cit. p. 232. The stele states that in the third year of the co regency of Amasis, Apries raised the Greeks in an attempt to recover effectual sovereignty.

call for criticism are the policy of Amasis[1] and his relations with the Greeks. The policy of Amasis requires special attention. The general belief is that Amasis became king at the head of an anti-Greek movement and in order to please nationalist sentiment he transferred the Greek mercenaries from Daphnae to Memphis, ostensibly to have them under his control but in reality, owing to latent phil-hellenism, to be his trusted bodyguard against the Egyptians.[2] Amasis' conduct was political; he paid close attention to his Asiatic frontier, and was always anxious to strengthen himself. Political motives moved him to court the Greeks in every way. They indeed were his sole hope in case of a Persian attack. Only from his Greek friends could any effective succour be expected. Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos, was now the most powerful ruler in the Hellenic world, and with him Amasis formed a friendship[3] which only came to an end when it seemed to the Samians improbable that Egypt could resist Persia. To Hera of Samos he sent divine images, and to the Dorian Athena of

---

[1]Hall, CAH, III. p. 292, 303-4, attributes a double policy to Amasis.

[2]Herodotus II. 154, 178. For Amasis' philhellenism see also Herodotus II. 178-81.

[3]Ibid., III. 39.

Samos he sent divine images, and to the Dorian Athena of Lindos in Rhodes two stone statues.[1] The shrine of Delphi had been honored by Amasis. When in 548 the temple was burned to the ground Amasis sent a thousand talents of alum, and the Greeks who had settled in Egypt, twenty minae.[2] His policy is probably rightly interpreted as balanced between conciliation of the Egyptian nationalists and fear of the Persian power.[3]

According to the traditional view, Amasis severely circumscribed the activities of the Greeks and their settlement, but archaeological evidence disproves this. Actually Egypt of Amasis seems to have been more open to the Greeks than before, for Naucratis was not the only Hellenic outpost during the reign of Amasis. It is possible that besides Daphnae, there were other Greek communities and pottery[4] suggests even closer contacts for this area than for Naucratis. Sherds of the late 7th and 6th centuries have been found in the Delta around Memphis and the Thebaid belonging to the reign of Amasis witnessing the penetration

---

[1] Ibid., II, 182.

[2] Ibid., II, 180.

[3] Cook, op.cit., p. 236.

[4] Attic Black Figure, Fikeclura, Clazomenian, and the Situlae. The pottery ranges from 570-530 B.C., or even later in the century--hence the common belief that Amasis recalled his Greek mercenaries from the eastern frontier at Daphnae about 565 is clearly wrong, and the contact between Greeks and Egyptians was probably greater than is usually thought to have been the case. Cook, op.cit., p. 22.

of Greek settlers beyond the settlements of Naucratis and Daphnae. It is probable therefore that Greek outposts in Egypt were widespread, and future archaeological investigation might shed more light on a most interesting chapter in Graeco-Egyptian relations before the coming of the Macedonians.

C. Political Co-operation of Egyptians and Greeks Arising from Their Common Hostility to Persia.

The prologue to the new chapter of history is provided by the empire of the Medes who in the 7th century established a powerful state and under King Cyaxares defeated Assyria and penetrated into Armenia and Anatolia being checked only by the resistance of the Lydians at the river Halys. This empire was meteoric and in the middle of the following century succumbed to the power of Persia, whose founder Cyrus, in eleven years (550 539) expanded the Achaemenid empire as far as the frontier of Egypt. Thus the greatest of the ancient Oriental empires came into being.

Cyrus' son Cambyses (529-522 B.C.) extended the conquests farther westward. He occupied Egypt and penetrated into Nubia and Ethiopia. These events are of outstanding historical significance.

During most of the period from 525 to 332 B.C. Egypt was a territory of the Persian empire and the history of this epoch reveals Egyptian nationalism in action. Owing

to the oncoming Persian menace from the East, Graeco-Egyptian political co-operation grew greater. This does much to explain the welcome later extended to Alexander and his Macedonians. Under the native Pharaohs of the Saite Dynasty Egypt enjoyed a period of prosperity and national rebirth. The most outstanding ruler of this dynasty, Amasis the Philhellene, constantly maintained a good understanding with the Greeks. Early in 525 Cambyses undertook the invasion of Egypt. A well-contested battle at Pelusium ended in a Persian victory. With the factory at Naucratis under Persian control, the lucrative Greek trade with Egypt was at the mercy of Cambyses.[1] The conquest of Egypt was disastrous not only to the Greek military settlement in the country, but also to the prosperous trading outpost of Naucratis. The Persian conquest indirectly dealt a blow to the Asiatic Greek cities which had the principal share in Naucratic trade.

The policy of Cambyses toward the conquered Egyptians seems to have been stern. Greek historians generally agree that it was unduly cruel. But contemporary monumental

---

[1] A.T. Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire (Chicago, 1948) p. 88. See also E. Drioton and J. Vandier, l'Egypte (3rd ed., 1952), pp. 600-2; Posener, La premiere domination perse en Égypte (Cairo, 1936).

and epigraphic evidence from Egypt contradicts the accounts of Herodotus[1] and Diodorus.[2] Tales of the mad doings of Cambyses in Egypt, Olmstead states, must be discredited.[3] The oft-repeated slander that he killed an Apis bull[4] is false. In the sixth year (524), while Cambyses was absent on his Ethiopian campaign, the sacred bull died. The next Apis bull, born in the fifth year of Cambyses, survived to the fourth year of Darius. The Bagoas letter from Elephantine asserts that when Cambyses came down to Egypt he destroyed all the temples[5]--a statement that agrees with Herodotus' account. It seems likely enough that Cambyses, in order to improve the economic condition of priest-ridden Egypt, confiscated the revenues of many of the temples. Doubtless, many temples became desolate when their income was cut off. According to an edict of Cambyses, preserved in a demotic text only three temples were officially recognized by him

---

[1]Herodotus III. 25-37.

[2]Diodorus I. 46.4; 49.6.

[3]Olmstead, op.cit., p. 89.

[4]Herodotus III. 27ff.

[5]A.C. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1923), No. 30, 14.

and retained their prerogatives and incomes, one of them being that of Ptah in Memphis.[1] The clergy therefore attacked his memory, so that Herodotus was told that he desecrated tombs, mocked statues of Ptah, and burned images of the other gods. Herodotus[2] has reported that an expedition, aiming at capturing the priests of the Temple of Am mon, was destroyed by a divine sandstorm. Diodorus[3] was told that Cambyses built his palaces at Susa and Persepolis with artisans and workmen abducted from Egypt. But this was obvious Egyptian propaganda and it is quite probable that Cambyses' reputation was unduly blackened.

On his way back from Egypt Cambyses learned that a revolt had broken out in Persia. Cambyses died on his way home. But Darius (522-486 B.C.), the scion of another branch of the Achaemenids, raised his standard and put the usurper to death, re establishing the dynasty. After achieving the throne, Darius had to face a series of revolts which broke out in various parts of the state. He quelled them all with a firm hand, reconquering the empire of Cambyses and even going farther. According to the Behistun inscription of Darius I a revolt broke out in Egypt while the

---

[1] G. Kraeling, The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri (New Haven, 1953), p. 28.

[2] Herodotus III. 26.

[3] Diodorus I. 46.4.

Persian king was fighting with the Babylonian pretender Nebuchadnezzar III.[1] We cannot say with certainty whether the words of the inscription on which the theory rests should be taken as implying a full-fledged revolt. It may merely refer, as Kraeling[2] states, to the personal disloyalty of Cambyses' satrap, Aryandes, who is said to have arrogated to himself royal privileges and become an ally of the queen of Cyrene against the Greeks of Cyrenaica. However, the act that brought about his downfall might have been his revaluation of Egyptian money at a higher standard than that of Darius' mint.[3]

Darius came to Egypt in person in 519 B.C., and at once resolved to conciliate Egyptian sentiment by every means in his power. Determined to win back his recalcitrant subjects, the king ordered that a hundred gold talents be granted to the person responsible for the discovery of the new Apis since the Apis-bull discovered in the reign of Cambyses had passed away.[4] Darius inaugurated various

---

[1]Darius Behistun Col. II 5-8; see R.G. Kent, Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon (New Haven, 1950), p. 123.

[2]Kraeling, op.cit., p. 29.

[3]Ibid., citing Herodotus IV. 166.

[4]Olmstead, op.cit., p. 142.

measures to increase the prosperity of the land of Egypt. He made the Oasis of el-Khargeh an outpost against the Greeks of Cyrenaica.[1] Diodorus[2] states that Darius was the sixth and last lawgiver of Egypt. He carried out a reform along liberalizing lines of the legal system of Egypt and restored the revenues of certain temples. The legal reforms of Darius are also known from the reverse of the so called Demotic Chronicle where there is a copy of regulations of importance to the temple priesthoods.[3] Nonetheless at the end of his reign a great revolt broke out to re-establish native rule.[4] Xerxes (486-465) ultimately suppressed it with great brutality. A new and more oppressive Persian regime was put into effect.[5] Egypt now had to pay a tribute of seven hundred talents and bear the expense of a large Persian garrison maintained at Memphis. Achemenes, the new governor, was subsequently assassinated by an Egyptian patriot.

Within a generation of this unsuccessful revolt,, the Egyptians rose again around 461. Under Artaxerxes I

---

[1]Kraeling, loc.cit.

[2]Diodorus I. 95. 4-5.

[3]Spiegelberg, Die Sogenannte demotische Chronik (Berlin, 1914), Col. C. 11 6ff or Meyer, SPAW 51 1915, 308, quoted by Kraeling, op.cit., p. 30.

[4]Herodotus VII. 1-7. See also Olmstead, op.cit., pp. 227-8.

[5]Herodotus VII. 7; III. 91.

(465-425), Inaros, a Delta leader, instigated a revolt and secured the help of an Athenian fleet of two hundred ships which was then operating against Persia in Cypriote waters.[1] The revolt enjoyed initial success but it was short-lived. The Athenians' attempt to establish themselves in Egypt ended in disaster in 454 B.C.[2] The Persians were subsequently able to reconquer the rebellious province after some twelve or thirteen years of fighting.[3] The peace of Callias[4] in 448 B.C., which reconciled Persia with Greece, and the Peloponnesian War (431-404), allowed Persia a free hand in Egypt. It was not until 404 that a great insurrection took place which aimed at the expulsion of all foreign groups. Not only were the Persians attacked, but a temple of Yahu belonging to the Jewish military colony at Elephantine was destroyed.[5] The revolt was successful, and its leader, Amyrtaeus, became the new Pharaoh, ruling as the sole king of the XXVIIIth Dynasty at Sais. Egypt retained its autonomy

---

[1] Ibid., III. 12, VII. 7; Thucydides I.104.

[2] Thucydides, I. 109. Casualty list of Athenians fighting in Egypt 459 B.C.: Tod, op.cit., I. no. 26, Samian commemoration of fighting in Egypt: G.F. Hill, Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, 2nd ed. by Meiggs and Andrewes (Oxford, 1951), p. 322.

[3] Herodotus VII. 236. See also Olmstead op.cit., pp. 303; 308; Drioton and Vandier, op.cit., pp. 603-4.

[4] The historicity of the Peace of Callias has been questioned by historians both ancient and modern. Hill, op.cit., p. 334 rejects its historicity. N. Hammond, A History of Greece to 322 B.C. (Oxford, 1959), p. 303 accepts it as historical.

[5] Kraeling, op.cit., pp. 111-3.

until around 340 B.C. During these years Greek mercenaries were employed, as in the cases of Agesilaus and Chabrias,[1] to repulse the continuing efforts of the Persians to reconquer Egypt.

The most serious revolt of the native Egyptians that led by Nectanebo was put down by the Persians in 343 B.C., and thenceforward little is known of the history of Egypt till the Macedonian conquest by Alexander. The defeat of Nectanebo was very important for subsequent developments in Hellenistic Egypt. Some Egyptians hated to think that they had been defeated by an unclean foreigner (Artaxerxes III). Years after this last experience of Persian rule, Egyptians still told Greek and Roman visitors that they had revolted against Persia because of her harsh rule and disrespect for the native gods. Artaxerxes was said to have killed the Apis and defied an ass.[2] These stories are important, for they show that after the Macedonian conquest of Egypt traditional propaganda against foreigners continued.

D. Alexander in Egypt

Late in 332 B.C. Alexander arrived in Egypt and was greeted as a liberator.[3] For two centuries the people of the

---

[1]Agesilaus (Spartan king): Xen. Ages. ii. 30-1; xxxvii. 3. xl.1; Chabrias (Athenian general in Tachos' service): (Ps.) Aristot. Economica ii.2.25. Both sources are cited by Eddy, op.cit., p. 259 n.4.

[2]Olmstead, op.cit., p. 440. Diadorus says Artaxerxes dismantled cities profaned temples, carried off a great deal of gold and silver, and stole the sacred writings in the temples. (Diadorus XVI.49.2; 51.1-2).

[3]Arrian Alexander III. I. 2.

Nile had suffered under the oppression of the Persians who had shown contempt for their religion even violating their temples; Before Alexander reached Egypt he had defeated both an army gathered by the Persian satraps on the river Granicus in Asia Minor and an army commanded by the Great King himself at Issus off the Syrian coast. By the autumn of 332 Persian power was in eclipse in the lands of the Eastern Mediterranean except in Egypt. In the summer of the same year he had destroyed the great commercial port of the Eastern Mediterranean, Tyre, which had given him more trouble than any other city to reduce.

At the head of the Nile Delta the Macedonians entered the capital, Memphis, then one of the largest cities in the world. There Alexander was crowned as Pharaoh and paid homage to the native gods by sacrificing to the deity Ptah, represented by the sacred bull, Apis, in which the god was supposed to be incarnated.[1] He celebrated the occasion with competitive games and a dramatic and musical festival, at which some of the leading artists of Greece were present.[2]

Leaving the main army at Memphis, Alexander returned to the coast. There on the shore near the town of Rhacotis, he traced out the lines of a new town, Alexandria,

---

[1] Ibid., III: I:4.

[2] loc. cit.

which would become a center of commerce between Egypt and Arabia, India, and the cities on the Mediterranean coast.[1] Thus, Alexandria was born. He chose a site some forty miles away from the old Greek city of Naucratis, communicating with the interior by a Canopic branch of the Nile. The site was covered by an island, Pharos, which, when joined to the mainland by a mole, the Heptastadion, gave alternate harbors, the Great Harbor and Eunostos, against the sea winds, from whatever direction they blew. Thus the site was the only possible one in Egypt for a healthy open port to be used by Macedonian sea-going fleets, especially as by that time warships tended to increase their tonnage and draught.[2] Tarn[3] holds that the immediate object was to create a great trade emporium to replace Tyre in the Mediterranean.

The Egyptians had long been used to the presence of Greeks, and in their eyes the Greeks were competent fighters a belief confirmed by the victory of Greek mercenaries fighting for Egypt against successive Persian armies. In the year 332, therefore, opposition against the

---

[1] Ibid., III. 1.5.

[2] D.J. Hogarth, "Alexander in Egypt and Some Consequences," JEA II (1915), 53.

[3] W. Tarn, Alexander the Great (Cambridge, 1948) I., pp. 41-42.

Macedonians was unlikely; they were in fact regarded as coming to liberate Egypt from Persian control. The famous Alexander-Romance[1] actually starts with the motive of connecting the Macedonian regime to the former native Pharaohs. In it Nectanebo II appears as the real father of Alexander. It also illustrates the effects of stories put about in Alexander's own lifetime which threw doubt on Philip's fatherhood and suggested that a god had begotten the conqueror of the world.[2] The main significance of the story, however, lies in its nationalist tendency. It proves the survival of the old spirit of Egypt and its desires to accept Greek rule.

Having concluded his military and civilian duties, Alexander was free to give rein to the romantic and mystical aspects of his temperament. He was eager to visit the oasis of Siwah at which stood the temple of Ammon, famed for the wisdom of its oracle. Arrian[3] states that an overmastering desire came upon Alexander, an irrational desire inspired by romanticism to accomplish a marvelous exploit. But this was not a desire without reason, and modern authors cite three principal motives:[4] (1) confidence in a veracious god

---

[1]Narrated in Ps. Callisthenes, Fabulous History of Alexander I. 3; II.26. See Budge, The History of Alexander the Great (1889) p. 12; cf. 'Kallisthenes' in Pauly-Wissowa (Stuttgart, 1919), xx, 1707ff.

[2]Hogarth, op.cit., p. 57.

[3]Arrian Alexander III.3.

[4]P. Jouguet, Trois études sur l'Hellénisme, (Cairo, n.d.) pp. 18-9.

whom Alexander wanted to interrogate about the success of his future projects; (2) an ambition to imitate his ancestors, Perseus and Heracles, who had consulted Ammon; (3) Alexander's eagerness to know if he really was the son of Zeus.

The first motive does not seem to be very extraordinary and does not justify such a long and perilous enterprise. The route through the Libyan desert was unmapped and arduous; only the devotion of his officers could have endured such an expedition without any military objective. The second motive seems stronger and more convincing than the first. For centuries, Ammon had ranked with Delphi and Dodona as one of the three great oracles of the Greek world. He was the God of Cyrene; Pindar[1] had written a hymn to him, which is lost, and the Athenians had had an Ammon-cult before 371/0 and had built a temple for this deity before 333/2.[2] Cimon, Plutarch[3] states, while he was in the vicinity of Cyprus, sent men to the shrine of Ammon to get an oracular answer from the god to some secret question. Alexander consulted Ammon as he had consulted

---

[1]Pindar Pyth. 4.16 (28). See also Pausanias 9.16.1 for beginning of Ammon-hymn.

[2]On the date see Sterling Dow, Harvard Theol. Rev. xxx (1937), 184, cited by Tarn, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 349.

[3]Plutarch Cimon xviii.7.

Apollo at Delphi,[1] and Arrian[2] first quotes from Callisthenes the statement, probably true, that one of Alexander's reasons for going to Siwah was because his ancestors Heracles and Perseus had done so before him.

Stories of miraculous guidance have been handed down describing how the path was shown by snakes who glided before the company, and how in the darkness, when the direct track was missed, ravens flew near and croaked until the right trail was regained.[3] At length the oasis was seen; the chief priest welcomed Alexander addressing him as 'son of Ammon', the title given for a Pharaoh. Alexander entered the inner shrine of the temple alone. Why he did so, what questions he put to the oracle, what answers he received--these are problems which historians have debated ever since and to which we shall never know the correct answer, for Alexander kept his own counsel. He wrote to his mother telling her that he would communicate his secret to her alone after his return; but since he did not go back to Macedonia it died with him.[4] Callisthenes, the historian,

---

[1]Plutarch Alexander xiv. 4. At Delphi Alexander received the title ἀνίκητος. Diodorus maintains that he got the title ἀνίκητος from Ammon at Siwah. For a detailed examination of the question, see Tarn, op.cit., II, pp. 338-46.

[2]Arrian Alexander III. 3. 1-2.

[3]Ibid. III. 3. 5-6.

