



## HERODOTUS'S PERSPECTIVE ON THE SITUATION OF EGYPT IN THE PERSIAN PERIOD FROM THE LAST SAITE KINGS TO XERXES' FIRST YEARS

**Reinhold Bichler**  
University of Innsbruck

### ABSTRACT

The inscription on the famous statue of Udjahorresnet on the Musei Vaticani touches upon a number of historical events, which are reflected in Greek historiography. Taking up different aspects of Udjahorresnet's career, the paper analyses Herodotus' perspective on the Egyptian sea forces and the foreign mercenaries in Egypt, the different characterization of Cambyses' deeds in Saïs compared with those in Memphis, and the role the Egyptian physician plays in the Histories. Eventually, Udjahorresnet's testimony about his presence on Darius' side leads to a closer look at the notorious problems connected with the chronology of Darius' first regnal years. By presenting the available evidence of Herodotus' reception in the mid-5th century BCE of these 7th–6th-century BCE events, I hope to further a more diversified sources-based discussion on Udjahorresnet and his world.

### I: HERODOTUS'S PERSPECTIVE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE EGYPTIAN SEA FORCES UNDER PERSIAN RULE AND A FLASHBACK TO THE MARITIME POLICIES OF THE SAITE KINGS

Udjahorresnet had to see how a Persian army including "foreign peoples of every foreign land" attacked his homeland and emerged victorious. Half a century later, an even greater Persian army, similarly consisting of "foreign peoples of every foreign land," attacked Hellas. This time, Egyptian naval forces were fighting under Persian command, and they fulfilled their duty. Since Aeschylus' tragedy *The Persians* is the oldest Greek text that gives an impression of the importance of Egypt and its military capacities, although under Persian rule, it seems useful to begin with a closer look at this document.

Herodotus, too, highlights the loyalty of the

Egyptian fleet under Persian command in the battle off Salamis, although shortly before Xerxes had brutally crushed a revolt in Egypt. Furthermore, we see the Egyptian sea forces fighting as part of the Persian fleet in the years after the outbreak of the Ionian Revolt. Eventually, a further look back shows a striking contrast between Herodotus' report of successful maritime policies under the last Saites and his silence about any actions of the Egyptian fleet over the long period from Cambyses' conquest until the outbreak of the Ionian Revolt.

This lack of information roughly corresponds with the notorious silence of Egyptian sources about the situation and maneuvers of the Egyptian fleet during Cambyses' conquest. It also concerns Udjahorresnet's role.<sup>1</sup> The specific functions associated with his title as "commander of the royal navy" have been and are still a subject to debate. Thus, the question

remains open whether his function was more commercial/political or more military in nature.<sup>2</sup> In any case, Udjahorresnet did not bear his title under the reign of Cambyses and Darius any longer, although, according to his own testimony, he bore it under Amasis and Psammetichus III. On the other hand, there is also remarkably scarce information about the maneuvers of the Persian fleet (including Greek ships) during the conquest.<sup>3</sup>

#### 1) A STARTING POINT: AESCHYLUS' *PERSAE*

Aeschylus' tragedy *The Persians*, performed in Athens in 472 BCE (and later on in Syracuse),<sup>4</sup> gives a first impression of the importance of Egypt and its military capacities under Persian rule, seen from an Athenian perspective.<sup>5</sup> The drama focuses on the performance of the Athenians in the battle off Salamis in 480 BCE. The strength of Xerxes' fleet is portrayed in Homeric dimensions. Apart from the fundamental problem of achieving realistic ratios with regard to the nominal total of battleships on both sides,<sup>6</sup> the following passage (of the messenger report) bears a special difficulty: "The Greeks had a grand total of about three hundred ships, and ten of these formed a special select squadron; while Xerxes—I know this for sure—had a thousand under its command, and those of outstanding speed [αἱ δ' ὑπέροκοι τάχει] numbered two hundred and seven" (V 338–343).<sup>7</sup> The passage could well be understood in such a way that Aeschylus assessed the total size of the Persian fleet with a round number, namely that of 1,000 ships, and within this number of 1,000 ships a special unit of 207 ships was given special importance.<sup>8</sup>

Aeschylus gives no further indication of the provenance and role of these 207 ships. This should be kept in mind if one considers Herodotus' catalogue of Xerxes' fleet. There he gives the well-known grand total of 1,207 triremes (7.89.1; 184.1), and he assigns 200 ships to the Egyptians (7.89.2). To identify this Egyptian contingent with the 207 ships mentioned by Aeschylus remains purely hypothetical. However, Aeschylus gives major importance to the Egyptians in the catalog-like depiction of the military squad by the chorus of the Persian Elders in the parodos, listing them right after the Persians (V 33–40). Several fallen commanders are also mentioned in relation to Egypt in the messenger report of the battle, which once again shows the diversity of the nations and regions represented in the army, and in the dialogue between Xerxes and the chorus within the framework of the exodos.

Aeschylus' image of Egypt remains obscure. In the parodos, the cities of Memphis and Thebes are mentioned as administrative centers and the nautical strength of the inhabitants of the Delta area is emphasized (V 33–40). No shadow falls on the military qualities and the loyalty of the commanders who are mentioned in connection to Egypt in the play. Their loyalty, like that of the Egyptians in general, seems to be taken for granted. It remains unclear from what point on in history the Egyptians had to provide the Persian kings with ships—both battleships and cargo ships. However, the dramaturgically significant clue of the chorus is the message that the Persians were first a significant land power and only later turned to seafaring [ἐμαθον] (V 109–113). Xerxes' confidence in the nautical strength and power of his fleet is bemoaned (V 550 ff.).