[4]A recent discussion of the question is that by P. Jouguet, "Alexandre a l'oasis d'Ammon et le temoignage de Callisthène," Bull. de l'Inst. d'Egypte xxvi (1944), 91-107.

caused confusion in later years by stating that the priest had greeted the king as 'son of Zeus', thus labelling him as a god. It cannot be said if he heard the greeting of the priest of Ammon, or was told of it by someone who did; anyhow he deliberately altered it and made the priest greet Alexander not as son of Ammon but as son of Zeus. When he first thought of this, is not known, but by the time he completed his book he was deeply committed to Zeus; he had invented the Milesian oracles, invested Alexander's prayer at Gaugamela, Darius' death, the defeat of Agis of Sparta at Megalopolis, and he had said that one Athenais at Erythrae had also testified to Alexander's high descent (εὐγένειαν), which in the context seems to mean 'divine birth'.[1] Moreover, the assumption made by many writers that the Greek World, had prior to Alexander, identified Ammon with Zeus, is not very plausible. There is evidence that on his return from Siwah to Egypt, Alexander sacrificed, not to Ammon but to 'Zeus the king'.[2]

Alexander's transaction with the oracle of Ammon was an attempt on his own part to establish his son-ship to Zeus-Ammon. It was natural that as he had conquered

---

[1] Tarn, op.cit., p. 357.

[2] Arrian Alexander III. 42.

Egypt he should call himself son of Ammon, for in this he was following traditional usage. It is to be noted that so far as his own companions attributed divinity to him, it was expressed as son-ship to Ammon, since elsewhere in the Near East there were no means of so satisfactory a kind for deifying a living sovereign. After his death the diadochoi whether in Asia Minor, Syria, or Babylon promoted his apotheosis for their own political ends as a divinity in the Egyptian pantheon.

Alexander's pilgrimage to the sanctuary of Ammon might have exercised a decisive influence on his thought. In this affair of Ammon, the universal domination goes together with the divine birth.[1] The religious theme of his divine affiliation serves as a basis for a political conception of world dominion. There was therefore a political reason that led Alexander to Egypt; and this policy was inspired by Hellenism. Alexander's object was not that defined by the limited aims of Isocrates,[2] simply to expand his power over the greatest possible number of barbarians. The victory of the Macedonian territorial state over the polis, with its

---

[1] Jouguet, op.cit., p. 26, quoting V. Ehrenberg, Alexander und Agypten. (Beihefte Zum Alten Orient, 71), pp. 30-42.

[2] Isocrates Philip 9; Panag. 17; Philip. 154. Φησὶ γὰρ χρῆναι τοὺς μὲν Ἕλληνας εὐεργετεῖν . . . τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων ἄρχειν.

extensive nationalism, had already rendered the old conception of empire by the polis obsolete. Alexander did not expect Hellenism by itself to make a unity of his empire. His aim was to weld together the various races of his dominions and to place them on the same footing, for the blending of races and nations was the only way to achieve unity.[1] In Egypt, Alexander came for the first time into contact with a great oriental civilization. He wanted to assure its fusion with Hellenism. His conduct at Memphis, where he sacrificed to Apis and performed an agon in the Greek manner, and his foundation of Alexandria, which was destined to become a cosmppolitan center, reveal Alexander's goal of unification between the Greek and the Oriental worlds. Alexander's great anabasis to the Libyan sanctuary marks the beginning of his political unification which was his principal achievement. It is true to say with Tarn that

> Alexander was one of the supreme fertilizing forces of history. He lifted the civilized world out of one groove and set in another; he started a new epoch; nothing could again be as it had been.[2]

His political programme involved a conscious and deliberate attempt to bring about a profound revolution in human life;

---

[1] P. Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, trans. H.R. Dobie (London, 1928), p. 474.

[2] W. Tarn, "Alexander: The Conquest of the Far East," CAH, vi, p. 436.

a revolution calculated to destroy forever the idea of city-state self-sufficiency and substitute for it nothing less than that of a universal brotherhood. Alexander is thus represented as striving in the name of 'homonoia' or 'concord' to break down the ideological barriers which had hitherto separated Greek from barbarian, and to create a concept of the cosmopolite or citizen of the world. Alexander was inspired by a conviction that he was fulfilling a law of destiny, regarding himself in Plutarch's words, 'as a common emissary sent from God to harmonize and reconcile the whole world.' (κοινὸς ἥκειν θεόθεν ἁρμοστὴς καὶ διαλλακτὴς τῶν ὅλων νομίζων).[1]

The reasons that led Alexander to Egypt are summed up by G. Radet:

> A natural drive for difficult enterprises, an attraction exercised by the mystery of distant lands and renowned countries, an ardent curiosity for the most ancient monuments of history and legend..., the prestige of an oracle universally known for centuries, an emulation aroused by the memory of the heros of his ancestry, a religious obsession of the problem of his divine origin, a need of a solemn affirmation opening to him unlimited expectations and liberating his mother from the infamous suspicions to which a fervent practice of dionysiac rites had given place, such are the reasons that motivate and justify his visit in the oasis of Siwah.[2]

---

[1] Plutarch De Alex. Fort. aut. Virt. I:6 and 8, quoted by C.N. Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture (New York, 1957), p. 88.

[2] G. Radet, "Notes sur l'Histoire d'Alexandre," Rev. Ed. Anc. xxviii (1926), 240.

On returning to Memphis, Alexander instituted wise policies of government. It is noticeable that he did not concentrate the administration in the person of one satrap. He preferred instead decentralization. Arrian states:

> It is stated he divided the government of Egypt between many officers, from his surprise at the nature of the country and its strength since it did not appear to him safe to entrust the command of all Egypt to one man.[1]

He retained the native officials and appointed two native governors at the head of the civil administration of Upper and Lower Egypt. Peasants and officials were protected against extortion, having the right of direct appeal to the king. Civilian and military control were separated; as the former collected the taxes, the military were not tempted to interfere with finance. He assigned the western and eastern frontier districts of the Delta, Libya, and Arabia to Greeks, Appollonius and Cleomenes of Naucratis. The two native officials were coupled with two Macedonian military governors, and the fortresses of Memphis and Pelusium received their special commandants. Alexander's financial superintendent Cleomenes of Naucratis was not to collect the taxes directly from the peasantry but through the minor native officials, as was previously the custom. These

---

[1]Arrian Alexander III: 5.7.

arrangements pleased the people, because the oppressive Persian system of tax collection was replaced by a method more efficient and more just. The effective control of the country seems to have soon been gathered into the hands of one man, Cleomenes of Naucratis, when one of the governors declined to act. Cleomenes was apparently clever enough to wrest the real power for himself, and seems to have acquired a reputation in the Greek World for dishonesty and extortion.[1]

The Ptolemaic dynasty devised a system on other lines and the high position granted to the Egyptians by Alexander is a feature not reproduced under the Ptolemies till the later days of their rule. They deviated from Alexander's political ideals. Not only did they justify their rule by the right of conquest but enhanced their authoritarianism by claiming divinity. When they did promote Hellenization, it was for reasons of military expediency, not humanitarianism.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., vii. 23.6.

[2] Moses Hadas, Hellenistic Culture (New York, 1959), p. 21.

CHAPTER II

PTOLEMAIC IMPERIALISM AND THE EGYPTIAN RESISTANCE

A. The Nature of Ptolemaic Imperialism

The preceding chapter has surveyed the Pre-Hellenistic Greco-Egyptian relations. We have seen how Egypt under the Saite dynasty and in the intervals of autonomy between Persian rule had begun to adapt herself to the new order. The effort to secure her independence compelled her to enter the concert of fourth-century powers and link herself closely with the Greek world. Under Persian rule Egypt was infiltrated by many foreigners. The rulers of the Saite house foreshadowed the policy of the Ptolemies by admitting into Egypt Greek mercenaries and traders, but they did not succeed in setting up a suitable *modus vivendi*, or in promoting intercourse between the intruding foreign element and the native Egyptians. They failed to bring about a synthesis between the two opposing forces and reserved for the Greeks political and social superiority.

Under the new political organization the problem the Ptolemies faced was not an easy one. It might have been possible for Alexander to educate the Orientals in the Macedonian

art of war, to overcome the resistance of Macedonians and Greeks, to bring about a fusion of races and civilizations. Alexander's own Macedonians were very far from sharing his ecumenical ideal. To give the vanquished peoples equality was, in their sight, to violate all precedents for the relationship between conquering Greeks and subjugated barbarians. They resented, to the point of armed mutiny, the diminution in their own status which Alexander's program implied. The object of Ptolemaic as well as of Pharaonic rule was in effect the exploitation of the country; they were not interested in enlightening the native population, and maintained a barrier between them and the Greeks. As Professor Rostovtseff[1] puts it, "On the Egyptian foundation they built their edifice in which all the upper storeys were for the dwelling of strangers and the cellars reserved for the natives." Hence they tended to relegate the Egyptians to an inferior position. But it was a state of affairs that could not last for long, and the policy of the ruling class inevitably changed with the force of circumstances.

It is to the papyrological records that we are indebted for the history of Egypt under Ptolemaic rule. It must not, however, be assumed that even with this testimony one can draw an accurate and precise picture of Ptole-

---

[1] M.I. Rostovtzeff, CAH vii, p. 153.

maic Egypt. There are many uncertainties and for the answers to certain historical questions one has to resort to speculation.

To appreciate the domestic policy of the Ptolemaic royal house, one should know the objectives of its foreign policy. Jouguet[1] has pointed out, "The way in which they conceived the government and administration of Egypt depends in great part on the idea which they had formed of their position in the world, and on this idea we have no direct testimony;" we can only surmise the motives of Ptolemaic imperialism by relying on the available facts.

There has been a great controversy over the nature of Ptolemaic imperialism since the first years of our century. Wilcken has pointed out that the Ptolemies envisaged a "Weltmachtpolitik", a policy aiming at universal domination. The Ptolemies strove for the hegemony of the Hellenistic world; and in order to achieve their imperialistic schemes they tended to extract all the wealth possible from Egypt. The empire was the end and Egypt the means. Aiming at playing the chief role in the Mediterranean international politics, they regarded Egypt as the chief source of their

---

[1]P. Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, p. 241.

revenues.[1] Rostovtzeff maintains a point of view diametrically opposed to Wilcken's. He holds that Ptolemaic imperialism was economic in character. The leading motive of the Ptolemies was to set up a powerful Egyptian state. In order to guarantee the autonomy and security of Egypt they had to control the sea and command the sea routes approaching Egypt.[2]

The first Ptolemies directed their efforts at home and abroad to two principal objects; the first, complete autonomy and self-sufficiency; and the second, to which the first was to contribute, the attempt to gain a dominant position in the affairs of the Hellenistic world. Of these two objects of Ptolemaic policy, which the early kings of the dynasty kept in balance, Philopater and his successors endeavored to maintain the first--political and economic self-sufficiency. The second goal--hegemony--they gradually abandoned under the pressure of circumstances.

Thus we may give three variant views with regard to the Ptolemaic foreign policy. First, that those kings, following Alexander's example, pursued a policy of universal domination, second, that the Ptolemies limited their ambi-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 242.

tions to Egypt, and third, that they endeavored to gain a dominant position in the Mediterranean world.[1] One may admit the last view is the most probable. Egypt in the preceding periods had to be powerful from the economic and military points of view in order to be able to repel an external invasion. It is not because in certain requests addressed to the king one reads: σοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης πάσης βασιλεύοντος [2] that we attribute a policy of universal domination. Only the last assumption explains satisfactorily the Ptolemaic intervention in the Hellenistic world, their attitude with regard to other Diadochoi.

Polybius,[3] who makes a distinction between the policy of Philopator and that of the first three Ptolemies, states: ὑπερῶν οἱ πρότεροι οὐκ ἐλάττω, μείζω δ' ἐποιοῦντο σπουδὴν ἢ περὶ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν Αἴγυπτον δυναστείας.

This statement reflects the importance of the external policy of the first kings of the dynasty. This does not suppose that the Lagids did not pay much attention to the domestic affairs of the country. In order to arrive at an enviable position in the Hellenistic world, the Ptolemies were in need of money, either for influencing the international markets and thus preparing the way for their political

---

[1]It is probable that the Ptolemies pursued a politico-economic imperialism, because Egypt like the other Hellenistic monarchies sought for the hegemony of the Eastern Mediterranean world. See P. Jouguet, "Les destinées de l'hellénisme dans l'Egypte grèco-romaine", CE 19 (1935), 89.

[2]PSI 541, II: 7-8.

[3]Polybius V. 34.5.

ideas, or for bringing under control the less prosperous states. This may mean that the Ptolemies should follow an economic demand in their royal policy.

In the following pages I will endeavor to expose the conflicting views of modern scholars concerning the internal policy of the Ptolemies, in order to deduce the attitude of the central power towards the natives and the aliens. In tracing the policy of the Ptolemaic oikos we have to ask the following questions: Did the Ptolemies pursue a royal or a racial policy? Was the focal point of the Ptolemaic policy an exploitation of Egypt? The present study will not only permit us to measure the distance that separates Alexander from his successors but it will also enable us to determine the importance of the native resistance to Ptolemaic imperialism.

In respect to the Ptolemaic dynasty and its three hundred years of rule over the Nile valley, two quite divergent judgements are becoming discernable among the papyrologists and historians who use the testimony to which the papyri apply. The majority of scholars support the view that the Egyptians were bitterly oppressed by the Ptolemies. W. Paremans[1] asserts that the Ptolemaic dynasty was in theory

---

[1] W. Paremans, "Ptolemée II Philadelphe", Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire XII (1933), 1006.

absolute in its rule and that it was interested primarily in exploiting the natives and in seeing that they filled the granaries and the banks of the royal oikos. Tarn holds that "there is no evidence to show that the acknowledged prosperity of the bureaucratic class extended down to the natives and we know of nothing which was done for them."[1] Elsewhere he states that "they did not help their subjects, their government, ethically considered, stood well below that of the other two Macedonian dynasties."[2]

Westermann[3] sees in Polybius' statement, " διὸ καὶ τὴν ὁρμὴν ποιοῦνται περὶ τῶν ἔξω πραγμάτων " a defensive policy and repudiates Paremans as having read an offensive and imperialist purpose into this essentially defensive policy.

In support of the view that the Ptolemies were oppressive rulers one has to take into account the explanation of the privileged position accorded to the Greeks and other aliens who streamed into the Arsinoite[4] nome in the time of Ptolemy II. Westermann states that those foreigners "became

---

[1] W.W. Tarn, "Ptolemy II", JEA XIV (1928), 260.

[2] W.W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, p. 269.

[3] W. Westermann, "The Ptolemies and the Welfare of their Subjects", AHR 43 (1938), 270-1.

[4] The Arsinoite name, ancient Fayyum, lies fifty miles south of Cairo, only a few miles from the western edge of the desert.

the overseers of the work done by the Egyptian manual labor."[1] Until 217 B.C. only foreigners, mostly Greeks, were enlisted in the army, which supported the ruling regime. The Greeks, therefore, formed an elite class with definite advantages which enabled them to exploit the Egyptians in the ultimate interest of the god-king.[2]

A second group of scholars asserts that the Ptolemies treated the natives well.[3] P. Jouguet as the representative of this group holds that the profits, which the Ptolemaic state obtained from the country by its strict control of resources and production and its energetic exploitation of the capacity for work always characteristic of the Egyptians, must have been enormous. He states also that these profits were used for the advantage of the state, incarnated in the person of the divine ruler.[4]

Most of the proponents of this view take into account, as Westermann puts it, "the economic and social factors

---

[1]Westermann, op.cit., p. 272.

[2]Ibid.

[3]A letter from a non-Greek shows the sense of racial inferiority from which some Asiatics and Egyptians suffered. 'They look down on me because I am a barbarian. So I beg of you to be good enough to pay me regularly, so that I shan't starve to death because I can't speak Greek'. (P. Col. Zenon 66). See Bell, Egypt from Alexander... Conquest, p. 137, n. 7, citing C. Preaux, Grecs en Egypte, p. 69. The editors translate hellenizein as 'act the Hellene', but even if the Greek letter was written by the man himself, which is by no means certain, the word may merely be an exaggerated way of saying 'I am not at home in Greek'.

[4]P. Jouguet, "La politique interieure du premier Ptolemée", Bulletin de l'institut francais d'archeologie orientalle XXX (1930), 513-36.

fixed in the situation when Ptolemy I took over the control of Egypt, first as a satrap, later as a king. It weighs more judicially the environmental factors concerned and the interplay of internal and external politics upon the social attitude of the state."[1]

Kornemann[2] maintains that Ptolemy I, in 311 B.C., following Alexander's example, aimed at fusing the two races and civilizations. But the transfer of the royal capital from Memphis to Alexandria indicated a new political orientation. Soter inaugurated a policy of oppression of the native element and this policy was pursued by his successors.[3]

In order to reconstruct the policy of Soter's successors, it is necessary to analyze the institutions of the Ptolemaic regime. The task of this paper is not to analyze every individual Ptolemaic institution but only those that explicitly reflect Ptolemaic imperialism, exploitation of the resources of the country and finally the animosity of the native population to the Macedonian regime.

It is interesting to determine the policy that the new dynasty followed with regard to the natives and to

---

[1]Westermann, loc.cit.

[2]M. Cornemann, Die Satropenpolitik des ersten Lagiden (Milan, 1925), pp. 235-45, cited by C. Preaux, "Politique de race ou politique royale", CE 21 (1936), 112-3.

[3]Préaux, op.cit., pp. 113-4, suggests that due to the scarcity of sources of the reign of Soter, it is difficult to arrive at a conclusion about Soter's policy. Did he follow a racial policy? Did he aim at blending the two races or oppressing the natives? She asserts that in all these cases no definite answers can be given. Even the penetrating studies of Bevan, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty (London, 1927), pp. 18-55, and P. Jouguet, loc.cit., maintain that Ptolemy followed a wavering policy.

the Greeks who poured into the country. The privileged position held by the Greeks in the army and the civil service of the Ptolemaic kingdom has been considered as evidence of Greek nationalistic sentiment maintained by the Ptolemaic regime and adopted by the Greek soldiers, traders, and other civil servants of the dynasty. It has been suggested that those "aliens" who streamed into Egypt during the first years of Ptolemaic rule considered themselves as conquerors ruling over a vanquished people. Westermann[1] indicates that "the first serious break in this nationalistic theory" was undertaken by Elias Bickermann[2] who held that this class discrimination and social hierarchy established by the Ptolemaic house was the outcome of economic motives and was determined by services rendered to the crown in definite callings, such as that of soldier, priest, peasant, or the like.

Another theory that places emphasis on the predominant interests of the crown is the one expressed by Mlle. Claire Preaux.[3] Instead of dealing with a policy basing itself on the concept of Hellenic nationalism or racial policy or a policy of royal favor, why should we not try to interpret the Ptolemaic policy from another angle? Mlle. Preaux has suggested that instead of conceiving the history of Ptolemaic Egypt as a strife between an

---

[1]Westermann, loc.cit.

[2]See his article: "Beitrage zur antiken Urkundengeschichte" in Arch. f. Pap. VIII (1927), 238-9, cited by Westermann, op.cit., p. 272, n. 7.

[3]Préaux, op.cit., pp. 111-138.

Egyptian camp and a Greek party led by the ruling Ptolemy, it is better to interpret the development of the institutions as the outcome of two divergent forces against the royal power. She holds that the institutions within the Ptolemaic domain reveal a "royal policy", a policy aiming at the doctrine of the predominant interest of the king. Since so many conflicting views have arisen regarding the attitude of the Ptolemies towards the two heterogeneous elements of their domain, I am inclined to believe that the privileged position of the Greeks reflects a royal power. Besides the political ambitions of the indigenous clergy, there was the avidity of the Greeks as well as the solid structure of the private right, either Greek or Egyptian, depending on the system of perogatives of the individual and the absolute sovereign.[1]

The continuous preoccupation of the Ptolemaic rulers to attract many aliens to Egypt strengthens this argument. A limited number of immigrants who would occupy the highest posts and provide technicians for the organization of the state could not be sufficient for the Ptolemies.

The regime had, it would appear, a twofold motive in favoring mass immigration. The first deals with the army. Whether we consider the natives as indifferent to the idea of joining the Ptolemaic army, or we ignore them completely, one thing is certain: they stayed entirely away from the

---

[1] Ibid.

regular troops, made up mostly of Greeks. No doubt, had a war broken out, the Ptolemies would have sent their agents to the Greek world to engage mercenaries. In my opinion, the ruling royal oikos did not pursue such a policy so that they might have at any moment an armed force at their disposition;

With regard to this object they fixed mercenaries on Egyptian soil by establishing the system of cleruchies which would provide them with enormous advantages from the economic point of view.[1] In addition to that, the foreign element, dwelling in Egypt, would enable the Ptolemies to pursue a policy of prestige and play an important role in the international politics of the Eastern Mediterranean world.

Consequently, in the third century only European personnel served in the Ptolemaic field army, and the old Egyptian military class became redundant. Between 312 B.C. and the Battle of Raphia no Egyptian served in the Ptolemaic army.[2] What happened to the old Egyptian military class during this era we do not know for sure, but many families survived and retained some sort of standing, since in the

---

[1] J. Lesquier, Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sons les Lagides (Paris, 1911), pp. 163-66.

[2] Tarn, op.cit., p. 179.

second century Egyptians drawn from some such class appeared in the army and civil services. Thus we see that absolute Greek authority over the military functions during the third century gave the Greeks an undisputed monopoly of power and position. The creation of this elite military class served the royal interests; it was an institution in which Ptolemaic expediency found support.

Another institution that bears the stamp of Ptolemaic royal power was the cleruchies. The distribution of land to Greek settlers might be interpreted as a usurpation of native land, and consequently, a tribute imposed on the natives.[1] The policy of the Ptolemies inallotting land to Greek cleruchs had many consequences in the political career of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Not only does it reflect a policy aimed at gratifying the royal interests but also a measure of coercion.

Cleruchic land was not considered as private property but as royal land. The statement " τὸν αὐτοῦ κλῆρον ὃν ἔχει ἐκ βασιλικοῦ "[2] well explains the fact that the cleruchic land served the interests of the crown. The sacred land[3] granted to the temples was administered for the king.

---

[1] Préaux, op.cit., p. 122.

[2] P. Tebtunis 815, p. 291, 1.3. "His own land that he has from the king".

[3] Ibid., 815, p. 292, 1.26.

From the Zenon archives we learn that the land of doreai (gift-estates), donated to several individuals was a variety of royal land.[1]

The alteration in the position of the cleruchs or military settlers was significant. At first the cleroi or allotments held on a contingent and precarious tenure, not heritable, not to be sold or mortgaged, resumed by the king on the holder's death; but by the end of the third century it was taken as a matter of course that the cleruch would be succeeded by his son, and gradually the right, first to sell, and afterwards to bequeath the cleros was established. This development had its influence, as we shall see later, on the de-Hellenization of the settlers.

We see, therefore, that a new conflict arose here between the interests and the rights of the cleruch and the power of the crown. This bears evidence to the fact that the institution of the cleruchies served only royal interests. It might have widened the gap between the privileged Greek and the native Egyptian, but, if the private right of the cleruch was threatened by the royal power, the Greek would revolt against the royal authority.

---

[1] P. Cairo Zen. 59179 cited by C. Préaux, Les Grecs en Égypte d'apres les archives de Zenon (Bruxelles, 1947), p. 52, n. 1; or PSI 513.

The Ptolemies instituted a dual policy concerning their Greek and native subjects. The chora as distinguished from the poleis, was the king's inheritance and this character is apparent, as we have seen, in the system of the ownership of the soil. The native Egyptians of the chora possessed no economic liberty. From the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus[1] we learn that the tenants of the royal lands and workers in the olive oil monopoly were limited in their personal freedom. They were part of the machinery of a system of centralization and absolutism at whose summit was the expression of the king's will. One of the signs of this servitude of the native Egyptian was the poll-tax, syntaxis. His person was catalogued on the registers of that tax, which were called laographiae.

The poleis stood in direct contrast to the great region of the chora. The principles of Oriental absolutism and Greek individualism were irreconcilable. The Greek cities in Egypt were incapable of being adapted to the concept of the king as a god, master, and even the owner of the country. There were three cities in Ptolemaic Egypt--Alexandria, Ptolemais, Naucratis--to which the Ptolemies allowed the institutions of genuine independent πόλεις. Naucratis

---

[1] P. Rev. Laws (259 B.C.), col. 44, cited by Preaux, op.cit., p. 48, n. 12. The Revenue Laws of Philadelphus shed light on the oil monopoly.

perhaps retained its old constitution, with its aristocratic Council of Timouchoi.[1] In the time of Philadelphus and Euergetes, Ptolemais[2] and probably Alexandria had an Assembly of the people, a Council, and a board of six executive magistrates called πρυτάνεις.

The Ptolemies, however, did not forget the absolute character of their regime. The poleis betray their position of dependence in dating documents by the king's years, celebrating his anniversaries, and stamping his image on their coins. Moreover, royal officials participated in the administration of the city. Ptolemais honored Euergetes.[3]

This system of government, on the whole, was fairly liberal, but was not maintained to the end of the dynasty. The poleis kept their liberty to a varying extent and remained the essentially Greek territory of Egypt and the centers from which Hellenism was expanded over the country.

Another feature of Ptolemaic rule that requires special attention is the system of State capitalism.[4] The most remarkable aspect of this system was the range and the

---

[1] P. Jouguet, La vie muncipale dans l'Egypte romaine (Paris, 1911).

[2] OGIS 47-9.

[3] OGIS No. 49. For a good account of Ptolemais see Bevan, op.cit., pp. 104-8; Carl H. Kraeling, Ptolemais City of the Libyan Pentapolis (Chicago, 1962), pp. 6-10.

[4] On the hellenization of the Egyptian economy: C. Préaux, L'économie royale des Lagides (Bruxelles, 1939).

character of the monopolies controlled by the State. We must add the complete monopoly in the field of finance and the numerous fields of production in which the Ptolemaic State was an entrepreneur of overwhelming power as against the competition of private individuals or organizations. The outcome was the development of an economic determinism which eventually deadened the energies of those very Greek agents whose enterprise was so lavishly used by the Ptolemaic despots in building up their mercantilistic system. No doubt in the reorganization of the state by the Ptolemies the loose machinery of the old Pharaonic State which had been improved by the Persians was taken over. It had been a system in which at times the central authority had predominated completely over all its subjects, but it had also been subject to infringements upon the absolutism of the central power by the strong temple priesthoods and by powerful noble families. Much of that system was ameliorated and made more efficient by application of Greek ideas of government, administration and the scientific control of agriculture and exploitation of natural resources. We will see how Greek insistence on strict organization of production threatened to make the life of the lower social classes, both Greek and Egyptian, unbearable, and made the Ptolemaic rulers seem in the eyes of the natives to be Occidental despots.

After having briefly analyzed certain aspects of

the Ptolemaic dynasty, one may infer that the military establishment, the cleruchies, and the system of state capitalism served primarily the interests of the crown. This picture of Ptolemaic royal economy affords ample evidence that these institutions were oriented toward meeting royal demands so that the dynasty could maintain itself in the international competitive system of the third and second centuries B.C. Those institutions provoked conflicts in the social, psychological, and economic order between two opposing camps one of which, the Greek, thought that everything was permitted and the other, the Egyptian, fostered hatred and animosity.

As has been mentioned above there was an extensive system of state monopolies which, in accordance with the practical policy of the Ptolemies, were organized to suit varying needs. Banking[1] was among them, and side by side with the royal banks which undertook private as well as state business, there seem to have been private banks leased by the ruling house to individuals.

The main Egyptian staple was wheat.[2] All corn-land, in whatever hand, paid a tax in corn direct to the

---

[1] C. Préaux, op. cit., p. 280.

[2] W. Tarn, op. cit., p. 189.

king. On the king's land no part of the crop belonged to the peasant till he had taken out the king's quota, which was the larger share, and transported this to the king's barn in his village. This was one of the sources of Ptolemy's great wealth. From the village barns the wheat passed to the central barn of the nome and from there to the king's barn at Alexandria.

But the great royal monopoly was oil. From of old, oil producing plants, sesame, croton, and colocynth had been grown in Egypt. Under the Ptolemaic regime, the cultivation of these plants was strictly controlled, the government fixing the amount of land to be set aside for the purpose in each nome and keeping an eye on the sowing and gathering of the crops. The seed was supplied by the government to the farmers; the produce was carefully calculated, a quarter being paid as tax, the rest delivered by the cultivators at a fixed price to the contractors. Finally the oil was distributed by retailers at a fixed price. To prevent competition, there was a heavy import duty on foreign oil. The king made an enormous profit which Tarn calculates at a figure as high as "from seventy per cent on sesame oil to 300 per cent or more on colocynth."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 192 or Préaux, op.cit., p. 85.

Another monopoly was that of textiles.[1] The temples were allowed to continue the manufacture of the fine linen (byssos) and had to deliver a fixed quantity to the king for purposes of export. Among other monopolies were those of salt, natron, papyrus and beer.

From these monopolies, and from the rents of the domain land, the ruling dynasty derived a large revenue in money and in kind, which was increased by numerous taxes. There were taxes on cleruchic and other kinds of lands, a succession duty on estates, taxes on sales, on house property etc.[2] Last came the apomoira,[3] a tax of one-sixth of the produce of vineyards, paid in kind, and of orchards and gardens paid in money.

Foreign trade[4] was stimulated by the Ptolemaic house. Among the imports in the Ptolemaic period were timber, metals, slaves and horses. To pay for those Egypt's most valuable export was corn for she was the main granary of the Hellenistic world. But she also exported papyrus, of which she was the sole supplier to the whole ancient world, the fine byssos linen, glass, alabaster and other varieties

---

[1]Hunt-Edgar, Sel. Pap., II, no. 204.

[2]Tarn, op. cit., p. 193.

[3]Bevan, op. cit., p. 183; Rostovtzeff, A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C. (Madison, 1922), p. 99.

[4]C. Préaux, Les Grecs en Egypte d'apres les archives de Zenon (Bruxelles, 1947), pp. 57-64; Rostovtzeff, "Foreign Commerce of Ptolemaic Egypt," JEBH IV (1932), 728-69.

of stones. There can be no doubt that by all these measures the Ptolemies accumulated tremendous wealth, although the actual income of the Ptolemies is unknown.[1] The dynasty was generally regarded as the richest among the Hellenistic monarchies, and accumulated that 'Treasure of the Ptolemies' which so excited Roman covetousness.

B. The Ptolemaic Dynastic Cult

One of the most outstanding features of Ptolemaic imperialism was the new dynastic cult. Being the lords of Egypt by conquest, the Ptolemies looked to the doctrine of divine right as the legitimate foundation of their authority. The monarchy that the new rulers endeavored to establish was the outgrowth of the national monarchy of Philip and Alexander.[2]

The origin and character of the dynastic cult is a much disputed question. Some hold that the cult was derived from the cities; that the kings merely accepted an homage which was profitable and later transformed it into a state religion. Others maintain that it owed much to the political

---

[1] Jerome's figure (on Daniel xi.5), 14,800 talents under Ptolemy II is worth little. Cited by Tarn, op.cit., p. 194.

[2] W. S. Ferguson, CAH vii, pp. 7ff.

initiative of the rulers themselves.[1] MacEwan[2] states that of the two expedients, leagues and monarchy, which fourth century Hellas used for combining smaller states into relatively large units, monarchy was an importation. Macedonian kingship was quasi-constitutional and he is in full accord with Tarn[3] who points out that the absolute monarchies of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies exhibit no Macedonian constitutional traits of any kind. Ferguson[4] is of the opinion that Hellenistic kingship had Macedonian kingship as its core and does not agree with MacEwan's[5] view that the pattern of Alexander's empire was Persia.

It is true that Hellenic political thinkers of the fourth century B.C. were beginning to realise the futility of the polis and the political system that had wrecked Hellas,[6] and that the Greeks attributed divinity to city founders and other outstanding philanthropists.[7] Ferguson

---

[1] P. Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, p. 291.

[2] C.W. MacEwan, The Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship (Chicago, 1934), p. 23.

[3] Tarn, op.cit., p. 23.

[4] Ferguson, op.cit., p. 9.

[5] MacEwan, loc.cit.

[6] E. Barker, CAH VI, pp. 505-13.

[7] Some Sicilian tyrants seem to have received extraordinary non-Hellenic honors. This was the case with Gelon (See Diodorus Bibl. Hist. XI,38), and Timoleon (Plutarch Timoleon 39) who were deified by the Syracusans.

holds that "from one point of view the attribution of divinity to man was deference or when construed unfavorably flattery, and it harmonized with Greek psychology to translate extraordinary endowment of will, intellect, and character... into the sphere of the supernatural, and thus to acknowledge the mystery of strong human personality".[1]

MacEwan[2] has inferred that the recurrence of the institution of monarchy in the sophisticated culture of the Hellenistic world was a conscious adoption from the Orient of a convenient political form. But Bevan[3] asserts that the cult was a Hellenic development, not borrowed from an Oriental tradition.

I am inclined to believe that the official cult was indeed Greek, which grew gradually from the worship of a ruler after death, but it was not till the latter part of the third century that the reigning Ptolemy and his wife were worshipped.[4] But Greek though it was in its forms, a cult of this sort could hardly have been the product of the pre-Hellenistic epoch. It appears to have grown up

---

[1]Ferguson, loc.cit.

[2]MacEwan, op.cit., p. 30.

[3]Bevan, op.cit., pp. 48-9.

[4]P. Lond. III. 879, p. 6 'In the reign of Ptolemy the Benefactor God, the son of Ptolemy and Cleopatra the Gods manifest and Queen Cleopatra his wife'.

under the influence of Oriental theocratic and absolute ideas. Deification of a living or recently dead ruler was an essential pattern of the Hellenistic monarchy, naturally conditioned by local peculiarities. The Greek of the polis despised Oriental ideas of absolute monarchy and could not submerge his will to a mortal god. Heroization was a feature of pre-Hellenistic Greece and Ionian cities had decreed honors to living men.[1]

It was stated above that the worship of the living Ptolemy was the development of the Hellenistic world. We may now attempt to examine the political motives that lay behind the repeated acts of deification as well as the development of the cult in Ptolemaic Egypt.

Progress from the sporadic urban cult of a living king to an official imperial cult was seemingly the work of the Ptolemies. Two steps are clearly recognizable. The first was taken by Ptolemy Soter, probably on assuming his title as a king in 305 B.C., when he established in his capital an official state cult of Alexander. The priest, an eponymous official, was of Macedonian or Greek descent, appointed by the ruling oikos, and the ritual used was Hellenic, not native. In instituting the cult of Alexander

---

[1]Lysander is usually cited as the first deified Greek. Duris of Samos in (Plutarch Lysander 18) is the authority.

in the new capital of his domain, Ptolemy sought to distinguish his claim to kingship in the matter of legitimacy from the claims of the other dynasts.

Ptolemy Soter was worshipped as a Saviour-god in the Greek city of Ptolemais founded by him in Upper Egypt.[1] But in the rest of Egypt there was no royal cult. All over the Hellenistic world, rulers were being deified, as was the case with Demetrius Poliorketes[2] to whom the Athenians paid divine homage. Ptolemy I received divine titles and honors from the Rhodians who, after he had successfully rescued the island from the siege of Demetrius, called him "Soter". This was the beginning of the divinisation of the Ptolemaic kings, but the dynastic cult had not yet taken an official form. He left this task to his son and successor Ptolemy II.[3] Ptolemy Philadelphus proclaimed the apotheosis of his father under the name of Soter, which the Islanders had given him, and in 279 B.C. he instituted

---

[1]Jean Scherer, "Le Culte de Soter a Ptolemais et à Coptos", Bulletin de l'Institut Francais d'Archeologie Orientale XLI (1942), 71-73.

[2]Diodorus XX. 46. 1-3 and Plutarch Demetrius X. give a full account of the divine honors decreed by the Athenians to Demetrius.

[3]W.W. Tarn, "The Hellenistic Ruler Cult and the Daemon", JHS 48 (1928), 206-19.

Tarn holds that the attempt to show that the Hellenistic ruler cult was inaugurated at Bactra and that Alexander was its author has broken down.

games on the Olympic pattern in his father's honor.[1]

A passage from the Rhodian historian Callixenos preserved in Athenaeus has left a description of those games, considered to be one of the most brilliant monuments of the dynasty.[2] A few years later Ptolemy II took the last step; his sister and wife Arsinoe II, who didd in July 270, had already been worshipped before her death as a goddess, Philadelphus, "the brother-loving", and since the king could not be left out of the cult of his wife, the two were associated as θεοὶ ἀδελφοί , the "Sibling Gods." Arsinoe received special honors[3] and was associated with many deities, including Isis. Henceforth, at their accession, every king and his consort were worshipped under some cult title as "sunnaoi theoi" ("gods who share the temple") and were worshipped and associated with the deified Alexander. Bell[4] holds that the priest of the deified Alexander and the Ptolemies was eponymous and his name was used in dating clauses, as in the following example from a contract of 173 B.C.;

---

[1]P. Jouguet, op.cit., p. 295.

[2]Athenaeus The Deipnosophists II.5. 196a-203b.

[3]An Egyptian text depicts Arsinoe as having joined the members of Ra. This is the "Stele of Mendes" found by Mariette in 1871. A new fragment that gives the date of the death of Arsinoe (270 B.C.) is in Bouche-Leclercq, Histoires des Lagides (Paris, 1903), I, pp. 177-178.

[4]H.I. Bell, Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt, (Liverpool, 1927), p. 23.

> In the reign of Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy, and Cleopatra, the Gods Manifest, the eighth year, when Heracleodorus, son of Apollophanes, was priest of Alexander and the Saviour Gods and the Fraternal Gods and the Benefactor Gods and the Father-loving Gods and the Gods Manifest and the Mother-loving Gods, when Sarapias, daughter of Apollonius, was daughter of Demetrius was Basket-Bearer of Arsinoe the Brother-loving, when Irene, daughter of Ptolemaeus, was priestess of Arsinoe the Father-loving.[1]

Bell is of the opinion that these cult titles, which are quite un-Egyptian and when they occur in Egyptian contracts are evidently translations, are therefore alone adequate evidence that the ruler cult was purely Greek. Ptolemy II was thus the real founder of Hellenistic state cults. Pre-Hellenistic Greeks might have paid divine honors after death to outstanding men who had done something helpful to them, but the official state cult, as founded by Ptolemy II, was simply a "political expression of divine right."[2] Bell seems to agree on this point with Tarn when he says that "the ruler cult was essentially a worship of power; power may seem, as indeed it is, an inadequate reason in itself for worshipping anybody, alive or dead, but it is not to be despised in an age of chaos and insecurity."[3]

---

[1] P. Griss. 2, cited by Bell, loc.cit. The document is in Greek.

[2] W.W. Tarn, "Ptolemy II", JEA XIV (1928), 248.

[3] Bell, op.cit., p. 24.

Ptolemy Soter had been a usurper whose right was the right of the strongest and the ablest. Ptolemy II made that right the gift of heaven. The king now ruled, not because he was a conqueror, but because he was a god.