According to Aeschylus' messenger report, Xerxes himself ordered the formation of his fleet to be based on the advice of "the man from Athens" (Themistocles)—who remains anonymous in the play. "They were to arrange the mass of their ships in three lines and guard the exits and the surging straits, while others are stationed so as to surround the island of Ajay completely" (V 366–368). It is important that Aeschylus also states that the Persians were quite willing to fight before they were pushed back: "At first the streaming Persian force resisted firmly" (V 412).

In his description of Xerxes' military squad, Aeschylus mentions only leading commanders, who seem to be Persians of origin or to be in Persian service, at any rate. We do not know the sources from which the author may have drawn to shape his depiction of the Persian army, nor should we exclude his poetic imagination in naming some of the various commanders. There are also other notable particularities: persons of the same name who are mentioned multiple times do not have to be thought of as identical. The historicity of the persons in question, whose name, function or provenance refers to Egypt, should not simply be taken for granted. Also, the effort to locate these individuals by identifying them with namesakes in Herodotus' large catalogue of Xerxes' troops turns out to be problematic. In addition, it is also true for *this* catalogue of troops that its provenance is unclear and its source value is controversial.<sup>9</sup> A detailed survey of the commanders connected with Egypt in *The Persians* is given in APPENDIX II.

## 2) HERODOTUS' PERSPECTIVE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE EGYPTIAN FLEET UNDER PERSIAN RULE SINCE THE OUTBREAK OF THE IONIAN REVOLT

Remarkably, when Herodotus gave his outstanding report of the sea battles fought in 480 BCE roughly half a century later than Aeschylus he, too, highlighted the loyalty of the Egyptian fleet under Persian command, although a rebellion had broken out in Egypt at the end of Darius' reign and was crushed by Xerxes and Achaemenes.<sup>10</sup> It is only in Book VII that Herodotus mentions this rebellion. After the Persians' defeat at Marathon, Darius prepared a new campaign, but in the fourth year, the Egyptians, who had been subjugated by Cambyses, rose up in revolt (7.1.3). In the next year Darius died (7.4). Xerxes made an expedition against the rebels in the following year (7.7). The consequences were grave: "Once he [Xerxes] had crushed the rebellion and reduced the whole population of Egypt to a state of even worse slavery [καὶ Αἴγυπτον πᾶσαν πολλὸν δουλότερον ποιήσας] than they had experienced under Darius, he left his brother Achaemenes the son of Darius in charge of the country [ἐπιτρέπει Αἰαμιμένει]."<sup>11</sup>

After having crushed the rebellion in Egypt, Xerxes prepared for his great campaign against Hellas (cf. 7.20). And this is where we meet the Egyptians (as in Aeschylus) as loyal followers of the Persians.<sup>12</sup> Their naval forces, which comprised 200 ships, were under the direct command of Achaemenes (7.89.3, 97). Contrary to Aeschylus, Herodotus does not mention any names of subordinate local leaders (cf. 7.96). Generally, he paints a fairly favorable picture of the military effort of the Egyptians. They distinguished themselves in the battle off Artemision: "Among Xerxes' troops, battle honours went to the Egyptians, for various notable achievements, but particularly for capturing five Greek ships, crews and all" (8.17). After the debacle off Salamis, Mardonius, who had advised the King to go to battle, tried to put the blame on the Phoenicians, Egyptians, Cyprians, and Cilicians, speaking of them as cowards (8.100.4–5). However, Herodotus is depicting the Persian general in a negative light at this point. Later on, we learn that Mardonius had not hesitated to incorporate the combat troops of the Egyptian fleet into the land army he led to the battle at Plataea the following year (479 BCE) (9.32).<sup>13</sup> Taken in sum, this rather favorable picture of the Egyptians' loyalty corresponds with their former behavior in service of Persian fleets during the time

span between the outbreak of Ionian Revolt and the Egyptian rebellion in Darius' last regnal years.

In Herodotus' account on the sea battle off Cyprus, only the Phoenicians are mentioned (5.109.2, 112.1, 115.1). When the Persians then deployed their fleet for the decisive battle off Lade (494 BCE), they are said to have had 600 ships under their command (6.9.1),<sup>14</sup> including ships of the Egyptians: "As for their navy, the Phoenicians formed the most willing contingent [προθυμότετοι], and they were supported by the Cyprians (who had recently been conquered), the Cilicians, and the Egyptians" (6.6).<sup>15</sup> In 490 BCE, a greater military expedition was led by Datis and Artaphrenes. The fleet allegedly included 600 triremes plus some additional supply ships. Despite the defeat of the troops that landed at Marathon, the Persians could achieve successful operations in the Aegean. The presence of Egyptian ships is not mentioned explicitly, but might have been included in Herodotus' conception: "...they [the troops of the land army] were joined by the whole naval force which the various states had been required to raise, and the horse-transport ships that Darius had ordered his tribute-paying subjects to build the year before" (6.95.1).

If we consider these data on the activities of Egyptian battle ships under Persian command we might wonder what chances Herodotus gave the Egyptian rebellion at the end of Darius' reign: Probably, he considered them rather a lost cause, given the strength of the Persian forces. He certainly had the experience of the later revolt of Inaros in mind, which he frequently alluded to in the *Histories* (esp. c. 3.12.4; 7.7).<sup>16</sup> On the other hand, one might also wonder if Herodotus mentally included Egyptian ships in his image of the former operations of the Persian fleet. But our testimonies, as we will see, are too scarce for any definitive assessment. The former role of the Egyptian fleet under Persian rule remains rather obscure.

## 3) THE LACK OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE EGYPTIAN FLEET DURING THE TIMESPAN BETWEEN CAMBYSES' CONQUEST AND THE OUTBREAK OF THE IONIAN REVOLT

As we saw, the Egyptian fleet appears in Herodotus' narrative as an integral part of the Persian fleet in the context of the so-called Persian Wars. But we miss concrete hints as to the circumstances of the former integration of Egyptian naval units into the Persian navy that was assembled by Cambyses.<sup>17</sup> In all

probability, Egypt was conquered by the land forces.<sup>18</sup> Yet, the conquest of Egypt involved considerable naval forces, mainly Phoenicians (3.17.1–2, 19.2–3), but also Ionians and Aeolians (2.1.2; 3.1.1), as well as Cyprians (2.182.2; 3.19.3).<sup>19</sup> Allegedly, Polycrates of Samos, too, sent forty triremes to Cambyses, although Herodotus expresses doubts on this matter (3.44–45).<sup>20</sup> In sum, we do not learn much about the composition of the Persian fleet, and tangible information regarding the concrete mission of the Persian navy is lacking. Herodotus' report focuses on *one* major event. When the Egyptians had been defeated on land, Cambyses sent a Mytilenean ship upstream to Memphis with a Persian herald aboard. The massacre of the ambassador and the crew led to the siege and surrender of Memphis (3.13.1–3). The Libyans then capitulated voluntarily, as did the Hellenes in Barke and Cyrene (3.13.4). The Hellenes, who fought on the side of Cambyses, were sent home from Memphis by ship after Cambyses' return from his campaign against the Ethiopians (3.25.7). He had taken his entire infantry on this military venture, but left units of the Hellenes in Egypt (3.25.2).

What is worth mentioning in this context is Cambyses' failed military campaign against the Carthaginians. The Phoenicians' refusal to go to war against "their own children" caused the entire venture to be doomed from the beginning. Herodotus specifically states that the entire Persian naval power leaned on the Phoenicians as their main support and that the remaining contingents were not strong enough (3.17.1–2, 19.2–3). The Libyans and Hellenes who had been overthrown by Cambyses in Cyrenaica then appear again in the catalogue of tax districts established by Darius (3.91.2–3).<sup>21</sup>

Only in Book IV does Herodotus report that Cambyses had made Aryandes governor [ὑπαρχος] over Egypt and that Darius later eliminated him (4.166). The following report about the activities of the fleet in the Egyptian territory is linked to Aryandes. In Herodotus' scenario, a military campaign against Libya took place around the same time as Darius' unsuccessful Skythian campaign [τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦτον χρόνον] (4.145.1).<sup>22</sup> Presumably, the campaign served to crush internal turmoil and to secure sovereignty over the entire region.<sup>23</sup> Herodotus suggested that Aryandes secretly hoped to overthrow the Libyans [ἐπὶ Λιβύων καταστροφῇ] (4.167.3). As with Darius' Skythian campaign and with other major military

campaigns of the Persian kings, both land army and fleet participated in the attacks. Amasis was commander of the fleet and Badres served as commander of the foot troops (4.167.1).<sup>24</sup> Herodotus does not give any details about the role of the fleet or of the specific fleet units (4.167.1; 4.201, 203).

It should be noted, therefore, that for the entire period between the conquest of Egypt and the Ionian rising, Herodotus offers no details regarding either the role of the Egyptian contingents of the fleet or of the fleet itself. This is striking, since he was well aware of the powerful role Egyptian sea forces played in the maritime policies of the last Saïtes.

#### 4) THE RISING IMPORTANCE OF THE EGYPTIAN FLEET IN THE SAITE PERIOD AND HERODOTUS' SILENCE ON THEIR ROLE DURING AND AFTER CAMBYSES' CAMPAIGN

Herodotus appears to assume that the Egyptians had already mastered the art of seafaring early on in history and that they had been sailing the Mediterranean for at least as long as the Hellenes (see 2.34.3). But, apart from the story about King Sesostri's legendary naval expedition from the Arabian Gulf along the Red Sea coastline (2.102.2),<sup>25</sup> nothing more is said about further nautical activities of the Egyptians before the reign of King Necho. Interestingly, Herodotus reports about the circumnavigation of Libya by a Phoenician fleet on Necho's order only in Book IV, in the context of various other stories of spectacular expeditions (4.42).<sup>26</sup> In Herodotus' chronology of events, this legendary enterprise started immediately after the end of Necho's fatal canal project Herodotus described in Book II (4.42.2).<sup>27</sup> Probably, the account of the successful Phoenician sailors would not have fit in so well in the context of Book II. In fact, the news about the increasing sea strength of the Saite dynasty, which follows thereafter, shows a by no means frictionless relationship with the Phoenicians. However, in Herodotus' perspective King Necho opened of a successful period in the maritime history of Egypt:

After the halting of his work on the canal [παυσάμενος δὲ τῆς διώρυχος], Necho turned to military ventures. He had triremes constructed in the northern sea,<sup>28</sup> and others in the Arabian Gulf by the Red Sea; the slipways are still visible. He used these ships as occasion demanded, and he also engaged the Syrians on land, won a battle at

Magdolus, and then took the important city of Cadytis. He sent to Branchidae in Miletus the clothes which he happened to be wearing during his successful campaign against the Syrians, and dedicated them to Apollo (2.159).