The Ptolemies' title to Egypt was the right of conquest. It was their "land won by the spear." It was not due to mere chance that just at this time there appeared a series of treatises on kingship. Each in its own version repeats the same theory of the power of one man--the Best; and of his rights and, to a much larger degree, of the duties of the Best man towards the population.[1] It is quite possible then that the Ptolemies searched for a philosophical foundation for their power. φιλανθρωπία, πρόνοια, ἐπιείκεια, εὔνοια, εὐεργεσία , should be the leading principles of human conduct.[2] Almost all the philosophers of the Hellenistic era asserted as unquestionable the view that the ideal ruler should display these virtues and apply them in peace and in war. Whether the Ptolemies sought to apply the dictates of philosophy in their administration or not will be noted later in this chapter. In the last analysis the dynastic cult was a political device.

---

[1]Treatises on Kingship: Xen. Mem. III. 9. 10; Oxyr. 1611, 11.38 ff., Berl. Pap. 13045 (1st century B.C.), cited by M. Rostovtzeff, SEHHW (Oxford, 1941), III, pp. 1495-6.

[2]E.R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of the Hellenistic Kingship", Yale Classical Studies I (1928), 55ff. (The source is not available). See also: Persaeus, SVF I p. 96, no. 435; Cleanthes, SVF I. p. 107, no. 481, cited by Rostovtzeff, op.cit., p. 1594.

Dr. Dodds[1] in his article "Why Greek Rationalism Failed" makes the following remarks:

> Here the ancient predicament is especially close to the modern one, and both have given birth to the same significant symptom--the mass adulation of kings and dictators. Hellenistic and Roman ruler-worship was no doubt in part a political device; but the device only worked because the masses so desperately needed a Magic Helper. When the old gods withdraw, the empty thrones cry out for a successor.

Side by side with this Greek cult, moreover, was the Egyptian cult of the Ptolemy as Pharaoh. In Egypt the Pharaoh himself had been a god, and the Ptolemies adopted the position that they were the legitimate heirs of the Pharaohs. There is of course a difference between being ruled by a god in human shape and being under the guidance of a transcendental God whose will is interpreted by intermediaries. The Egyptian Pharaoh did not rule by a divine right which came to him upon his accession to the throne, but ruled because he was born a god, with the divine function of ruling inherent in his physical and spiritual being.

The Ptolemies acquired their title, in the Greek view, by the right of conquest; their dominions were "spear won". The rulers of Hellenistic Egypt could maintain their position only through a devoted following, and soon adopted

---

[1]These are the remarks by E.R. Dodds from a talk published in the Listener, 8 May, 1952, pp. 745-6, cited by Bell, op.cit., p. 24. See also: C. Preaux, L'Economie Lagide, p. 557 ff. points out similarities between the Egyptian and the Greek conceptions of royal power.

the expedient of deification, which the climate of the Hellenistic world had made normal.

C. The Native Reaction to Ptolemaic Imperialism:

The reaction of the Egyptians to Greco-Macedonian imperialism included a series of rebellions whose strength was sustained over a long period of time.[1] These revolts were not only directed against the Ptolemaic monarchy but also against those institutions that had held the natives in contempt. Mutual hatred between Greek and Egyptian had grown intense, for the elite class of new comers had acquired an undisputed authority over the native population. The Egyptians fought to emancipate themselves from the rule of the Ptolemaic monarchs and to bring about the collapse of the Ptolemaic house and its agents. Milne[2] and Jouguet[3] have held that during the three hundred years of Ptolemaic power, scarcely any of the Greek settlers ever acquired a real knowledge of Egyptian culture and language.

A revolt, Mlle. C. Preaux claims, "is the evidence of a policy; it announces that there is an antagonism of interests or rights."[4] An analysis of the Egyptian upris-

---

[1] S. Eddy, The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism, 334-33 B.C. (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961), p. 257.

[2] J.C. Milne, "Egyptian Nationalism under Greek and Roman Rule", JEA 14 (1928), 226-34.

[3] P. Jouguet, "Les destinées de l'hellénisme dans l'Égypte grèco-romaine", CE 19 (1935), 89-108.

[4] C. Préaux, "Esquisse d'une histoire des revolutions egyptiennes sous les Lagids", CE 22 (1936), 522.

ings will enable us to grasp the forces that caused the disintegration of the Ptolemaic dynasty.

Is it possible to trace accurately the conflict between the Ptolemaic rulers and the native Egyptians? This is a rather difficult undertaking because of the scarcity and the perplexity of the available sources. Polybius and Diodorus have maintained that the primary function of those insurrections was to establish equilibrium in the international politics of the Eastern Mediterranean world.[1] In addition to the account given by these historians we have the testimony of epigraphic and papyrological records that shed new light on the nature and character of the Egyptian uprisings. It is the hieroglyphic, demotic, or the Greek sources that disclose the official version of the events.[2]

The explanation generally given is that these struggles were the manifestation of national aspiration. Latent Egyptian national longings which had long been dormant in the traditions of the priesthood of the old religion seem to have been awakened. Also in isolated prophecies of the Egyptian clergy of the second century the dream of a national king with Memphis as his capital found a belated

---

[1] Préaux, loc.cit., Cf. infra, pp. 72 ff.

[2] Préaux, op.cit., pp. 522-3.

reappearance. Under Ptolemy III the Oracle of the Potter[1] speaks undisguisedly of the "coast town" yielding its pre-eminence and of the return thither of the Good Genius. Whether these revolts reflect an active nationalistic feeling or not, one thing is certain: they were the most important phenomena of Egyptian anti-Hellenism.[2] Egyptian nationalism was made up of a complex of forces intended to preserve religion, restore native kingship, and expel the foreign oppressor. To accomplish that it was necessary to overthrow the ruling dynasty whose power was supported by a corrupted military and civil elite class, polluting the land and exploiting the native population.

A study of the Egyptian insurrections might provide us with an answer concerning the object, development, and outcome of these rebellions.

The first native uprising that coincided with the brief apogee of the Ptolemaic power may have broken out during the reign of Euergetes I about 245 B.C.[3] Our sources

---

[1]For the "Oracle of the Potter" see R. Reitzenstein and H.H. Schraeder, Studien zum antiken synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland (Berlin, 1926), pp. 39-41. The document is in Greek.

[2]Special literature for the native revolts includes: Westermann, op.cit., pp. 270-89; the articles by Milne, loc.cit., and Préaux, op.cit., pp. 522-552; M. Alliot, "La fin de la resistance egyptienne dans le sud sons l'Epiphane", Rev. des Et. Anc. 54 (1952), 18-26.

[3]Préaux, op.cit., p. 523; W. Tarn, CAH VII, p. 717.

call this revolt a "domestic sedition".[1] Justin[2] states that Ptolemy would have occupied the whole of the Selucid kingdom had he not been called back to Egypt by this domestic revolt. Neither the contemporary evidence nor any allusion from Polybius, our best authority for this period, confirm Justin's statement. Since our sources are silent we have to rely on speculation. It might have been a palace coup d'etat, a revolt of the Greeks in Alexandria or an uprising of the Egyptians in the chora. Mlle. Preaux,[3] who has made a careful and detailed investigation of the Egyptian revolts is rather sceptical about the motives of this uprising during the reign of Evergetes I. Neither can we rely on the Oracle of Potter--a Greek document that discloses an anti-Hellenic hostility on the part of the natives--for the concrete motives of this revolt, nor can we admit that the king designated by the prophecy was Evergetes I.

The obscure uprising of 245 B.C. was followed by

---

[1]A commentary on a passage of Daniel (XI. 7-9) written by Saint Jerome, taken from an older work in which Porphyry had treated the book of Daniel and explained its historical background. Saint Jerome's commentary is as follows: "Berenice being murdered... her brother Euergetes succeeded as the third king..., and entered Syria... And when he heard that in Egypt a sedition was in progress..." This passage is cited by Bevan, op.cit., p. 194. See also Justin Epitome XXVII. I. 5ff.

[2]Justin, loc.cit.

[3]Préaux, loc.cit.

the battle of Raphia in 217 B.C., an event of outstanding significance in Egyptian history and of great consequence to the Ptolemaic regime and Hellenism in Egypt. Ptolemy IV with the help of Egyptian machimoi won the battle against Antiochus III, but it was a Pyrrhic victory for Egyptian Hellenism and the Ptolemaic dynasty. Ptolemy, having to make preparations to withstand an invasion of Egypt by his Seleucid rival Antiochus III, was forced to enroll a large number of Egyptians, arming and training them in the Macedonian manner.

Jouguet states that "by an innovation which was to have important consequences, a Macedonian phalanx had been made up of Lybian and, above all, Egyptian subjects, largely recruited from the mass of the natives outside the warrior class."[1] These men played a substantial role in winning victory for the Ptolemies at Raphia in 217 B.C.

The Battle of Raphia hastened the de-Hellenization process and compelled the later kings of the Ptolemaic dynasty to pursue an Egyptianizing policy and make widespread concessions to the native population. After the

---

[1]Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, p. 214.

[2]Polybius, V. 107, 2-4.

battle of Raphia Ptolemaic Egypt was on the verge of a whole series of native uprisings, long, hard-fought, and vicious, rather like the guerilla operations of the Maccabees, different only in that the Egyptians failed to achieve independence. The Egyptians who fought so successfully in the phalanx at the battle of Raphia, fought with a more astonishing tenacity in their revolt which immediately followed.

Rendered confident by their share in the triumph, and utilizing their new military abilities, the Egyptians, Polybius[1] states, were looking for a ruler who would emancipate them from the Macedonian dynasts. This sounds as if they had been inspired by the Demotic Chronicle which speaks of a Heracleopolite who should rule after the foreigners and Ionians. It was not for nothing, Rostovtzeff says, that "the appearance of these prophecies coincided with active opposition on the part of the native population and with insurrections,"[2] All this indicates that the

---

[1]Polybius, V. 107, 2-4: Ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς καθοπλίσας τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίοχον πόλεμον πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν ἐνδεχομένως ἐθουλεύσατο, τοῦ δὲ μέλλοντος ἠστόχησε· φρονιματισθέντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ Ῥαφίαν προτερήματος... ἐζήτουν ἡγεμόνα... ὅ τ' καὶ τέλος ἐποίησαν, οὐ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον.

[2]Rostovtzeff, CAH VII, p. 115.

Egyptians never accepted the Ptolemaic rule and never settled down to be loyal subjects. The uprising was long and terrible and soon spread throughout Egypt. Polybius,[1] our chief authority, gives a short description of the war. He explains it as a national insurrection of the natives, proud of their victory, against foreign domination. The little we know of this conflict from our sources shows that it was not a regular war but a long-drawn-out affair, guerilla warfare creating misery throughout this or that district. This uprising was a chaotic rebellion of the natives all over Egypt, an outbreak of despair and pillage directed not only against the Ptolemaic monarchs but against all the oppressors of the people, including some of the temples. On the whole it seemed to be a serious menace to Hellenism itself, so serious that both Philip V of Macedon and the Seleudid ruler Antiochus III offered aid to Philopater to suppress it.[2] The extreme gravity of these events led the ruling regime to make changes in policy toward native Egyptians. There were concessions--military, religious, economic, and social. Ptolemy greatly extended

---

[1]Polybius V. 107 and XIV. 12. 3-5. See also Preaux, op.cit., p. 526; W.W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, (3rd ed., 1952), 22-3; Bevan, op.cit., pp. 239-40. A trilingual stele, found at Tell el-Mashkoutah (Pithon) in 1924, records a decree of the synod of priests gathered at Memphis and is dated 15 Nov. 217 B.C. This decree gives valuable additional information about Raphia and defines its chronology. See F.W. WalBank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, I. (Oxford: 1957), p. 611.

[2]Polybius XV. 20:1.

powers and privileges in an attempt to gain the support of the clergy, and re-created military aristocracies of Egypt. But in the last analysis the reforms were limited.[1]

Ptolemy V was crowned in Egyptian fashion at Memphis, which became the second royal residence. He took the title Epiphanes Eucharistos, whose hieroglyphic equivalents signified "The God who Cometh Forth" and "Lord of Beauties".

Nock[2] suggests that the title was taken by Ptolemy V at his coming of age "ἀνακλητήριος" in 197, which was followed by his coronation at Memphis in Egyptian style on November 26. It has been held that this Ptolemaic practice of giving a characteristic and personal epithet to the individual ruler is something quite different from Pharaonic nomenclature, but Nock suggests that the "epithets" ἐπιφανὴς and εὐχάριστος are older Egyptian epithets. In the meantime a new uprising broke out and was finally put down in 185 B.C. when Ptolemy V captured the town of Lykopolis after a siege. Diodorus says this rebellion nearly cost Ptolemy his throne.[3]

---

[1]The concessions are known from the Rosetta Decree: OGIS 90; Modern literature includes: Bevan, op.cit., pp. 261-65; M.I. Rostovtzeff, SEHHW, II, p. 707; Tarn, op.cit., pp. 205-6.

[2]A.D. Nock, "Notes on Ruler-Cult", JHS 48 (1928), 39 or Bevan, op.cit., p. 260.

[3]Diodorus XXVIII. 14.1; Polybius XXII. 17. 1-5; P. Teb. 919, 920. Modern literature: Preaux, op.cit., pp. 531-33; Rostrotzeff, op.cit., p. 715; M. Holleaux, CAH VIII. 187-8; M. Alliot, loc.cit.

During the reign of Philometer a civil war was fomented by Dionysios. Petoserapis,[1] a native who had been esteemed for his military talents. This revolt had repercussions in Memphis, the Fayum area, and even in the Thebaid. The native outbreaks which began in 216 culminated in the great revolt under Ptolemy V and continued spasmodically throughout the century. Under Soter II Thebes was taken, looted, and partially destroyed.[2]

Our papyrological documents reveal that during this period peasants continued to withhold their loyalty from the Pharaohs in a new way--by mass refusal to work. The royal peasants of Tebtunis[3] refused to carry on the irrigation work because of some judicial action carried out in violation of provisions laid down by the government. Westermann[4] maintains that ἀναχώρησις (flight or going up to the temple) and ἐκχώρησις (the going out, presumably from the nome) were the most outstanding concessions that the Ptolemaic regime had granted to the natives. The former was connected with the right of asylum, granted by the

---

[1]Diodorus XXXI. 15a. The name means "The one that Sarapis has given" and follows an old formula. This might have some bearing on the acceptance of the Sarapis cult by natives.

[2]P. Jouguet, op. cit., p. 336.

[3]P. TeB. III. 1, 707 (118 B.C.)

[4]Westermann, "The Ptolemies and the Welfare of their Subjects," AHR 43(1938), 276.

Ptolemaic government to the temples of the native gods.

Thus, it seems that the ἀναχώρησις was a group protest against injustice or pressure from administrative officials. The ἐκχώρησις Westerman says, was a walk of workers from their idia--their own place--into another nome.[1]

It appears that those two institutions were not a manifestation of a benevolent paternalism on the part of the Ptolemaic regime, as Westermann holds, but a collective complaint on the part of the oppressed peasantry against the exploitation and injustice of the administrative officials.[2]

Though the Egyptians emerged defeated from a conflict of more than a century, the Ptolemies found themselves compelled to make concessions, probably to the warrior class and the clergy who had been, as Jouguet puts it, "the soul of the revolt."[3]

There is much evidence to illustrate the native revival after 200, and the Egyptianizing policy of the Ptolemaic rulers. No more estates were conferred upon Greek officials; many new asylums came into being and old ones were reinstated.

---

[1]Westermann, loc.cit.

[2]Ibid., p. 277. Such a phenomenon hardly seems possible; no government would allow a mass exodus from one nome to another. This might have been the right to strike.

[3]Jouguet, loc.cit.

We see that Philopater and his diadochoi, despite some attempt at reaction, tended more and more to convert their rule into a national Egyptian monarchy. Tarn asserts that after Raphia the Egyptian military class, the machimoi, was revived and the size of its holding was increased. The Greek cleruchs began to be called κάτοικοι for distinction.[1] Already in the second century we hear of an Egyptian Paos with the titles "Kinsman and General of the Thebaid."[2]

In 215 a Greek and a native were joint tenants in a lease.[3] After 200 racial assimilation began and names ceased to be the criterion of race as some natives obtained Greek names and some Greeks were egyptianized.

Tarn holds[4] that a new mixed race formed intermediate between Greeks and natives, and Hellene came to signify a man with some Greek culture. It is perhaps due to this new class that Egypt in her final conflict with Rome would never be divided.

It can thus be seen that while race mixture and assimilation caused a certain amount of Hellenization among

---

[1] Tarn, op. cit., p. 206.

[2] OGIS: 132.

[3] P. Frankf. 2, cited by Tarn, loc. cit.

[4] Tarn, op. cit., p. 207 or Bell, "Hellenic Culture in Egypt", JEA 8 (1922), 146. Perhaps the weakening of Greek family organization is attested by the appearance of marriages without ἔκδοσις of the bride (συγγραφὴ ὁμολογίας). See Tarn, op. cit., p. 207, no. 1 or H. J. Wolff, Written and unwritten marriages in Hellenistic and Post-classical Roman Law, 1939, esp. ch. I.

the natives, it inevitably brought about a de-Hellenization of the Greeks living in the chora.* The Egyptianized Greek adopted native religion[1] and customs. Egyptian literature began to propagate the overthrow of the Greek regime and the downfall of the hated Alexandria.[2]

Tarn has arrived at the outstanding conclusion that what the Ptolemies had brought to Egypt was not the spirit of Hellas, but only external forms. By the first century Hellenism had lost its vigor and integrity and the Roman conquerors had to save what remained of it, nurse the Greek element, foster the gymnasia, and again diminish the re-acquired power of the clerical aristocracy.[3]

We may sum up by stating that this long-continued warfare sapped the power of the ruling oikos. From the Egyptian point of view these revolts were crowned with partial success and furthered the Egyptianization of the Greeks living in Egypt. It must be noted here that this warfare was directed against a specifically foreign regime which had usurped the native kingship.

---

*The writer of a papyrus letter written in the second century B.C. speaks of her son learning Egyptian as a means of financial betterment. (P. Lond. i, p. 48, no. 43, cited by H. Bell, Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest, p. 38, n. 8.

[1] OGIS III, 130, 175, and Bell, "Popular Religion in Graeco-Roman Egypt", JEA 34 (1948), 82.

[2] In the Potter's Oracle col. II 1.2 the overthrow of Alexandria is prophesied. See p. 69, n. 1 supra for reference.

[3] Tarn, loc. cit.

We may now begin a more careful investigation of the causes of the Egyptian opposition to Hellenism, and determine its relationships to the classes that made up the Egyptian social structure. We have seen that the establishment of a foreign dynasty in Egypt resulted in the overthrow of native kingship and a widespread political and social upheaval all over the country. The military uprisings, riots, guerilla warfare, and anachoresis were the expression of the native resistance to Hellenic imperialism.

The first Ptolemaic institution that became the object of Egyptian reaction was Ptolemaic kingship. Occupation of the throne of Egypt by an alien king was an attack on the gods of Egypt who were incarnate in the person of the ruling Pharaoh. Macedonian imperialism not only meant the abolition of native rule and interruption of cosmic kingship, but also endangered the prestige, rank, and authority of the indigenous aristocracies.

The ruling Ptolemy might have been never regarded by the Egyptians as their king. The memory of the dethroned god-king and the dream of a restoration of the traditional kingship by a native was reflected in the anti-Hellenic literature of the Egyptians.

Antagonistic religious literature became extremely violent during the era of Ptolemaic rule in Egypt.