After the short rule of Psammis, whose campaign to Ethiopia is mentioned only in passing (2.161.1), Psammetichus' great-grandson Apries takes over the throne. Herodotus succinctly reports that he waged war against Sidon and got involved in a naval battle against the ruler of the Tyrians [ἐναυμάχησε τῷ Τυρίῳ] (2.161.2).<sup>29</sup> These scarce remarks are sufficient to underline the successful beginning of Apries' reign,<sup>30</sup> but in the center of Herodotus' narrative the change of power from Apries to Amasis covers large passages. And it is only at the end of his colorful story about King Amasis' deeds that Herodotus comes back to maritime operations. The last sentence in Book II marks the culmination of Egyptian naval victories: "He [Amasis] was also the first person to capture Cyprus and to make it a tribute-paying state" (2.182.2).<sup>31</sup> Yet, the following sentence immediately leads to the conquest of Egypt (3.1.1).

## II: HERODOTUS' REPORT ABOUT THE ROLE OF GREEK TROOPS IN EGYPT AND THE SITUATION IN SAIS DURING THE TRANSITION OF POWER TO THE PERSIANS

Udjahorresnet was eager to memorialize that he did his best for the protection of the great sanctuary in Sais during the time of the occupation after the conquest of Egypt. He tells us also that he made a petition to Cambyses "about all the foreigners who dwelled in the temple of Neith" and that the Great King ordered to expel them and to purify the sanctuary. Unsurprisingly, Udjahorresnet was concerned about the behavior of the foreign soldiers who entered the country together with Cambyses' army. Herodotus' attention, however, is much less drawn to these soldiers than to the Ionian and Carian mercenaries who were in the service of the Saite Kings.<sup>32</sup> Three times they play a major role in the dynastic change of power, including the conquest of Egypt by the Persians. On the other hand, Herodotus tells us nothing about the further destiny of these soldiers. In addition, he provides only scarce information about the Hellenes in Cambyses' land forces. Nevertheless, he let us see that the Saites, as well as Cambyses, had Greek soldiers at their side.

In regard to the situation of Sais, it is interesting to see that Herodotus not only avoids a clear statement that Cambyses' mistreatment of Amasis' mummy took place in the sanctuary of Neith, but he also does not give any indication as to whether the city had suffered any damages during the occupation by the Persians. Cambyses' notorious deeds as a "mad dog" are linked to his stay at Memphis. Generally, Herodotus himself does not report any damages of sanctuaries or other buildings caused by Cambyses. Relevant reports about such damages appear only in later sources. We should therefore resist the temptation to use Herodotus' stories of Cambyses' deeds for speculations of an historic background for Udjahorresnet's references to the "great turmoil."

### 1) THE ROLE OF THE GREEK TROOPS IN THE SERVICE OF THE SAITE KINGS AND THE AMBIVALENT POLICIES OF KING AMASIS

The presence of foreign soldiers in Egypt starts with Herodotus' version of the transition of power from the Dodecarchy to the Saite Kings. According to Herodotus, Psammetichus was able to succeed in the fight against his royal opponents and to end the short phase of the Dodecarchy with the help of Ionian and Carian mercenaries and his Egyptian supporters. These mercenaries had allegedly been pirates at sea, before the king befriended them (2.152). And he gave them land: "As a reward for the Ionians and Carians who had helped him win, Psammetichus gave them each their own land to settle; the Ionians were on one side of the Nile, the Carians on the other; these places were called the Encampments [Στρατόπεδα]" (2.154.1).

In Herodotus' accounts the presence of these mercenaries is generally connected with a new quality of information about Egypt and about the events that took place in the country. "They were the first foreigners to live in Egypt, and it is thanks to their residence there that we Greeks have had some connection with the country, and that is how we have reliable information about Egyptian history from the reign of Psammetichus onwards" (2.154.4).<sup>33</sup> However, we do not learn anything new about the military activities of the mercenaries for a considerable amount of time. Herodotus does not specify whether these mercenaries were involved in the crushing defeat of the Egyptian troops under King Apries in the battle against the Cyrenians (2.161; 4.159.4–6), only, that the king's defeat triggered a rebellious movement of the Egyptians and of King Amasis,

who was popular among the people,<sup>34</sup> and that the rebellion led to open confrontation with Apries.

Initially, Apries' reign was characterized by military success. Herodotus calls him the most fortunate [εὐδαιμονέστατος] ruler since Psammetichus (2.161.1). Apries' maritime engagement, as mentioned above, belongs to that period too. But with the defeat of the Egyptians in battle against the Cyreneans, the tide turned. Apries' greatest mistake however, was the brutal way in which he punished Patarbemis, a man of high standing. Allegedly, he considered him a traitor without even hearing his part and ordered to cut off the victim's nose and ears (2.162). This scandalous act, which reminds of the behavior of Persian despots and thus casts a dark shadow on the future, caused heightened public indignation (2.162.6).<sup>35</sup> It subsequently led to Amasis victory over Apries and to his inglorious end.