It advocated the overthrow of the Ptolemaic regime and the restoration of native kingship.[1] The anti-Hellenic spirit of the Egyptians is depicted in the prophecies of the Demotic Chronicle and the Oracle of the Potter which coincided with the native uprising in 217 B.C. Both documents prophesy the expulsion of the Ptolemaic dynasty. The Demotic Chronicle[2] has survived in Egyptian on a papyrus, though both the beginning and the end of the document are lost. The papyrus is a palimpsest with both Greek and Demotic of the early Ptolemaic epoch, so that its date can be fixed with some accuracy either in the reign of Ptolemy II or, more likely, in the reign of Euergetes I (246-221). It is said to have been found in the Necropolis at Memphis. This would have been a likely place for someone to have an anti-Macedonian document because the prophecies of Nectanebo's return were linked with Memphis, and therefore probably originated there. As for the Potter's Oracle, it is likely to have come from Heracleopolis, from among the clergy of the gods worshipped there.

---

[1]The texts that display an anti-Hellenic spirit are the "Sesostris Legend" in Diodorus i. 17. 1, 5-6, 8; the "Osiris Legend", ibid., i. 56. 1-6; Dem. Chron. iv. 8-11, 17-21; Oracle of the Potter: P. Rainer i. 8-9; ii. 8-10; P. Oxy. i. 19-20; iii. 66-72, cited by Eddy, op.cit., p. 303, n. 15.

[2]The Demotic Chronicle is P. Dem. Paris 215: Notices et extraits des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliotheque Imperiale (ed. W. Burnet de Presle, Paris, 1865). The Demotic Chronicle is an Egyptian document; it is critically discussed and translated into German by W. Spiegelberg, Die sogennante demotische Chronik (1914), cited by Eddy, op.cit., p. 291, n. 60.

The oracle would appear to be a revelation granted by the god Thoth.[1] The prophecy deals primarily with the reestablishment of native royalty. The prophet looks forward to the time when a man of Heracleopolis will expell the Ionians, rule over them, and establish native kingship, law, and custom. The Oracle of the Potter, of which we have fragments in some tattered papyri of the second and third centuries A.D., may be taken as displaying the hopes of Egyptian nationalism under the Ptolemaic regime.[2] It reflects a strong spirit of anti-Hellenism, describes the Egyptian state as a society of chaos and disorder, curses the hated Alexandria, and prophesies the resumption of native holy rites and the coming of a king sent by Re and established by Isis. The papyri are too fragmentary as Bevan maintains to yield a connected story, but one can make out that days of oppression and misery are prophesied under foreign enemies who are called Zonophoroi, the "girdle wearers", probably the Persians. Then the Savior-king, by whom the city of the Zonophoroi shall be laid waste and the holy things brought back to Egypt, arises.[3]

---

[1] Eddy, loc.cit.

[2] Bevan, op.cit., p. 240.

[3] Reitzenstein, loc.cit. See also: Tarn, op.cit., p. 228; Rostovtzeff, CAH VII, p. 115; Preaux, op.cit., p. 525. It is interesting to point out that the concept of national salvation by a Savior-king was common in other Hellenistic apocalyptic works such as in the Book of Daniel. Daniel 7 is a prophecy dealing with the overthrow of a fourth

The essential idea of the Oracle of the Potter is rather similar to that of the Demotic Chronicle, and both predict the collapse of Greek rule in Egypt. Both disclose a hostility to those who have interrupted the native dynasty, exploited the natives, and brought about a political and social upheaval. Both apocalyptic documents lament the current crisis. Where is the Pharaoh, to set things right? The forces of chaos, the Greeks, are in the ascendency, and there is no Egyptian king on Egypt's throne.[1]

Thus we may come to the conclusion that anti-Hellenic literature played an active role in stirring Egyptian nationalism. The native Savior-king was the spiritualization of previous historic kingship. In the pharaonic epoch the kings were held to be the source of good, even of life itself. Ramses IV, for example, was hailed at his accession as the bringer of joy to heaven and earth.[2] The hungry were fed, the naked were clothed, and the imprisoned were set free. The Hellenistic Savior-god-king

---

human monarchy, the Macedonian, which had followed the earlier Assyrian, Median, and Persian empires. It looks forward to the establishment of a divine monarchy under the kingship of a Yahweh-sent messiah. Daniel 9 predicts the destruction of the Hellenizing party. Daniel 10-12 contains a long prophecy of the end of the Seleucid kingdom and Antiochus IV. On Daniel 7-12 see O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in Das Alte Testament (Tubingen, 1934), pp. 574-6; on Daniel in general, J.A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (New York, 1927); R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament 2nd ed. (New York, 1948), pp. 755-68.

[1] Eddy, op. cit., p. 294.

[2] J.A. Wilson, "Joy at the Accession of Ramses IV", ANET (ed. J.B. Pritchard, Princeton, 1950), pp. 378-9.

would transform nature upon his arrival. To a demoted clergy, a curtailed aristocracy, or an oppressed peasantry, nature had been reversed by the Ptolemaic imperialists. The coming of a national king would bring order and social justice, and amaliorate the hard conditions faced by the poverty-ridden Egyptians. Anti-Hellenic religious literature, therefore, widened the gulf between Hellene and Egyptian and created a hostile spirit to the Ptolemaic monarchy which had overthrown and oppressed native kingship.

Oppression of the peasantry by the Ptolemaic regime was one of the major factors in Egyptian anti-Hellenism. Hellenistic anti-Hellenic literature explains economic hardship as a grievance against the Ptolemies, either proclaiming that under the Pharaonic rule the Peasants had been taken care of or prophesying that the coming savior would vindicate and drive out the enemy, end the oppression, and feed the suffering masses.[1]

It seems evident that the resistance of the peasantry was not directed against the Ptolemaic system itself, but against the corruption and hard practices of the administrative elite. It is true that the system of state capitalism

---

[1] Eddy, op. cit., p. 303.

of the Ptolemaic rulers was taken over from pharaonic practice and was perfected by the Ptolemaic monarchs with their application of new ideas, techniques, and practices. The peasants had become accustomed to hardship during the previous epochs, but the increasing demands of the Ptolemaic administration converted the system into an unbearable burden. The growing demands of warfare on the Ptolemies in the second half of the third century, and the corruption and arrogance of the governmental officials, those with a colonial mentality, aroused the hatred and animosity of the peasants. The natives must have felt themselves despoiled. They were subject not only to a foreign ruling oikos, but a whole new race which expanded and insinuated itself throughout the country. Discontent must have smoldered for a long time, and we hear of disorders as early as the beginning of the reign of Euergetes.[1]

Rostovtzeff,[2] in support of the argument that the unfair and unjust management of the various branches of administration was one of the leading motives for Egyptian

---

[1] On the Hellenization of the Egyptian Economy and the role of the Egyptian peasantry, cf. C. Preaux, L'Economie royale des Lagids (1939); M.I. Rostortzeff, "Foundations of Social and Economic Life in Hellnistic Egypt", JEA 6 (1920), 161-78; W.L. Westermann, "The Greek Exploitation of Egypt", Classical Weekly 20 (1926) 3-6, 10-4; (the source is not accessible to me).

[2] M.I. Rostovtzeff, SEHHW, 11, pp. 709-10.

anti-Hellenism, has shown that the officials, responsible to the government in property and person, exerted pressure on the workers: We are in possession of a series of measures in the φιλάνθρωπα of Euergetes II,[1] which are based on the enumeration of the grievances and complaints of the λαοί : They are as follows:

1) Governors of the nomes and other officials collected payments from the λαοί for their own private benefit:

2) The working classes suffered a terrible scourge in the σταθμοί or billeting of soldiers in their dwellings, a burden from which they were exempt by law:

3) Royal officials customarily compelled the natives to render private services:

4) Officers would arrest persons for the purpose of extorting payment of private debts:

5) Collectors of rents would confiscate the property of the λαοί :

It is evident from the φιλάνθρωπα that the greatest evil from which Egypt was suffering lay in the corruption, dishonesty, and arbitrary acts of Ptolemaic officialdom:

Complaints may not have occurred under the reign

---

[1] The φιλάνθρωπα of Euergetes II are proclamations of peace or grants of amnesty. See Rostovtzeff, ibid., pp. 873-882; 885, 887, 888, 890, 897 ff.

of Ptolemy II; but in the second century, Tarn[1] holds, the bureaucracy broke down in the mass of abuses, until Ptolemy Euergetes II reformed it and made it last another century.

Westermann[2] asserts that institutions of ἀναχώρησις, ἐκχώρησις and πίστις[3] were expressions of the Ptolemies' concern for their subjects and not manifestations of oppression and injustice.

The increased austerity which resulted from the system of detailed control over the life of the population, combined with the nationalisation of production and exchange, was an unbearable burden for the natives and caused intense discontent. Further, as has been mentioned above, the system necessitated giving officials an exaggerated role in affairs; their abuses and arbitrary action aroused a spirit of anti-Hellenism among the natives.

Our papyrological evidence shows explicitly that anti-Hellenism was not directed against the ruler but against the royal functionaries.[4] They arrogated to themselves

---

[1]W.W. Tarn, "Ptolemy II", JEA XIV (1928), 254.

[2]W.L. Westermann, "The Ptolemies and the Welfare of their Subjects", AHR, 43 (1938), p. 278-9.

[3]The purpose of πίστις was to restore to individual royal peasants their freedom of movement at periods critical for the economic life of Egypt. It was granted in the form of letter of safe conduct. See Westermann, loc.cit.

[4]For the corruption of bureaucracy see: Polybius XVI. 21.1; Pap. TeB. 5 Sel. Pap. II, no. 20; Rostovtzeff, SEHHW, I. 414, II. 893-4; 912; Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, pp. 200-4.

real feudal prerogatives.

Consequently, the lot of the peasant was most unhappy. The peasants performed the most disagreeable and unpleasant work. No wonder the Demotic Chronicle and the Oracle of the Potter promised the expulsion of the Ptolemaic overlords and the alleviation of the sufferings of the peasants.

Agatharchides, who described the Nubian gold fields, gives an account of the harsh and appalling conditions existing in the royal mines. He describes the institution of mining as inhuman and depicts the conditions of the laboring peasants as intolerable.[1]

A study by M. Hombert and C. Preaux indicates that the average life expectancy in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt was 23.18 years, whereas the average length of life in the ancient world as a whole was between 31 and 32 years.[2] This study plainly shows the hard conditions prevailing in Ptolemaic Egypt, and one must recall that the Oracle of the Potter laments the misery and chaos of the chora existing under the Macedonian despots.

---

[1]Agatharchides=Diod. III. 12.1-14.15.

[2]M. Hombert and C. Préaux, "Note sur la durée de la vie dans l'Égypte grèco-romaine", CE 20 (1945), 139-46. However, one must not disregard disease, and climate as possible factors affecting life expectancy of Hellenistic peasants.

The Ptolemaic regime seems to have been aware of the abuses of the bureaucratic class and to have endeavored to deal with them. A series of royal ordinances in the reign of Euergetes is important evidence that discloses a real royal concern to prevent dishonest and inhumane practices.

We may infer that the economic exploitation of the peasantry by the ruling regime was contrary to the traditional Egyptian principles of social justice. Exploitation of the natives aroused hostility to the European despots and a yearning for the restoration of native rule.

The Egyptian clergy played a substantial role in organizing and leading the native resistance, in both its literary and militant aspects. Only some sort of unity of determination and coordination could make possible the military outbreaks of 217 and 163 B.C. The compromise between the Ptolemies and the priestly caste that followed the native uprisings may be regarded as evidence that some members of the clergy participated in the opposition to Hellenism.[1]

The power of the priestly aristocracy was early

---

[1]For pre-Hellenistic relationship between the king and the priest see: J.A. Wilson, The Culture of Ancient Egypt, pp. 88-9, 175, 184-6, 206-35, 288. For the Hellenistic age: Diod. i. 73. 2-3; StraBo xvii. 1. 3-5.

diminished by the Ptolemaic monarchs. The king took the temple lands, caused all priests to come to the royal capital to celebrate his anniversary, and deprived them of their lucrative monopolies of oil and flax. Not only did he administer, through his officials, the lands of the temples, but he made sacerdotal appointments. The administration of the temples was under the authority of the ἐπιστάτης who held the office for life. The priests could hold meetings (synods) at Canopos or Memphis, but apparently only to regulate religious matters, and it was the Ptolemaic ruler who determined their competence.[1] Thus, we can see that the power of the priesthood was kept severely under control.

The ruling royal oikos did make some effort to collabroate with the priestly caste. Most temples remained rather wealthy throughout the period. Tarn[2] holds that the Ptolemies tried not to offend the religious susceptibilities of the natives by patronizing the Egyptian religion, providing endowments and constructing temples for native gods at various sites. In some cases the Ptolemies diverted old temple revenues to new state cults, as happened in the Arsinoite nome.[3] This might explain why Strabo found a

---

[1] P. Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, pp. 310-12.

[2] Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, p. 201.

[3] P. Revenue Laws, col. xxxvi.

few of the old temples in poor condition when he visited Heliopolis.[1]

The temples were the principal centers of the Egyptian civilization in the Pharaonic epoch. The priests formed a powerful hereditary class. They had an impressive hierarchical organization, made up of the High Priests, the Prophet, the Stolistai, the Pterophoroi and the Hierogrammateis.[2] These persons, therefore, had a common tradition of ideology and leadership indispensable for undertaking and organizing resistance. Furthermore, the temples commanded the allegiance of the Egyptian machimoi. This is affirmed by papyrological evidence.[3]

No concrete information is available to trace priestly participation in the native insurrections, but relying on hypothesis, we can assume that the temples formed the framework of Egyptian resistance to Hellenism. We have seen that Hellenistic Egyptian literature is full of an anti-Hellenic spirit. It is possible that the authors of the Demotic Chronicle were the priests of Harsaphes[4] at

---

[1]Strabo, xvii. 1. 27-9.

[2]Jouguet, op.cit., p. 311. Priests who dressed the gods in the temples; Wing Bearers; Sacred Scribes.

[3]C. Préaux, "Les Égyptiens dans la civilization hellénistique", CE (35 (1943), 148-60, discusses the priestly families.

[4]Cited by Eddy, op.cit., p.

Heracleopolis, for the Chronicle mentions that a god and a Heracleopolitan would rule over Egypt and overthrow the foreign dynasty. This city had been outstanding during the Pharaonic era and Manethon[1] states that Heracleopolitan dynasties had once ruled over Egypt. The papyrus with the Demotic Chronicle written on it is said to have come from Memphis[2] and it is possible that the priesthood of the old Egyptian capital may have played an active part in the national resistance. We can also surmise that Heliopolis, the center of worship of Re, may have been the place where the Oracle of the Potter was written, because it prophesied that Re would send a king who would retaliate against the Ptolemaic rule and thus restore the native kingship.[3] Whether the clergy of Thebes[4] played a substantial role in the native reaction or not, is doubtful due to the lack of epigraphic and papyrological testimony.

The power of the priesthoods, kept severely in check by the early Ptolemies, grew steadily; the right of asylum was extended to temple after temple, and the priestly caste

---

[1]The real history of the IXth and Xth Dynasties in Wilson, op.cit., pp. 105-7. The Hellenistic interpretation in Manetho (Jacoby FGH 609, frag. 2-3. 10).

[2]Eddy, op.cit., p. 317.

[3]Reitzenstein, op.cit., p. 40.

[4]A. Battaille, "Thèbes grèco-romaine", CE 52 (1951), 325-53.

became once more a formidable power in the state. The ruling oikos granted sums of money to the priests in the style of the ancient Pharaohs. The growing cooperation between the native clergy and the crown is attested by the trilingual Pithon Decree[1] written by one of the synods of clergy after the victory of Raphia. The hieroglyphic and Greek versions of the decree are very much mutilated and only the demotic part is saved. Written in the traditional style, it celebrates the irresistible Pharaoh Ptolemy IV for his triumph over Antiochus III. Philopater on his part stated his concern for the welfare of the temples and granted new endowments. The Rosetta Decree[2] of 196 displays a rapprochement between the crown and the priesthood. The native clergy congratulated the young king on having punished the rebels who "under the reign of his father had attacked and pillaged the temples."[3] Furthermore, the coronation of Ptolemy V at Memphis shows a new orientation of the royal house towards the priestly class and the loyalty and willingness of the clergy to collaborate with the ruling regime. This growing together between the throne and the

---

[1]See p. 72, n. 1 supra.

[2]OGIS 90.

[3]Ibid., cited by Préaux, op.cit., p. 529.

altar helped in the assimilation of Greek and Egyptian and further weakened the influence of Hellenism. Summing up, we can conclude that the Egyptian clergy comprised two categories: those who made up the priestly elite and became pro-Ptolemaic because they were dependent on the crown for their rights, privileges, and incomes; and those of the lower ranks who tended to support the rebels in their resistance to Hellenism and the ruling dynasty.[1]

Thus it would appear from this survey of the social classes in Egypt that the anti-Hellenic movement was recruited by certain priests and by remnants of the old military nobility from part of the Egyptian proletariat. Hatred of the ruling bureaucracy came from the aristocracies of those regions, both the warrior class which was dishonored by defeat and its loss of power, and the priestly caste. There was a sharp distinction between the owning, ruling class and the demoted feudal and priestly aristocracies. The Greek regime confiscated their estates, turned out the hereditary owners and replaced them with Greeks and Macedonians.

The movement in time was also paralleled by Greek animosity, for some Greeks came to hate the ruling regime

---

[1]Eddy, op. cit., p. 320.

as much as the natives did. There was a strong flavor of class war in all this, as the literature, the riots, the flight of peasants, and the military outbreaks indicate. Of course allegiance to the Ptolemaic regime was also to be found in all these social strata.

Although the Macedonian dynasty emerged victorious and survived for another century, Hellenism itself weakened. "The externals of Hellenism, the Greek tongue, Greek law, modified of course by Egyptian custom and local conditions, Greek institutions so far as they could be adopted, some elements of Greek religion, Greek social life..., all these could be and were transplated to the new environment; but the spirit of Hellas, that mental freedom, that fulness of humanity, that exquisite balance, that fearless, cloudless facing of concrete reality, which are the glory of Hellas, could not but wither in such an atmosphere."[1]

The Egyptianizing policy of the late Ptolemies accelerated the process of de-Hellenization. In the last decade of its existence, the Ptolemaic dynasty tried to become Greco-Egyptian. This was an attempt to rally all groups possible for the defense of Egypt against the rising power of Rome. It was evident that the future of Egypt was not to be determined by the Ptolemaic monarchs, but by the Emperors of Rome.

---

[1]H.I. Bell, "Hellenic Culture in Egypt", JEA 8 (1922), 145-6.

CHAPTER III

THE CULT OF SARAPIS

A. The Genesis of the Cult of Sarapis

The various currents that promoted cosmopolitanism and the Hellenistic religious amalgam were in part the cause and, in their accelerated pace, the effect of Alexander's military conquests. Whatever Alexander's personal motivation might have been, he became the catalyst for the Hellenistic melting pot. Hellenism had a profound effect on the Oriental peoples. But it must not be supposed that the influence was one-sided. The Greek mind was bound to receive as well as to give. In nothing was it so obviously receptive as in religion, a realm in which it had always tended to feel and respond to Oriental influences.[1]

The Olympian religion was about to collapse; with the decay of the polis and the political disasters which had shaken the self-confidence of the Greeks came a craving for a more personal and redemptive religion. This was found

---

[1] H. Idris Bell, Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt (Liverpool, 1957), pp. 1-5. The author gives an excellent account of the "pagan amalgam" before the rise of the Hellenistic period.

in Oriental cults, to which the analytic and orderly Greek mind gave a coherence and a systematic formulation often previously lacking.