The constellation in the decisive battle at Momemphis is quite remarkable.<sup>36</sup> Now, Apries waged war "against the Egyptians" together with his mercenaries, including 30,000 Ionians and Carians, whereas Amasis went to war against the foreigners [ἐπὶ τοὺς ξείνους] (2.163).<sup>37</sup> At this point of his narration, Herodotus includes an account of the seven *genea* of the Egyptians, highlighting the importance of the warriors.<sup>38</sup> Their strength could reach up to 250,000 Calasirians and 160,000 Hermotybians (2.165–166).<sup>39</sup> Herodotus does not give any exact information on the strength of the military contingent of Amasis. He mentions only that the mercenaries fought bravely on Apries' side, "but the vastly superior numbers they were up against ensured their defeat" (2.169.1).

Initially after his defeat Apries was treated well. But later on Amasis surrendered his predecessor to the Egyptians, who killed the former king and buried his corpse in the sanctuary of Athena, together with his forefathers (2.169.2–4). At a certain distance from the tomb of the Saite dynasty, but still within the boundaries of the sanctuary [ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ ἰσοῦ], there is also the tomb of Amasis, which Herodotus now describes in more detail (2.169.5). Without saying so explicitly, Herodotus already brings Amasis' end and the following transition of power into the mind of his audience.

Amasis now managed to bring over the mercenaries to his side. He settled the Ionians and Carians near Memphis, "where they acted as his personal guards to protect him against the Egyptians

[φυλακὴν ἑωυτοῦ ποιούμενος πρὸς Αἰγυπτίων]" (2.154.3). They now served the new ruler who had overthrown Psammetichus' great-grandson. Eventually, they played a crucial role in the next dynastic change.

Amasis had clearly stylized himself as a friend of the Hellenes in many ways. He possessed an expansive network of diplomatic relations, and his gifts were displayed in Delphi and Cyrene, as well as in Lindos and on Samos (2.178–182; 3.47). But the ambivalent character of his policy of alliance remains noticeable. This does not only become obvious through his opportunistic relationship with Polycrates of Samos. As we have seen above, Herodotus also sets a noteworthy signal with the last sentence of the story of Amasis, which concludes the Egyptian *logos*: Amasis' conquest of Cyprus (2.182.2).<sup>40</sup> The Hellenes who lived in Cyprus were of course also affected by its surrender. Amasis is thus depicted as one of the shady conqueror-kings, whose ambiguous policies with regard to the Hellenes form a leitmotif in Herodotus' *Histories*.<sup>41</sup>

## 2) THE ROLE OF THE MERCENARIES DURING THE CONQUEST OF EGYPT

Within his account of Cambyses' military success, Herodotus attributes crucial importance to the betrayal by Phanes of Halicarnassus, who was one of Amasis' mercenaries.<sup>42</sup> When Cambyses then planned his military campaign, Phanes came to speak to the Persian king and informed him in detail about the military situation in Egypt. His experience was of crucial importance for the march of the Persian army through the desert. So he advised Cambyses to seek for diplomatic relations with the king of the Arabians (3.4). But he had to pay for his betrayal with the death of his sons. The mercenaries who fought on the side of the Egyptians were angered by Phanes' treacherous deed. Thus they decided to kill his sons in a form of ritual sacrifice and drink their blood before the battle. Their evil deed foreshadows Herodotus' report about the decisive battle.<sup>43</sup> According to Herodotus the battle took place near the Pelusian mouth of the Nile (3.10.1).<sup>44</sup> Its outcome opened the way for the invaders: "The fighting was fierce and losses on both sides were very heavy, but in the end the Egyptians were routed" (3.11.3).

Herodotus does not include any further details at this point.<sup>45</sup> Thus, we do not learn anything more

about the further fate of the Ionian and Carian mercenaries. He only points out that the Hellenes did not have to go to war against the Ethiopians with Cambyses, although all the remaining troops of the land army did (3.25.2). Finally, upon his return, the king sent all the Hellenes home. They departed from Memphis by ship (3.25.7). The mercenaries, who had previously served under Amasis and Psammenitus, could possibly also have been among them.

### 3) THE CONTRAST BETWEEN CAMBYSES' DEEDS IN SAIS AND IN MEMPHIS

Soon after the conquest of Memphis, Cambyses brought the royal family to trial (3.14–15). Although Cambyses had him released, Psammenitus did not refrain from engaging in further rebellious activities.<sup>46</sup> Therefore, he was sentenced to death by drinking bull's blood (3.15.4).<sup>47</sup> Herodotus then moves the focus on Cambyses' stay in the city of Sais, where he entered the palace of Amasis [τὰ τοῦ Ἀμᾶσιος οἰκία]. There he immediately "gave orders that Amasis' corpse was to be taken from the coffin and brought outside" (3.16.1). Herodotus does not give any further details on the exact localization of the tomb at this point. Probably, his dramatic account of the destruction and subsequent burning of Amasis' mummy on Cambyses' orders should not be explicitly connected with the sanctuary of Athena (3.16.1–4; but see 2.1.169.5). Cambyses had thus given orders for an outrageous act to be carried out [ἐντελλόμενος οὐκ ὅσια], which was directed against both the *nomos* of the Persians and of the Egyptians (3.16.2–4). But we should keep in mind that Herodotus knows to play with different opinions.<sup>48</sup>

In consequence, Herodotus adds an alternative version: The mummy Cambyses mistreated was that of another man, arranged on Amasis' order near the entrance of the tomb. By telling this version he reveals a tradition which probably was told to cover up any facts which might shed a negative light on Amasis, but at the same he expresses his doubts: "In my opinion, Amasis never gave these instructions... and it is just a story told by the Egyptians to make an impression [Αἰγύπτιοι σεμνοῦν]" (3.16.7). In any case, it is noteworthy that Herodotus avoids giving the impression that the horrible scene where Amasis' mummy is destroyed and burned had taken place within the boundaries of the sanctuary of Athena. Right from the very beginning of his account, the attention is directed towards the *royal palace*.