Intercourse between East and West had antecedents. From the very earliest time at which we can form any clear ideas of the Greek religion it was already a blend of diverse elements. Some of the gods display clear traces of their foreign origin, such as Dionysus, whose worship was derived by the Greeks from Thrace. Athene was a Mycenaean snake-deity, taken over by the Ionian settlers from the early inhabitants of Attica. "The religion of historic Greece was in fact a hotch-potch of many and diversified elements, some of them going back to the remotest times, but welded into a comparatively coherent system by the rationalizing Greek genius".[1] But during the Hellenistic era Greek and Oriental ways and beliefs were brought into a more intimate contact. Some Greeks became completely absorbed into the Oriental milieux, some Orientals into those of Greeks. Thus a new religious synthesis came into being, a new syncretistic phenomenon that became the most striking and unique feature of the Hellenistic religious pattern.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 6; R.W. Hutchinson, Prehistoric Crete (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1962), p. 209 states that Athena was an owl-goddess.

The reception of Egyptian cults by Greeks began prior to the conquests of Alexander. The worship of the Hellenized Ammon of Siwah, through the Greek cities of Cyrenaica no doubt came into Athens in the fourth century, though individual Athenians had visited the oracle in the fifth century.[1] The Egyptian deity Isis was worshipped by the Greek community at Naucratis,[2] and Greeks at Memphis had adopted the worship of the Osirified Apis under the name Osorapis.[3] Thus, Greeks settled in Egypt had developed intimate relations with certain Egyptian cults before the third century. From the death of Alexander to the beginning of the Ptolemaic regime, there is evidence of a growing acceptance of Egyptian cults by the Greeks and a consequent Hellenization of these cults. We have seen in the pages of Herodotus how the Greeks tended to identify the Egyptian divinities with their own. Satis and Anukis, the goddesses of the Cataract, became Hera and Hestia; the falcon Horus of Edfu, Apollo; Ammon-Ra Sother of Thebes, Zeus. At Tenturis, Hathor was Aphrodite; at Hermopolis, Thoth was Hermes. Very often, too, when they

---

[1] Plutarch Cimon 18.

[2] C.C. Edgar, "An Ionian Dedication to Isis", JHS XXIV (1904), 337.

[3] Wsir-Hp is the native Egyptian name for the Osirified Apis; Osorapis seems to be the earliest Greek form (cf. infra, p. 99, n. 3). Sarapis is the common Greek form though there is no satisfactory way of explaining the loss of the original initial W (= Greek O, Coptic ou: Osiris, Ousir).

used the Greek name they meant an Egyptian god, and sometimes both Egyptian names (in a Grecized form) and Greek names are given side by side.[1] Seleucus I and his son Antiochus I dedicated an Osiris cup to Apollo at Miletus.[2]

Of the four great Oriental religions which were developed during the Hellenistic epoch and were the outcome of the religious syncretism of the age, the religion of Isis and Sarapis is the one we can establish with greatest accuracy. We know very little of its form and character before the imperial period. One fact however is certain. The Egyptian worship that spread over the Mediterranean world sprang from the Serapeum erected at Alexandria by Ptolemy I, somewhat in the manner in which Judaism emanated from the temple of Jerusalem.[3]

The earliest history of the cult has become the object of a long controversy among scholars who assign various interpretations to its genesis.[4] Was Sarapis of native origin or an Asiatic importation? Did his name derive

---

[1] OGIS No. 111 (vol. 1, pp. 190 ff.). The Greek, however, did not cease to worship his own gods; even outside Alexandria, Ptolemais and Naucratis Zeus, Apollo, Demeter, Aphrodite, or any other deity could be worshipped with Greek rites at little temples, set up wherever any number of Greeks were living together in Egypt.

[2] OGIS No. 214 (vol. 1, pp. 325 ff.), or P. Roussel, Les cultes egyptiens a Delos (Paris, 1915/16), p. 244.

[3] Franz Cumont, Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, 4th ed. (Paris, 1929), p. 70.

[4] For the establishment of the cult of Sarapis see: P. Jouguet, Trois études sur l'Hellénisme, pp. 121-25; H.I. Bell, Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest (Oxford, 1948), pp. 38-9; E. Kiessling, "La genese du culte de Sarapis a Alexandrie", CB 48(1949), 317-23; A.D. Nock, Conversion (Oxford, 1933), pp. 38-9.

from the Chaldean deity Sar-Apsi, or from that of the Egyptian divinity Osiris-Apis?[1] Thus the question of the derivation of the cult requires special attention.

There is ample literary evidence for linking the creation of Sarapis to Ptolemy I. Tacitus[2] and Plutarch[3] both assign the cult at least to the reign of Soter, and literary evidence connects a knowledge of the cult with Nicocreon,[4] Timotheus,[5] Menander[6] and Demetrius of Phaleron.[7] The so-called 'lychnaption inscription'[8] from the Memphite Sarapeum which, according to Wilcken, refers to the worship of Sarapis, and a dedication[9] of the residents of Alexandria

---

[1]Cumont, loc.cit.

[2]Tacitus Histories 4.83. Tacitus' account that Ptolemy brought the statue of Sarapis from Sinope on the Black Sea is a legend. The temple of the mummified bulls near Memphis was called Sinopion, and it may be thought a confusion in the legend, when it makes the image of Sarapis brought from Sinope. See G. Roeder, Real Encyclopadie (IA, 1920, 2401).

[3]Plutarch Isis and Osiris 28.

[4]Macrobius Sat. 1.20.16.

[5]Plutarch loc.cit. Timotheus was one of Ptolemy I's theological advisors and the Athenian exegetes of the Blensinian cult.

[6]Menander who died in 292/1 B.C. called Sarapis a " ξενὸς θεός ". B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XV (1922), 164, no. 1803; O. Weinreich, Aegyptus xi (1931), 13ff.

[7]Diogenes Laertius V. 76.

[8]V. Wilcken, Urkunden der Ptolemaerzeit, (Berlin, 1927), I, pp. 34ff.

[9]OGIS No. 21 (vol. 1 p. 51).

with a new deme-name are the only non-literary records on the basis of which one may assume the origin of Sarapis to be linked to the reign of the first Ptolemy. Some calculations based upon the account given on the inscribed column discovered in the Sarapeum at Delos assign the introduction of the cult of Sarapis into the island to the reign of Soter, while others place the event in the next reign.[1] Hence, if we rely on the evidence provided by Tacitus and Plutarch as well as by the non-literary records we have to assign the foundation of the cult to Ptolemy Soter.

Statements that the cult-statue was procured by Ptolemy I from Sinope or elsewhere in Asia have led to a search for an Asiatic origin, and an attempt has been made to identify Sarapis with the Babylonian Shar-apsi;[2] but after the thorough investigation of the question by Wilcken[3] there seems to be no doubt that the new god was really a Hellenized form of the Egyptian Wsir-Hp. In Wilcken's

---

[1]Roussel, op.cit., pp. 71-75. W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization (3rd ed., London, 1952), p. 357 dates the introduction of the cult about 300 B.C.; Roussel, Rev. hist. et litt. Rel., VII, p. 33 thinks it at least as early as 260 B.C. Clement of Alexandria The Exhortation to the Greeks IV. p. 107 states that the image was, according to some, sent to Ptolemy II Philadelphus, but there is no doubt that it was Ptolemy I who introduced the cult.

[2]A recent study of the Babylonian origin of Sarapis is by Ruth Stiehl, "The Origin of the Cult of Sarapis", History of Religions, 3 (1963), p. 21-33.

[3]Wilcken, op.cit., pp. 77ff. The earliest Greek papyrus that justifies the Egyptian origin of the cult is the "Complaint of Artemisia", in which the vengence of the "Lord (σεσπότης) Oserapis" is called down upon a man

view sir-Ḥp was not believed to be merely a single Apis after death, but rather to be the embodiment of all the dead bulls from the beginning downwards. There is evidence of his worship in the neighborhood of Memphis,[1] even by Greeks before the appearance of Sarapis, and it seems that what Ptolemy did was to raise the prestige of this local deity and to represent him, in accordance with Greek conceptions, as a man of ideal beauty, like the Hellenic Zeus. It is not clear, however, at just what time the cult of Osorapis in Memphis was transformed into the cult of Sarapis. In the native language the God's name was always written Wsir-Ḥp, but at some time, early in the Ptolemaic era, the Greeks began to call the deity Sarapis.[2] One may assume, then, that the change in the name of the deity as well as the change in his character which made him a Greek god, coincided with the founding of the cult in Alexandria. Here again, we are unable to fix the date of the foundation of the cult in Alexandria. Hieronymus, according to Eusebius[3]

---

by whom she had had a daughter. (Ibid., pp. 97-104, no. 1). This document antidates Ptolemy I and is a proof that, even before Soter established a cult of Sarapis at Alexandria, the Osir-Hap of the Memphis Sarapeum was already a deity of prestige for the Greeks in Egypt.

[1]G.A. Cooke, North-Semitic Inscriptions (Oxford, 1903) no. 72 = CIS ii.123. See also P. Jouguet, "La Politique Interieure du Premier Ptolemee", Bull. Inst. Franc. Arch. Or., xxx, p. 535.

[2]Jouguet, op.cit., p. 532.

[3]Eusebius Werke, Die Chronik Des Hieronymus, ed. R. Helm (Berlin, 1946), p. 129, No. 28.

placed the event in 286. This date refers no doubt to the introduction of the cult image and the official institution of the cult in the Ptolemaic capital. Since these dates are apparently associated with the events mentioned in the traditional account given by Tacitus and Plutarch, the work of Timotheus and Manetho consisted in adapting the Memphite to its Alexandrian form.[1] The cult image of Bryaxis and the temple designed by Parmeniscus assured the new god a genuine Greek form and home.[2]

Another interesting theory is the one that identifies Sarapis with Helios.[3] This association goes to the famous image of Sarapis in Alexandria, of which Macrobius[4] says that Sarapis' Kerberos with his three heads is an emblem of Time in its stages of past, present and future. But it seems to me that Macrobius' allegorical exegesis is purely

---

[1]Plutarch Isis and Osiris 28 mentions the dream of Ptolemy I and his mission to Sinope which brought a cult statue from there. He continues that the statue brought to Egypt was inferred to be a representation of Pluto which the advisors of Ptolemy I, Timotheus and Manetho persuaded Ptolemy was Sarapis. Manetho, an Egyptian high-priest in Heliopolis, and Timotheus, the exegetes of the Eleusinian cult, had therefore something to do with organizing the cult. See also W. Kroll, Real Encyclopadie XIV (1928), 1062f., S.V. Manethon.

[2]Kiessling, op.cit., p. 332.

[3]R. Pettazzoni, "Sarapis and his Kerberos", Essays on the History of Religion (Leiden, 1954), pp. 164-170.

[4]Macrobius Sat. I.20.13, cited by Petazzoni, Ibid.

subjective, arising out of the speculative philosophic climate of his day. Macrobius went farther by associating Sarapis with the sun.[1] But the concept of Sarapis as a solar deity is older than Macrobius.[2] Thus, the intimate connection of Sarapis with the sun is not, as has been alleged, Greek in origin, but genuinely Egyptian.

The establishment of the cult of Sarapis has usually been thought of in its political aspect, and not adequately with regard to its religious importance. Ptolemy was not a dynast so emancipated from all the prejudices of his age as to look upon religion as nothing more than a means to justify his imperial ends. Whether Ptolemy used religion as an instrument for achieving his political aims or not, will be discussed later in this chapter.

If the solar exegesis of Sarapis in Macrobius' account is not the outcome of the philosophical tendencies of his time, we may conjecture that the notion of triceps as a symbol of time, may also have derived from the Egyptian

---

[1]Macrobius, ibid., I.20.17: Sarapis et solis unam et individuam esse naturam.

[2]Ἡλιοσάραπις is found in votive inscriptions: Sinope, " Θεῷ Ἡλιοσαράπει "; see D.M. Robinson, AJA IX (1905), 306, no. 30, cf. 303, no. 25, 323, no. 64. In religious syncretism Sarapis was identified with Zeus: " Εἷς Ζεὺς Σάραπις ". Cf: Weinreich, Neue Urkunden zur Sarapis-Religion (Tubingen, 1919), pp. 17 ff., 24 ff., cited by Pettazzoni, op.cit., p. 156, no. 10. Sarapis appears also under the triple name " Εἷς Ζεὺς Σάραπις Ἥλιος " in the Mithraeum of the Baths of Caracalla in Rome. Cf. Cumont, op.cit., p. 79. The above cited epigraphic material and Macrobius' references to Adonis, Attis, Osiris and Horus as solar deities (Sat. 1.21 passim), reduce the value of his testimony.

religious tradition. R. Pettazzoni[1] maintains that Macrobius' interpretation has a real basis in Alexandrian religion as linking itself to the eternity of the city. Basing himself on epigraphic material[2] he holds the view that during the Graeco-Roman period a cult of Aion[3] flourished in Alexandria. Sarapis, according to Macrobius, as a solar divinity is the natural guarantor of the duration of Alexandria in time because the sun is the lord of time.

A new theory has recently come into being concerning the institution of the cult of Sarapis. Welles, repudiating the traditional belief that the cult of Sarapis was established by Ptolemy Soter, has developed a new viewpoint

---

[1]Pettazzoni, loc.cit.

[2]The notion that Alexandria should have a patron deity is attested by an inscription of Chois (2nd century A.D.), cf. G.J. Milne, "Greek Inscriptions from Egypt", JHS XXI (1901), 275 ff., and an inscription of Koptos (3rd century A.D.). cf. Weigall, Annales du Service (1907), 49.

[3]In Pseudo-Callisthenes (I.30) it is mentioned that while Alexander was in Libya, asked the god Ammon to tell him where to build a city which will make his name "ἀθάνατον"; and he received the answer that his name would last "for ages, ever young and ever new" (αἰῶνα ἀγήρατον νεάζοντα), if he founded a city opposite the island Proteus where the god Aion Plutonius holds sway. Alexander sacrificed to the unknown god and an eagle snatched the entrails of the victim and brought them near an ancient shrine with obelisks bearing the name Sesostris (Ps. Callisthenes 1.33). This was no other god than the god Sarapis, who, revealing himself to Alexander in a dream, assured him that the city would endure to all eternity. (Ibid.). The above evidence is cited by Pettazzoni, op.cit., p. 168.

which attributes the creation of the cult to Alexander himself. Relying upon the testimony of Pseudo-Callisthenes, he is inclined to believe that Alexander's anabasis to the Ammonium was to receive instructions as to where and under what divine protection he should found his city.[1]

Thus, Welles holds that the foundation of Alexandria coincides with the genesis of the cult of Sarapis, and that the institution of the new deity should therefore be assigned to Alexander.

In order to comprehend his viewpoint, it is necessary to examine the sources which Welles cites for supporting his argument. First, he claims historical authenticity for the narrative of Pseudo-Callisthenes and states that Alexander had been at Racotis before he visited the temple of Ammon at the oasis of Siwah. Secondly, the action of Alexander in erecting a sanctuary of Sarapis in Alexandria is attested by the following literary and archaeological evidence; John Malalas,[2] a writer of the sixth century A.D., describing the foundation of Alexandria by Alexander, adds the following statement: "ἔκτισε καὶ ἱερὸν τῷ Σέραπι ἡλίῳ ". Another piece of information comes from the Lexicon of Suidas[3] who, defining Σάραπις as Σῆρον Ἄπιδος (Tomb of Apis) states:

---

[1] C. Bradford Welles, "The Discovery of the Cult of Sarapis and the Foundation of Alexandria", Historia XI (1962), 281.

[2] Ibid., p. 285. See also Glanville Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest (Princeton, New Jersey, 1961), pp. 38-40.

[3] Welles, loc.cit.

τούτου ναὸς ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐκτίσθη παμμεγέθης καὶ πάνυ λαμπρός. This "Yaós" might have been elsewhere, but to a later Greek the terms "παμμεγέθης and λαμπρός", would suggest the most magnificent of all Sarapeia of the Hellenistic world to be the one in Alexandria.[1] Another source linking Alexander to the Alexandrian Sarapeum revolves about the architect Parmenion.[2] This reference to the building activity of Parmenion or Parmenion-Parmeniscus has been confirmed by a long account in the archives of Zenon of Caunus dated in 243 B.C.[3] It is stated as follows: Ἐν τῷ Παρμενίσκου Σεραπείῳ. Arrian[4] also states that Alexander ἧκεν ἐς Μέμφιν καὶ θύει ἐκεῖ τοῖς τε ἄλλοις θεοῖς καὶ τῷ Ἄπιδι (Apis might have been Sarapis). But even though all this evidence associating Alexander with Sarapis has been discounted by several scholars, there is now available new

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] In the Latin translation of Ps. Callisthenes by Julius Valerius (about 300 A.D. and edited by B. Kuebber, 1888, I, 32) it is stated: "Tunc (after receipt of the dream oracle) Parmenioni architecto laborandi scilicet simulacra cura mandatur (by Alexander), ut ne illis Homeri versibus demutaret (referring to the inscription in Iliad I. 528, of Zeus nodding assent to Thetis). Et Parmenion quidem iussa complet, ipse non inhonorus hoc labore. Quippe templum etiam nunc Sarapion Parmenionis appellatur". In the earlier Greek version there is a change in the name: κελεύει ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ Παρμενίωνι ἀρχιτέκτονι ξόανον κατασκευάσαι δωμησάμενον τέμενος ἐμφερὲς τοῖς Ὁμηρικοῖς στίχοις, ... ὁ μὲν οὖν Παρμενίων κατεσκεύασε τὸ καλούμενον Παρμενίσκου Σαραπεῖον. See Welles, op.cit., pp. 285-87.

[3] P. Cairo Zenon, 59355, 102-103 and 128, cited by Welles, op.cit., p. 286, n. 77.

[4] Arrian III.1.4.

epigraphic testimony that may revolutionize our knowledge about Sarapis. This is an inscription[1] found in 1959 in Hyrcania southeast of the Caspian Sea. It is as follows:

Εὔανδρος Ἀνδραγόραι,
Ἀπολλοδότῳ χαίρειν.
ἀφήκαμεν Ἕρμαιον
ἐλεύθερον ὑπὲρ βασιλέως
Ἀντιόχου καὶ βασιλίσσης
Στρατονίκης καὶ ἐκγόνων
τέκνων Σαράπιος καὶ ἀνατεθείκαμεν
ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὴν ἄφεσιν αὐτοῦ εἰς (κ)αὶ
τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ.

] Γορπιαίου. Ἔρρωσθε[2]

The date of the inscription[3] falls within the reign of Ptolemy II during which period the worship of Sarapis had

---

[1]The inscription was discovered by R. Ghirshman and published with commentary by Louis Robert, Hellenica XI-XII (1960), 85-91.

[2]It is translated as follows: "Evander to Andragoras and Apollodotus, greeting. We have released Hermeus in freedom for the benefit of King Antiochus and Queen Stratonice and their children, sanctified to Sarapis, and we have deposited in the temple the document of his release of himself and of his possessions. (Year ?) Gorpiaeus. Farewell." Cf. Welles, op.cit., p. 290.

[3]Welles holds that undoubtedly the cult of Sarapis spread outside Egypt during the reign of the first Ptolemy. If we rely upon the testimony mentioned on p.98, nn. 8 and 9, we have to admit that the inscription is contemporary to Ptolemy II.

spread throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. The author points out that ties between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies were strained throughout this period. Nor were there any commercial relations between the two states, since their monetary systems were on different standards.

Therefore, if we accept the assumption that the Seleucid empire had very few connections with the West, and was mainly concerned with Asia, and since Hyrcania is a long way from the Mediterranean, there is a probability that the temple goes back to Alexander's time and belonged to one of his otherwise unknown civic foundations.

To sum up, B. Welles maintains that all the sources cited favor his interpretation and strongly suggest that the cult of Sarapis was set up by Alexander, rejecting any statement that the god was created by the Ptolemies.

So far, I have dealt with the conflicting theories over the establishment of the cult of Sarapis. The origin of the new deity has long been the subject of general statements and studies which have produced varying conclusions as to its genesis. I am inclined to believe that the two theories advocated by R. Pettazzoni and B. Welles, namely, the interpretation of Sarapis as a solar deity, and the view assigning the institution of the cult to Alexander himself, are unconvincing for two reasons. First, the notion that Sarapis was a sungod has already been rejected by modern scholars because it does not base itself on very

authentic testimony and is not convincing to modern historical sensibilities. The idea that Alexander instituted the Sarapis cult, though plausible, requires a very analytic examination, in order to decide on its objectivity. But such an analysis takes time, and the theory is very recent. Future examination will decide on its objectivity and acceptance. Consequently no final picture can be drawn and, after examining the available evidence, one is still left with the impression that there is more to be said on the subject.

The most convincing interpretation is the one that connects Sarapis with the Memphite Osorapis. The cult of Sarapis was a fabricated cult of the Hellenistic period. It seems clear that it was not of foreign importation, but a humanized and Hellenized form of the local god of Memphis, Osorapis. The new deity was an adaptation of the Egyptian religion to the spirit and needs of the Hellenistic epoch. As Kiessling[1] puts it, the Alexandrian Sarapis with his Hellenistic traits, was the old Memphite god Wsir-hp, Osiris-Apis. Ptolemy I Soter had this deity artificially synthesised out of native and Greek religious ideas and

---

[1]Kiessling, op.cit., p. 319.

ceremonies. Egypt contributed the Memphite god Osorapis, himself a blend of the Egyptian deities Osiris and Ptah manifest in the Apis Bull. These ingredients were mixed with concepts drawn from Greek mystery religion and brought to Egypt by the Eleusinian exegetes[1] Timotheus, who worked with Manetho to complete the whole.

Another piece of evidence that supports the Egyptian origin of the cult comes from the fact that the majority of the dedications to the Egyptian deities are to Sarapis and Isis together. This is easily understandable in view of the ultimately Osirian origins of Sarapis, and is indeed an added confirmation of that derivation, since it appears that Sarapis stood, in relation to Isis, in the Place of Osiris.[2]

B: The Political Function of the Cult and Its Rejection by the Egyptians

Having defined the new deity as the outcome of Ptolemaic endeavor, I must now turn to the motives that led to the creation of the new syncretistic cult.

---

[1] Exegetes (ἐξηγητής), an interpreter of expounder, usually of sacred love. At Eleusis there were three exegetai of (or from) the Eumolpidae. Cf. M. Cary, et.al., (ed.), "exegetes", Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford, 1949) p. 353.

[2] P.M. Fraser, "Two Studies on the Cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic World," Opuscula Atheniensia III (1960), 1-54; R. Merkelbach, Isisfeste in griechisch romischer Zeit: Daten und Riten (Meisenhein am Glan, 1963), pp. 46ff.

The explanation commonly given is that Ptolemy's object in founding the cult was to provide a meeting place for Greeks and Egyptians, and thus to create a bond of feeling between the intrusive Greek and the indigenous Egyptian element in the population of his usurped dominions.[1] It was a clever political idea to institute a Hellenized Egyptian religion in Alexandria, in which imperial unity could be found.

There has been little opposition to this view, save from Schubart,[2] who has pointed out that the Sarapis cult won its position without assistance from the state. But as Kiessling[3] has remarked, such an enterprise could only have been successful if the native population had expressed a religious sentiment through the mediation of the indigenous clergy. A.D. Nock[4] is not sure that ethnic unity was the purpose behind the creation of the god. He holds

---

[1]This opinion is held by all those scholars previously mentioned. p. 97, n. 4 supra. Fraser, op.cit., pp. 1-2 supports the view of the Osirian origin of Sarapis.

[2]W. Schubart, Einfuhrung in die Papyrsiskunde, p. 339, cited by Kiessling, op.cit., p. 318.

[3]Ibid.

[4]A.D. Nock, "The Roman Army and the Roman Religious Year," HTR 45(1952), 208-9.

that if any special appeal was intended, it was one directed to the Greek-speaking world as a whole and not to Egypt.

No certainty is possible since we are still uncertain regarding the nature of Greek and Egyptian elements of the cult. It is important to remember that the cult was primarily for the Greek or Hellenized section of the population. P.M. Fraser suggests that in creating Sarapis Ptolemy did not have in mind the Egyptian population at all, but aimed at giving the Greek population of Egypt and particularly of Alexandria a patron deity which was otherwise lacking. The intrusive Greek element no matter where it came from, brought with it the worship of the Olympian divinities, but left behind it the particular deities of its own cities. Thus, Sarapis the author continues, might almost be defined as a city-god, though there is no formal evidence for a Sarapis Polieus or for the conception of Sarapis as a god of Alexandria before the Ptolemaic period.[1] The above mentioned view is in full accord with the one held by R. Pettazzoni[2] who points out that Ptlemy as a successor of the Pharaohs and the heir of Alexander, was the interpreter of real and concrete needs which were above all religious,

---

[1]Fraser, op.cit., p.

[2]Pettazzoni, op.cit., p. 167.

and were felt by him as such, even if he used them for political ends. The chief need was that Alexandria as a capital of a new dynasty should have its own patron deity, since that had been the case with all the previous pharaonic capitals.

Whether the Ptolemaic ruler, in founding the cult, aimed at achieving an ethnic *rapprochement* between the two racial elements of his domain and justify an *instrumentum regni*, or to introduce a patron deity for his new imperial capital, one thing is certain, that the attempt, if really made, did not meet with complete success.

The Ptolemaic government outfitted the new worship with impressive temples. A great center was established in Alexandria, where the Sarapeum reached magnificent proportions.[1] By the middle of the third century numerous Greeks in Egypt had adopted this worship and Sarapis began to develop as a *Kosmokrator*, a ruler of the whole world, a master of fate itself, a savior to all mankind.[2]

---

[1] For Sarapis' Temples see: E.R. Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1927), pp. 41-47; H.I. Bell, *Egypt from Alexander... Conquest*, pp. 38-40.

[2] For Sarapean Theology: A.D. Nock, *Conversion*, p. 102. P. Hombert, "Sarapis Kosmokrator et Isis Kosmokrateira", *Antiquité Classique* 14 (1945), 319-29. The author gives a group of texts and inscriptions where the god is cited with the epithet κοσμοκράτωρ. Here are some examples from Hombert's texts: (1) An inscription of the Mithreum of Thermes of Garacall in Rome: Εἷς Σάραπις Ἥλιος κοσμοκράτωρ ἀνίκητος. (2) Papyrus Leyde: ἐπικαλοῦμέν σε, κύριε, ἅγιε, πολυύμνητε, μεγαλότιμε κοσμοκράτωρ Σάραπι.

In an age when ambitious men were striving for position and power, and when honor and place depended upon the favor of the kings, Sarapis came to be looked upon as the god who would further careers and enhance reputation. The official classes adopted the new worship in large numbers. Zoilus of Aspendus, in a letter to Apollonius the finance minister of Ptolemy II, reminded the official that Sarapis could make him even greater than he was now in the favor of the ruler. Sarapis could also heal. Zoilus related to Apollonius the story of his own attempts to build a temple to Sarapis: The god had commanded him in a dream to build him a shrine in the Hellenic quarter. When Zoilus did not obey the command, Sarapis threw him into a great sickness, from which he was healed only after he had offered prayers and promised to execute the orders of the god.[1]

κοσμοκράτωρ [ᾰ], ορος, ὁ, lord of the world, epith. of οὐρανός, Orph. H. 4.3; Ζεὺς Μίθρας Ἥλιος K. Not. Scav. 1912, 323 (Rome). (2) of the Emperors, IG 14.926, Sammelb. 4275, cf. Ptol. Tetr. 175, Heph. Astr. 1.1.(3) Astrol. οἱ ἑπτὰ K. Dam. Pr. 131. οἱ τοῦ σκότους τούτου κ. the cosmic rulers of this sinful world, Ep. Eph. 6.12. Liddell-Scott-Jones," κοσμοκράτωρ ", Greek-English Lexicon, I, p. 984. Since κοσμοκράτειρα is not listed in Liddell-Scott-Jones, and the references to κοσμοκράτωρ are later, Hombert's texts suggest that the word was invented for the Sarapis cult.

[1]A. Deissmann, Licht von Osten (4th ed., Tubingen, 1923), pp. 121-28. Deissmann's comparison of Zoilus and St. Paul is a classic statement of the characteristic upper-class structure of Sarapis or any other pre-Christian cult. This papyrus is dated 258/7 B.C. See also F.G. Grant, Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism (New York, 1953), p. 144, or a long passage from Aelius Aristides Oratio VIII, given in E. Bevan's Later Greek Religion (London, 1927), pp. 71-76.

Sarapis, therefore, could never have become a popular god had he possessed no qualifications other than the support of the ruler. It was indispensable that he should acquire attributes which appealed particularly to soldiers, and ambitious civil servants. But the Egyptians themselves took virtually no interest at all in the new god. The numerous dedications to him were made almost entirely by Greeks.[1] After the great native uprisings at the end of the third century Sarapis lost favor even with the Greek population in Egypt, and in the eyes of the Ptolemaic regime no longer appeared to be its honored god.

The cult of Sarapis was, therefore, predominantly Greek; as a means of uniting the peoples along the Nile, the Egyptians made it a miserable failure. There might have been Egyptian propaganda against it. The Egyptian temples were always sensitive to competition as their own pre-Hellenistic history had shown, and one can readily

---

[1] Fraser, op. cit., p. suggests that there were almost 200 dedications to Sarapis and his circle; 2 or 3 to Sarapis alone; a large group to Sarapis and his circle; 13 to Sarapis and Isis with an additional Olympian deity; 3 to Isis alone and associated Egyptian deities, etc. All except two are of the third century and almost all come from Alexandria. He thinks that the evidence of the dedications seems to suggest that the appeal of Sarapis in Ptolemaic Egypt was very restricted; he appears to have been worshipped more in the third century than any other period, largely in Alexandria and largely by Greeks. There is no evidence of a Greek of low class, and virtually no Egyptian.

imagine the local priesthood's looking with suspicion at the creation of the Ptolemaic dynasty.[1] Dr. Fraser has arrived at the conclusion that the decline of the cult was due to the Ptolemaic dynasty itself. He maintains that the new deity owed its popularity to the example and initiative of the ruling royal house. The disappearance of the cult from the royal capital arose from the deflection of Ptolemaic interest from this quasi-Greek cult to the native Egyptian divinities.[2] The movement towards Egyptianization that gathered momentum in the reigns of Philopator and Epiphanes, as well as the decline of dedications to Hellenic gods and the adoption of local cults by the Greeks bear witness to a deteriorating interest in the Greek gods along the Nile valley.[3] It must be stressed that this trend was gradual and never achieved completeness, but it did serve to bring about a slow reorientation of religious and cultural loyalties. One of the deities to become

---

[1]For the rejection of Sarapis see: J.G. Milne, "Egyptian Nationalism under Greek and Roman Rule", JEA 14 (1928), 226-34.

[2]Fraser, op.cit., p.

[3]H.I. Bell, "Popular Religion in Graeco-Roman Egypt", JEA 34 (1948), 82-97 discusses the rise of native gods and the decline of Hellenic deities among Greeks. See also W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, pp. 337-38.

popular was Isis. By the end of the first century B.C. her cult had become so widespread that she was regarded as one of the few universal deities not only in Egypt, but in the Eastern Mediterranean, in Greece and even in Roman Italy.[1] This is good evidence of the toughness of the native Egyptian religious tradition.

After the beginning of Sarapis' decline, Ptolemy IV Philopator seems to have made one more effort to institute a Greco-Egyptian imperial god, this time from Hellenic Dionysus. This policy was implemented soon after the outbreak of the Egyptian rebellions that marked Philopator's reign. Whether the new official cult was an imperial cross-cultural worship with Philopator taking steps to encourage his subjects to accept it, one thing seems to be certain, that Dionysus did not become a symbol of faith to the natives any more than Sarapis had been.[2] The rejection of the cult of Dionysus by the Egyptians is another example depicting the native religious reluctance to accept Greek gods.[3]

---

[1]Nock, op.cit., pp. 38-40; Hombert, op.cit., pp. 319-20.

[2]P. Berlin 11774; E.R. Bevan, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, p. 234; Pertizet, Revue des Etudes Anciennes (1910), 234.

[3]S. Eddy, The King Is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C. (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961), p. 278. See also F. Jesi, "Notes sur l'edit dionysiaque de Ptolemee IV Philopator", JNES 15 (1956), 236-40.

Thus, one may infer that native hostility to the cult, and the failure of the official policy of the Ptolemaic dynasty combined with the indifference of the Greeks to worship Sarapis were the major forces operating together which accelerated the decline of the new deity.

Before turning to the expansion of the Sarapis worship throughout the Hellenistic world, it is worthwhile explaining that the new deity combined the attributes of many powerful Hellenic gods with characteristics of Osiris.[1] The combination of disparate deities in a single cult is a clear indication of the Hellenistic tendency towards syncretization. But even more significant of the new religious climate are the theological attributes which Sarapis seems to have acquired. We have seen how epigraphic and linguistic evidence confirm the Egyptian origin of the cult. If one accepts on the authority of Manetho, the Pluto-form in Alexandria which Sarapis takes, this also signifies that the death deity of Memphis is shown and the new divinity was syncretized as a special form of Osiris-Apis of the Egyptian pantheon.

Like Osiris, Sarapis is a god of fertility through his connection with Pluto. This is sometimes shown in the

---

[1]For a detailed account of the theological attributes of Sarapis see Hans Bonnet, Reallexikon der agyptischen Religionsgeschichte (Berlin, 1952), pp. 649-55.

Kalathos on the head of Sarapis, decorated with stalks of wheat. Also, the occasional representations of snakes springing out of the body, breast and head of the god, indicate the chthonic powers and functions of Sarapis. Just as Osiris was the creative power of the Nile water, so also was Sarapis celebrated as lord of the Nile and dispenser of the Nile floods.

Above all, the new deity was the protector of sailors and travellers by sea. For example, a recruit in the Roman army in the second century A.D., announcing his arrival at Misenum writes: "I thank the Lord Serapis that when I was in danger at sea he straightway saved me."[1] Lamps in the form of a ship show the epithet "good journey" and the picture of Sarapis with a rudder. In some inscriptions Sarapis is called Neptunis. It stands to reason from all this that this interpretation of Sarapis developed in Alexandria, a great port city. But they also inserted the essence of Osiris likewise who, if only accidentally, was a god of the sea. Sarapis was also a god of healing and it is not without significance that the statue of the Egyptian god of healing Imphotep stood in the vicinity of the Memphis Sarapeum. This cult of Imphotep went undoubtedly back to the Greek cult of Asklepios.

---

[1] Hunt-Edgar, Sel. Pap. I, 112.

The most outstanding aspect of Sarapis was his identification with Helios. At the outset, the new god was considered the son of Helios and then came to be equated with Helios himself. This is meaningful, in that Osiris was at first considered to be of the successors of Re and, in a later age, became the sun-god himself. The parallel development of Sarapis to Osiris must certainly display the influence of Egyptian ideas on the Sarapis cult.

Another feature of Sarapis was his equation with Zeus, in which capacity he became κοσμοκράτωρ, the ruler of the world. This concept of Sarapis conforms to Egyptian theological ideas regarding Osiris. Nevertheless, Sarapis was never an indigenous god, according to the Egyptians. To them, he was the Hellenic form of Osiris or Osiris-Apis.

An interesting feature of the Sarapis cult was the katoche, an institution which has been the subject of much controversy. In spite of this one can say that the concept of katoche was not foreign to Egyptian thinking. By the katoche a man bound himself to the service of the god, and while the bond lasted he could not leave the Sarapeum. How the katoche was established and how it ended is not certain, but the strong probability is that in both cases the god's will was revealed in a dream. The resemblance of this institution to Christian monasticism need not be stressed, but the differences are such as to make it hazardous to suppose any connections between the two.

The cult of Sarapis and circle soon spread from Alexandria to the Greco-Roman world and we must now consider certain aspects of this diffusion.

It has been widely held in the last decades that the cult of Sarapis was caused by the ruling dynasty of Egypt. That is to say, Ptolemy I aimed at ruling more than the land of the Nile and included in his foreign policy propaganda for Sarapis.[1] Whether the Sarapis-cult bears the stamp of Ptolemaic sovereignty, or not, is a point that has long been debated by scholars. Wilcken, Cumont, Cornemann and others have attributed the spread of the cult to the imperialistic policy of the Ptolemaic house. Cumont[2] has explicitly expressed the view that "the cult of Sarapis was adopted wherever the authority or the prestige of the Lagides was felt, and wherever the relations of Alexandria, the great commercial metropolis, extended. The Ptolemies induced the rulers and the nations with whom they concluded alliances to accept it."

In order to accept or reject the theory of an expansion rooted to the Ptolemaic imperialism itself, it is

---

[1] H.I. Bell, A History of Egypt:::Arab Conquest, p. 40, suggests that the new deity was actually created by Soter with a view of its being exported overseas; Nock, op.cit., pp. 54-5 points out that the Ptolemies did not make any effort to propagate the cult.

[2] F. Cumont, Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, p. 74.

necessary to examine individually the areas into which the imperial policy of the Ptolemaic dynasty extended. Dr. Fraser holds that had the cult been introduced into Delos, when the island was under Ptolemaic authority, the outcome would have been the establishment of a public cult and not of a private one.[1] Thus, the whole history of the cult from its inauguration as a private practice until its official recognition two generations later, reveals, as Roussel saw, a lack of Ptolemaic propaganda or influence operating in the institution of the Delian cult. The same conclusion can be drawn at Athens. The first instance of the appearance of Sarapis in Athens is dated to 215/4 B.C., when a group of Sarapiasts issued a decree in honor of some of their own magistrates, and these Sarapiasts were not Athenian citizens. This decree was passed in 215/4 when Athens and Egypt were on close terms. Therefore it is rather difficult to think of a deliberate Ptolemaic propaganda to influence Athens, when the private cult was confined to metics and other foreigners.

Thus, considering the evidence from the Aegean as a whole, Fraser states, we can see that there is no instance in which an imperial policy was necessarily followed in regard to the cult. The normal movement of commerce

---

[1]Fraser, op.cit., p.

and trade suffices to explain the diffusion of the cult in the Aegean area.[1]

Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia were all under Ptolemaic rule during part of the third century, but there is little Hellenistic evidence of any sort from this region. The coast of Asia Minor, the northern Aegean and the Pontic area confirm the inference drawn from the Aegean region.

Two important pieces of information from Macedonia, an instruction of Philip V,[2] traditionally hostile to the Ptolemies, and a "double dedication" from Amphipolis,[3] disprove the theory of Ptolemaic religious imperialism in this part of the Hellenistic world. Two conclusions can be drawn; first, that Philip V had a particular interest in the cult of Sarapis, and secondly, it is improbable that he would have tolerated any vestige of Ptolemaic propaganda.

---

[1]Fraser, op.cit., p.