Remarkably, no measures are reported that were taken against the city of Sais and its inhabitants on Cambyses' orders, as well as any measures that were taken against the sanctuary of Athena. Cambyses' deeds as a "mad dog" are linked to his stay at Memphis.

In Herodotus' narrative, the series of his infamously evil deeds begins with the return of the despot from his disastrous military campaign against Ethiopia. The starting point is the killing of the Apis. The well-known story about this evil deed and its negative consequences, such as the annihilation of Cyrus' dynasty, need not be discussed in detail at this point.<sup>49</sup> In the given context, however, it seems important to mention that Memphis is *the* setting where the wicked deeds of the king take place. In addition to the brutal treatment of Apis' priests and the governors and the people of the city of Memphis (3.27–29), these evil acts include the opening of tombs, the desecration of the cult image in the sanctuary of Hephaistos, and the desecration and burning of cult images in the sanctuary of the *cabiri* (3.37). As is well known, Herodotus includes some important reflections on this outrageous behavior and on the respect for foreign customs, using the example of how to treat the bodies of the deceased (3.38). Generally, Herodotus does not mention the destruction of buildings and the plundering of treasures in his description of Cambyses' numerous atrocities. The reports about his notorious deeds are to be found in texts that were written in later time.<sup>50</sup>

### III: THE FIRST CONQUESTS MADE BY CAMBYSES AND BY DARIUS AND THEIR DUBIOUS "SUPPORTERS"

Udjahorresnet's position as chief physician suggested the idea of identifying him with one or the other physician at the Persian court mentioned in the *Histories*. To what extent such identifications can be corroborated should be examined with regard to the highly complex structure of Herodotus' text.

Herodotus connects Cambyses' and Darius' first deeds as conquerors and overshadows their achievements with subtle, at times obvious, irony. In both cases, he presents a pair of alternative versions highlighting the "true" reasons for their successful imperialistic policies.

On the one hand, both scenarios contain physicians of a rather dubious character—vengeful the one, a picaresque figure the other—and the kings' women-folk as the "real actors" in the background; on the

other hand, we meet a pair of dubious “political” actors: a traitorous deserter and an exiled trouble-maker.

#### 1) THE ANONYMOUS EGYPTIAN EYE DOCTOR AND THE GREEK PHYSICIAN DEMOCEDES

Right at the beginning of the Egyptian *logos*, Herodotus introduces Cambyses as son of Cyrus and Cassandane, daughter of Pharnaspes, who had already died during the lifetime of Cyrus (2.1.1). But, at the beginning of Book III, Herodotus presents us with three versions of the reasons for Cambyses' campaign.<sup>51</sup>

Following the first, the “Persian” version (3.1), an Egyptian physician was sent to Cyrus, who had asked Amasis for a specialist eye doctor. Therefore that man hated Amasis [ὃς μεμφόμενος Ἀμάσι ἐπρηξε ταῦτα] and advised Cambyses to ask for the daughter of the Egyptian King. Amasis “knew full well that Cambyses was not about to make her his wife, but his concubine [ὡς παλλακὴν].”<sup>52</sup> Therefore he sent him Nitetis, the daughter of Apries, his former king and master [δεσπότης], whom he had murdered. Later on, as Cambyses met her, she revealed the truth to him. The news made him furious and motivated his campaign. This is the “Persian” version [λέγουσι Πέρσαι]. The second version is explicitly attributed to Egyptians [Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ οἰκημεῦνται] (3.2): Cambyses was the son of Apries' daughter, sent to Cyrus instead of Amasis' own daughter. But, as Herodotus comments, this version is not correct [λέγοντες δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγουσι]. “They are in fact perfectly well aware—for no one understand the Persian customs [νόμιμα] better than the Egyptians—, first that it is not legal for the Persians to let an illegitimate son become king while a legitimate heir is alive,<sup>53</sup> and second Cambyses' mother was Cassandane the daughter of the Achaemenid Pharnaspes.” The Egyptians are simply distorting the facts in an attempt to link themselves to the house of Cyrus (3.2). Herodotus' *third* version (3.3), eventually, is declared “unbelievable” [οὐ πιθανός] by the historian himself. Cassandane allegedly hated Cyrus' new wife from Egypt and felt that she had been offended in her honor. Cambyses, who was still a young boy at the time, wanted revenge for his mother.

The three versions have a crucial point in common: the presence of Nitetis, the daughter of

Apries, as one of the Persian king's concubines at the Persian court.<sup>54</sup> Herodotus' remark, that the Egyptians tried to attach themselves to the new ruler via the dynasty of Apries and his father Cyrus, can also be interpreted in the opposite way. In fact, it could be seen as a “national” interest to attach the foreign ruler to the highly respected Egyptian dynasty, which had been overthrown by Amasis. Also the story of Cambyses' destruction of the mummy of Amasis probably points in the same direction.<sup>55</sup>

Remarkably, it is the figure of an Egyptian ophthalmologist, whose anger against Amasis led—if we follow the “Persian” version—finally to the conquest of his own country.