[2]This instruction of Philip V addressed probably to the city of Thessalonica forbids the use of the funds of the Sarapeum for purposes other than those connected with the cult, and lays down the penalties for those who will violate the regulation. See Fraser, op.cit., p.

[3]The double dedication from Amphipolis was made by a certain Alceus to Sarapis, Isis and Philip V. It is the only double dedication of this type outside Ptolemaic Egypt. (The evidence for Sarapis in Macedonia was collected by W. Baege, De Macedonum Sacris (diss. Hol. 22 (i), 1913), pp. 158 ff., cited by Fraser, op.cit., p.

From Syria there is testimony in the form of an inscription from Laodicea ad Mare,[1] dated 174 B.C. Here in Laodicea ad mare, a Seleucid territory, when the Seleucid and Ptolemaic houses were in a continual enmity, there can be no question of the cult having been introduced by the Ptolemies. From the Greek mainland we possess a well-known document relating to the spread of Sarapis. It is a papyrus of the Zenon archive, dated in 257 B.C., providing us with an excellent example of the private propagation of the cult.[2] Sarapis-worship might have spread in Greece proper through the influence of mercenary troops coming back from Egypt, since we know that Boeotia, Aetolia and other cities of the Western and Central Greece provided a substantial part of the Ptolemaic army.[3]

We may therefore conclude by stating that the cult of Serapis spread in the Greco-Roman world, not because the Ptolemies sought to rule the Hellenistic world, and used the cult to further their political schemes, but in the main through private action and enterprise. Ptolemaic imperialism cannot be credited as the ultimate agency that caused

---

[1] P. Roussel, "Decret de Laodicee sur-Mer", Syria XXIII (1942-43), 21-32.

[2] p. 113, n. 1 supra.

[3] M. Launey, Recherches sur les armees hellenistiques (Paris, 1949), I, pp. 144-229.

the expansion of the new worship. Private action by merchants, mercenaries and priests who had obtained knowledge of the new god from the Ptolemaic domain, was the most important factor for the spread of the cult. The new deity might also have spread through intermediate centers of diffusion, or through the desire of the independent communities to express friendship to the Ptolemies by adopting the Alexandrian deity. It is not, therefore, plausible to admit that the Ptolemies, after having achieved a superficial unity between the two heterogeneous elements of their kingdom, tended to expand the Sarapis-worship for reasons of imperial or military expediency.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

In the course of this brief historical survey of pre-Hellenistic Graeco-Egyptian relations, we have seen that Egypt and the Aegean area had established close contacts over a considerable length of time. Egypt early established relations with the Minoans, as shown by stone vessels and other objects of Egyptian manufacture, dating to the third millennium B.C., which have been found in the island of Crete. About 1200 B.C., the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean were overrun by the "Peoples of the Sea," who placed the Egyptian world in mortal peril. The Pharaohs repelled these attacks, but their power in Asia was shattered and the internal vitality of their state was impaired beyond recovery.

Under the Saite Dynasty (663-525 B.C.), Egypt and Greece entered into a political cooperation which arose from their common hostility to Persia. The foundation of a Greek settlement at Naukratis, in the Egyptian Delta, and Pharaoh Amasis' philhellenist attitude are indicative of substantial Graeco-Egyptian ties. While for most of the period from 525 to 332 B.C. Egypt was under Persian rule, the history of this epoch discloses new Greco-Egyptian cooperation. An outstanding example is the attempt of

the Greek Delian League in 461 B.C. to assist Inaros in expelling the hated Persian overlords. In 332 B.C., Alexander the Great, leading his Greco-Macedonian forces, came to Egypt and, aided by the extreme hatred for the Persians there, overcame the Achaemenid regime almost without striking a blow.

With the conquest of the Orient by Alexander, a new order began. Alexander's achievement both stimulated the Greeks to export Hellenic culture and the eastern peoples to accept it with eagerness. Whether, as his detractors assert, Alexander was an opportunist who coveted the power of Darius, or he was a visionary who, from the outset, made it his goal to unify mankind, there can be little doubt that after the conquest of Darius' empire was assured Alexander was in fact impelled by a drive to unify the oikoumene into a single body.

But Alexander's diadochoi were far from sharing his ecumenical ideal. They deviated from a policy directed toward making the conquered peoples equal partners in the newly founded states. The early kings of the Ptolemaic dynasty, steeped though they might have been in Hellenic culture, displayed, in their official policy, no interest in abstract theorism, economic or political. They were rather concerned with securing stability, wealth and influence in the world for the state which they had established. Their policy was dominated by purely practical considera-

tions, not by humanitarianism. Their energies were directed against the eastern Mediterranean world in which they aspired to play a leading role. Egypt to them was no more than the source of their power and wealth. In brief, the primary aim of the Ptolemaic regime was to accumulate the maximum wealth, to incur the minimum expenditure and to effect the fewest possible reforms in the existing order.

With the settlement of Macedonians and Greeks on Egyptian soil, an epoch of widespread political upheaval and painful social adaptation began for Egypt. This gave rise to an intense reaction against Macedonian imperialism and eventually, against Hellenism itself.

There were two major causes underlying Egyptian anti-Hellenism. The first was the overthrow and continuing oppression of the native royalty by a foreign dynastic house. This resulted in the diminution of the power of the native aristocracies. Egyptian apocalyptic literature prophesied the downfall of the Macedonian despots; this literary reaction was one of the determining factors in the struggle against Hellenism.

Aside from the reaction to the suppression of the native kingship, there was a second significant cause for Egyptian anti-Hellenism. This was the economic exploitation and social degradation of the native Egyptians at the hands of the Greeks. The Ptolemaic policy of introducing Greek immigrants into Egypt and the concentration of almost

all the best positions in the ranks of the Greek elite class endangered the prestige of the indigenous aristocracies. Much has been said about the participation of the Egyptian military and priestly classes in the anti-Hellenic movements. While in many societies these classes may not remain loyal to the ancien regime, in Egypt large numbers of them did oppose Macedonian imperialism. In the apocalyptic literature of the Hellenistic Egyptians, consciousness of economic exploitation is sometimes strongly marked. Both the Demotic Chronicle and the Oracle of the Potter prophesy the collapse of the Macedonian ruling house and its expulsion by a heaven-sent saviour.

The effects produced by the Ptolemaic oikos can also be seen in the over-all history of anti-Hellenism. The conflicts within the Hellenistic monarchies grew in intensity toward the end of the third century B.C. as each began to shape its foreign and military policy to consolidate its power. The increasing demands of warfare and the tightening of economic control over the Oriental peoples resulted in an increase in native opposition. Everywhere in the Hellenistic East there was a growing restlessness during the last twenty years of the third century B.C. Anti-Hellenistic propaganda circulated from Persia to the Aegean and revolts broke out in Judah, Egypt and the eastern parts of the Seleucid Empire. This tendency continued during the second century so that by 175 B.C. Egypt was in the

throes of a series of uprisings that weakened Ptolemaic rule: Raphia had aroused the national consciousness and in the second century the Greeks were on the defensive. The priestly decrees for Ptolemy IV, after Raphia, and for Ptolemy V show strong Egyptian coloring and give to these kings the titles of native Pharaohs. These events, combined with the deterioration of the ruling regime contributed to a gradual weakening of Hellenism in Egypt. In the reign of Philopater, a catastrophic decline set in and Hellenism, continually diluted by oriental influences, could maintain itself only so long as it was actively supported by the government. Thus a process of de-Hellenization was brought about.

In the sphere of religion, Egyptian resistance was directed primarily against the Graeco-Egyptian cult of Sarapis. Ptolemy Soter founded this cult with the intention of creating a rapprochement between Greeks and Egyptians. Yet, if this was really his intention, he failed to gain a complete success. Outside of Memphis and Alexandria, the chief centers of the cult, Sarapis seems to have had little appeal for the native Egyptians and apparently not even for the majority of Greeks in Egypt. Outside Egypt, the new cult spread everywhere, not because of Ptolemaic political propaganda but by the efforts of settlers and merchants. This is at least what the epigraphic evidence

suggests. In almost all the areas within the Ptolemaic sphere of influence, the cult betrays a popularity due to the individual initiative of merchants and mercenary soldiers rather than to the imperial policy of the royal Ptolemaic oikos.

In the final analysis, Egyptian resistance to Hellenism was an effort to maintain a native way of life, the continuity of which was threatened by Hellenism. The reaction was directed only against those institutions which were actually in opposition to Egyptian institutions. There was no reaction to Hellenism in its totality. Thus one may infer that economic and political motives constituted valid grounds for the awakening of Egyptian nationalism and its militant reaction to Hellenism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient Sources

1. Literary

(Pseudo:) Aristotle. Economica. Translated by G.G. Armstrong. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1935.

Arrian: Anabasis of Alexander. Translated by E.I. Robson (The Loeb Classical Library), London and Cambridge, 1929-33.

Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists. Translated by G.B. Gulick. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1927-41.

Clement of Alexandria: Protreptikos: Translated by G.W. Butterworth. (The Loeb Classical Library)

Diodorus: Diodorus of Sicily: Translated by F.R. Walton. (The Loeb Classical Library), London, 1957.

Diogenes Laertius: On the Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers. Translated by R.D. Hicks. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and Cambridge, 1950.

Homer: The Iliad. Translated by A.T. Murray. (The Loeb Classical Library), London.

_____: The Odyssey. Edited by W.B. Stanford. London, 1961.

Isocrates: Panegyricus. Translated by G. Mathieu and E. Bremond. (Collection des Universites de France), Paris.

Josephus, Flavius: Against Apion. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. (The Loeb Classical Library), London, 1961.

Justin: Epitome of the History of Pompeius Trogus: Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi. Edited by M. Galdi. Turin, 1921.

Macrobius: Saturnalia. Edited by Fr. Eyssenhardt. Lipsiae, 1893.

Pausanias: Description of Greece. Translated by W.S. Jones. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1918-35.

Plutarch: The Lives. Translated by B. Perrin. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1916-26.

Polybius: The Histories. Translated by W.R. Paton. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1954.

Strabo: The Geography of Strabo. Translated by H.L. Jones. (The Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, 1954.

Tacitus: The Histories. Translated by C.H. Moore. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1912.

Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War. Translated by C.F. Smith. (The Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1919-23.

2: Inscriptions and Papyri

Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. London, 1923.

Dittenberger, W. Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae. Leipzig, 1903-5.

Grenfell, P.B. (ed.): Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Oxford, 1896.

_____: et.al. The Tebtunis Papyri. London, 1902-.

Hunt, S.A. and Edgar, C.C. Select Papyri. (The Loeb Classical Library), London, 1934.

Jacoby, F: Die Fragmenta der grieschischen Historiker. Berlin, 1923-.

Kent, R.G. Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon. New Haven, 1953.

Kraeling, G.B. The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri. New Haven, 1953.

The Oracle of the Potter in R. Reitzenstein and H.H. Schraeder. Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland. Leipzig, 1926.

Pritchard, J.B. (ed.) Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Princeton, 1950.

Vitelli, G. et. al. Papiri greci e latini. (Publicazioni della Societa Italiana per le ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto). Florence, 1912.

Westermann, W.L. et. al. Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. dealing with Palestine and Egypt. New York, 1934-40.

Wilcken, V. (ed.) Urkunden des Ptolemaerzeit, altere Funde. Berlin, 1922-7.

Modern Sources

Alliot, M. "La fin de la resistance égyptienne dans le sud sous l'Épiphane", Revue des études anciennes 54 (1952), 18-26.

Alt, A. Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht. Berlin, 1954.

Bataille, A. "Thèbes grèco-romaine", Chronique d'Égypte 52 (1951), 325-53.

Bell, H.I. Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Liverpool, 1957.

_____. Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest. Oxford, 1948.

_____: "Hellenic Culture in Egypt", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 8 (1922), 139-55.

_____. "Popular Religion in Graeco-Roman Egypt", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 34 (1948), 87-97.

Bevan, E.R. A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. London, 1927.

_____: Later Greek Religion. London, 1927.

Bonnet, Hans: Reallexicon der agyptischen Religionsgeschichte. Berlin, 1952.

Bouche-Leclerq, A. Histoire des Lagides. Paris, 1913.

Burn, R.A. The Lyric Age of Greece. London, 1960.

Cary, M. et.al. "Exegetes", Oxford Classical Dictionary. Oxford, 1949.

Cohrane, N. Christianity and Classical Culture. New York, 1957.

Cook, M.R. "Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt", Journal of Hellenic Studies 57 (1937), 227-30.

Cumant, F. Les religions orientales dans le paganism romain. (4th ed.) Paris, 1929.

Deissmann, A. Licht von Osten. Tubingen, 1923.

Downey, G. A History of Antioch in Syria. Princeton, New Jersey, 1961.

Drioton, E. and Vandier, J. L'Egypte. (3rd ed.) Paris, 1952.

Eddy, S.K. The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961.

Edgar, C.C. "An Ionian Inscription to Isis", Journal of Hellenic Studies 4 (1904).

Eissfeldt, O. Einleitung in Das Alte Testament. Tubingen, 1934.

Emery, S. Archaic Egypt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1961.

Evans, A. The Palace of Minos at Knossos. London, 1928.

Ferguson, S.W. "The Leading Ideas of the New Period," Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. VII. London, 1928.

Fraser, H.P. "Two Studies in the Cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic World", Opuscula Atheniensia 3 (1960), 1-54.

Gardiner, A. Egypt and the Pharaohs. Oxford, 1961.

_____. Ancient Egyptian Onomastica. Oxford, 1947.

Grant, G.F. Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism. New York, 1953.

Hadas, Moses. Hellenistic Culture. New York, 1959.

Hall, R.H. "The Restoration of Egypt", Cambridge Ancient History, vol. III.

Hammond, N. A History of Greece to 322 B.C. Oxford, 1959.

Hill, F.G. Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars. Edited by Meiggs and Andrewes, Oxford, 1951.

Hogarth, J.D. "Alexander in Egypt and Some Consequences", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 2 (1915),

Holscher, W. Libyer und Ägypter. Gluckstadt, 1954.

Hombert, M. and Préaux, C. "Note sur la durée de la vie dans l'Égypte grèco-romaine", Chronique d'Égypte 20 (1945), 139-60.

Hombert, P. "Sarapis Kosmokrator et Isis Kosmokrateira", Antiquité classique 14 (1945), 319-29.

Hutchinson, W.R. Prehistoric Crete. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1962.

Jesi, F. "Notes sur l'edit dionysiaque de Ptolemée IV Philopator", Journal of Near Eastern Studies 15 (1956), 236-40.

Jouguet, P. Trois etudes sur l'Hellenisme. Cairo, n.d.

_____: "La politique interieure du premier Ptolemée", Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archeologie Orientalle 30 (1930), 513-36.

_____. "Alexandre a l'oasis d'Ammon et le temoignase de Callisthene", Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte 26 (1944), 91-107.

_____. "Les destinées de l'hellénisme dans l'Égypte grèco-romaine", Chronique d'Égypte 19 (1935), 89-108.

_____. Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East. Translated by M.R. Dobie. London, 1928.

Kiessling, E: "La genèse du culte de Sarapis a Alexandrie", Chronique d'Égypte 48 (1949), 317-23.

Kraeling, H.C. Ptolemais City of the Libyan Pentapolis. Chicago, 1962.

Launey, M: Recherches sur les armees hellenistiques. Paris, 1949.

Lesquier, J: Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sons les Lagides. Paris, 1911.

Liddell-Scott: "κοσμοκράτωρ", Greek-English Lexicon.

MacEwan, W.C. The Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship. Chicago, 1934.

Maspero, G: Passing of the Empires: Translated by M.L. McClure: London, 1900.

Mayani, Z: Les hyksos et le monde de la bible. Paris, 1956.

Merkelbach, R: Isis feste in griechisch romischer Zeit: Daten und Riten. Meisenhein am Glan, 1963.

Milne, G.J. "Egyptian Nationalism under Greek and Roman Rule", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 14 (1928), 226-34.

_____: "Greek Inscriptions from Egypt", Journal of Hellenic Studies. 21 (1901).

Montet, P: Géographie de l'Égypte ancienne. Paris, 1961.

_____: Le drame d'Avaris: Essai sur la pénétration des Semites en Egypte. Paris, 1941.

Montgomery, J.A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. New York, 1927.

Moscatti, S: The Face of the Ancient Orient. Translated by Valentine Mitchell, London, 1960.

Nock, D.A. Conversion: Oxford, 1933.

_____: "Notes on Ruler-Cult, I-IV", Journal of Hellenic Studies 48 (1928), 21-43.

Olmstead, T.A. History of the Persian Empire. Chicago, 1948.

Pendlebury, J. "Egypt and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age," Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 16 (1930).

Pettazzoni, R. "Sarapis and his Kerberos", Essays on the History of Religions. Leiden, 1954.

Pfeiffer, H.R. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York, 1948.

Posèner: La premiere domination perse en Égypte. Cairo, 1936.

Préaux, C: "Esquisse d'une histoire des revolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagids", Chronique d'Égypte 22 (1936), 522-52.

_____: L'économie royale des Lagids. Bruxelles, 1939.

_____: "Les Égyptiens dans la civilization hellénistique d'Égypte", Chronique d'Egypte 35 (1943), 148-60.

_____: Le Grecs en Égypte d'apres les archives de Zenon. Bruxelles, 1947.

_____: "Politique du race ou politique royale", Chronique d'Egypte 21 (1936), III-38.

Radet, G., "Notes sur l'histoire d'Alexandre", Revue des Etudes Anciennes 28 (1926).

Robert, Louis: Hellenica 11-12 (1960), 85-91.

Robertson, M: Greek Painting: Lausanne, 1959.

Robinson, M.P. American Journal of Archaeology 9 (1905).

Roebuck, C: Ionian Trade and Colonization: New York, 1959.

Rostovtzeff, I.M. Foundations of Social and Economic Life in Egypt in Hellenistic Times," Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 6 (1920), 161-78.

_____: The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World. London, 1941.

Roussel, P. "Decret de Laodicée sur-Mer", Syria 23 (1942-43), 21-32.

_____: Les cultes égyptiens à Delos. Paris 1915-6.

Scharff and Moortgat. Ägypten und Vovderasien in Altertum. Munich, 1950.

Steihl, Ruth. "The Origin of the Cult of Sarapis", History of Religions 3 (1963), 21-33.

Tarn, W.W. Alexander the Great. Cambridge, 1948-50.

_____, and Griffith, G.T. Hellenistic Civilization (3rd ed.). London, 1952.

_____. "Ptolemy II", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 14 (1928), 246-59.

_____. "The Hellenistic Ruler Cult and the Daemon", Journal of Hellenic Studies 48 (1928), 206-19.

_____. "Two Notes on Ptolemaic History", Journal of Hellenic Studies 53 (1933), 57-68.

Tod, N.M. A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions. Oxford, 1946.

Vercoutter, J. Essai sur les relations entre Egyptiens et Prehellenes. Paris, 1954.

_____. L'Égypte et le monde égéen préhellénique. Cairo, 1956.

Walbank, W.F. A Historical Commentary on Polybius. Oxford, 1957.

Ward, A.W. "Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean from Predynastic Times to the End of the Old Kingdom", Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient 6 (1963), 1-57.

_____. "Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean in the Early Second Millennium B.C.", Orientalia 30 (1961).

Welles, B.C. "The Discovery of the Cult of Sarapis and the Foundation of Alexandria," Historia 11 (1962).

Westermann, W. "The Ptolemies and the Welfare of their Subjects", American Historical Review 43 (1938), 270-87.

Wilson, A.J. The Culture of Ancient Egypt. Chicago, 1963.