A parallel figure then appears with the Greek doctor Democedes as responsible for the conquest of Samos. Although we do not learn anything more *in an explicit manner* about this Egyptian ophthalmologist, the story of Democedes and the presence of Egyptian physicians at Darius' court awaken memories of him.<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, one should resist the temptation, to identify Herodotus' ophthalmologist with Udjahorresnet.<sup>57</sup> Herodotus' account implies that this physician had already arrived at court during the reign of Cyrus, but neither should one take this detail for granted. Nevertheless, the tendency to “detect” Udjahorresnet in Greek sources seems to lead to even more unfounded speculations. This takes us back to the second person, whose anger against Amasis played indeed a crucial role in Cambyses' attack against Egypt, if we follow Herodotus' story (3.4). Why Phanes of Halicarnassos, one of Amasis' mercenaries, “a resourceful person and a brave fighter,” had a grudge against his master Herodotus does not specify (3.4.1). In any case, according to his narrative, he tried to get in contact with Cambyses and fled from Egypt to Lycia by ship. Amasis gave orders to his most loyal eunuch to chase after him. In Lycia the eunuch managed to get hold of Phanes, but the latter escaped with the help of a time-proven trick (3.4.2–3).<sup>58</sup> Now, there is in Ctesias an “alternative” version of the same story in which is not only King Amasis replaced by Amyrtaeus but also the figure of Phanes by an eunuch named Kombaphis, a cousin of the Persian kings courtesan Izabates (F 13.10 Lenfant = Photius). The tendency to speculate about the role of Udjahorresnet without any solid basis had also led him to be identified with this otherwise unknown eunuch.<sup>59</sup>

But let us come back to the ophthalmologist. Just as in Herodotus' "Persian version" of Cambyses' reasons to make the campaign against Egypt, a doctor is introduced as a dubious actor in Herodotus' stories about Darius' motives to conquer Samos. But in this case Herodotus presents a picaresque story of highly entertaining qualities.<sup>60</sup> To cut it short: Democedes, a Western-Greek physician, once in Polycrates' service at Samos, became a slave of Oroites and then of Darius. Due to his medical knowledge, he was able to heal Darius' injured ankle after the king's riding accident.<sup>61</sup> In consequence, he was esteemed at the king's court and became Atossa's tricky adviser, and he persuaded the queen to turn her husband's imperialistic ambitions against the Hellenes.<sup>62</sup> Darius' plans for a Scythian campaign should be postponed (3.129–138).

Within the framework of Herodotus' rogue-story of the Greek physician, we get an idea of the importance of the wide-spread interest in Egyptian medicine, which was present at the time and also of the relationship between Egyptian and Greek medicine.<sup>63</sup> Herodotus first hints at the presence of the Egyptian doctors at the king's court: "Previously, it had always been Darius' practice to have at hand Egyptian doctors whose as healers was unsurpassed" (3.129.2). His narration then contrasts Democedes' successful performance as Darius' physician with the failure of the Egyptian doctors. They "were about to be impaled for letting a Greek doctor get the better of them, but Democedes implored the king to have mercy and saved their lives" (3.132). Herodotus thus manages to bring the story of Cambyses, Nitetis and the Egyptian ophthalmologist in mind, without saying so. At the same time he connects the story of Democedes with the story of Syloson by a carefully placed flashback.

## 2) DARIUS' FIRST STAY IN EGYPT AND HIS ENCOUNTER WITH SYLOSON

At the time of Cambyses' campaign, many Hellenes came to Egypt for various reasons, as Herodotus declares: "to do business, naturally, to take part in the fighting, or just to see the country [οἱ δὲ τινες καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς χώρας θεηταί]." This statement is the beginning of the story of how the conquest of Samos came about. Herodotus continues by relating the first encounter of Syloson and Darius. "One of those who came as a sightseer was Syloson the son of Aecaes, who was Polycrates' brother and had been exiled from Samos" (3.139.1).

Syloson was a wealthy man, and one day he was seen walking around the market place of Memphis, wearing a red-flame-colored cloak. This was where Darius spotted him. Darius at that time was a member of Cambyses' guard, serving as a lance bearer "and was not yet a person of any particular importance" [δορυφόρος τε ἔων Καμβύσεω καὶ λόγου οὐδενός κω μεγάλου].<sup>64</sup> When Darius saw Syloson, he became eager to buy this purple cloak. But Syloson, by a divine chance [θεῖν τύχῃ χρεώμενος],<sup>65</sup> made it a present to him (3.139.2–3). The episode characterizes the future creator of the Empire's tax districts, whom the Persians called a "shopkeeper" [κάπηλος] (3.89.3).<sup>66</sup> Furthermore, Herodotus manages to connect Cambyses' conquests with those of King Darius in this episode. Later on in time, when Polycrates had been murdered by Oroites and Maeandrius had succeeded in gaining power over Samos, Syloson suddenly remembered the cloak he had once given to Darius free of charge. Thus Syloson asked to be given dominion over Samos in an audience with the king.<sup>67</sup> It was at his request that Darius put Otanes in charge of an expeditionary force, which finally led to the devastation of Samos (3.140–147).

## IV: HERODOTUS' CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS RELATED TO EGYPT DURING THE SHIFT OF POWER FROM CAMBYSES TO DARIUS AND SOME REMARKS ON EGYPT'S LATER HISTORY

After his Egyptian *logos* and the Cambyses story, Herodotus' focus was concentrated on other matters than the history of Egypt. Nevertheless, he did not only mention the role of the Egyptian forces under Persian rule in the "Persian Wars," but he gave also a series of proleptic references to the situation in Egypt during the era of the Pentecontaetia and in "his own days," especially on the involvement of the Athenians in the rebellion of Inarus and Amyrtaeus, which ended in disaster. Furthermore, it is in Book IV that he reports on the deeds and the final destiny of the Egyptian governor Aryandes. His narrations are connected with striking chronological questions. This, eventually, leads us back to the notorious problems of the chronological order of events within the first years of Darius' reign.

It is in full awareness of these problems that we have to consider Herodotus' statement about the presence of Egyptian physicians at Darius' court as well as Udjahorresnet's testimony about his presence on his master's side in Elam.

1) A STARTING POINT: HERODOTUS' PROLEPTIC REFERENCES TO THE REBELLION OF INARUS AND AMYRTAEUS, THE DEATH OF ACHAEMENES, AND THE DEFEAT OF THE ATHENIANS

Generally, there is a remarkable lack of information about Egyptian matters in the *Histories* when it comes to the period between Cambyses' death and the deeds of the Persian army in course of the "Persian Wars."<sup>68</sup> On the other hand, Herodotus presents a series of proleptic references to the situation in Egypt during the era of the Pentecontaetia and in "his own days." Their focus is on the involvement of the Athenians in the rebellion of Inarus and Amyrtaeus, which ended in disaster. Herodotus was well aware of the political situation of his own days: The land is still under Persian control. The dams for the protection of Memphis are watched by the Persians (2.99.3). And he states that "even in my day" [ἐν τῷ δὲ ἐπ' ἐμῷ] Persian guard posts are placed in Elephantine and Daphnae (2.30.3). Egypt and the Libyan neighborhood, Cyrene and Barke, are included in the sixth tax district organized by Darius. Special taxes back the Persians and their mercenaries in Leukonteichos (3.91.2–3).<sup>69</sup>

Herodotus' frequent proleptic references to the rebellion of Inarus and Amyrtaeus clearly underline his critical judgment on Athens' imperialistic "adventure." A first hint, rather disguised, is given in the story of the older Kings in Book II: it was only Amyrtaeus who rediscovered the island in the delta to which King Anysis had once withdrawn (2.140.2).<sup>70</sup> Two broader hints at this revolt against Persian rule are then given in the course of Cambyses' conquest of Egypt. Herodotus first uses his report on the battle near the Pelusian mouth of the Nile (3.10.1) with a reference to "those who fell along with Achaemenes the son of Darius at the battle of Papremis, killed by Inaros the Libyan" (3.12.4).<sup>71</sup> Then Herodotus comments on Cambyses' sentence upon Psammenitus and the insane judgment of the letter: "... in fact, if he had been able to steer clear of political involvement,<sup>72</sup> he would have regained Egypt and been able to reign as Cambyses' regent, since the Persians tend to honour the sons of kings; they even give the sons of kings who have rebelled against them their kingdom back" (3.15.2).<sup>73</sup>

The most relevant passage, in which Herodotus directly addresses the complete disaster that overcame the Athenians, who wanted to take advantage of the Egyptian uprising, follows later on

when a proleptic reference to the campaign which Megabyzus conducted against the Athenians and their allies in Egypt (3.160.2) rounds off the account of Darius' brutal crushing of the revolt in Babylon at the end of Book III.<sup>74</sup> Eventually, as just mentioned above, Herodotus made a short but highly significant remark on the sad consequences of the Egyptians' rebellion that Xerxes had crushed brutally. This remark is followed by an outlook on the destiny of Xerxes' brother Achaemenes, the new governor of Egypt: "Some time later, during his administration of Egypt, Achaemenes was murdered by a Libyan called Inaros the son of Psammetichus" (7.7).<sup>75</sup>

2) HERODOTUS' SCARCE REFERENCES TO KING DARIUS' STAYS IN EGYPT AND TO ARYANDES' EXECUTION

As we saw, the first time Darius had come to Egypt he accompanied his master Cambyses as a lance bearer. It is only incidentally in Book II that Herodotus on two occasions alludes to further visits of the later King Darius in Egypt, and the references are chronologically vague.<sup>76</sup> The time Darius is thought to have completed the canal project initiated by Necho (2.158) remains in the dark. At least the other reference clearly implies a date after the Scythian campaign: The priests of Memphis tell him that he is not allowed to erect a statue at the sanctuary of Hephaestus, since he has—in contrast to Sesostris—failed to conquer the Scythians (2.110).<sup>77</sup>

Now it is only in Book IV that Herodotus presents his colorful story of this failed campaign. Remarkably, in his narrative scenario, a vague synchronism links this event with another combined expedition on land and sea, directed against Libya [ἐπὶ Λιβύην] (4.145.1) and ordered by Aryandes, the governor [ὑπαρχος] Cambyses established after the conquest of Egypt (4.166.1). As mentioned above, Herodotus only reports about the land operations. He gives no details on the mission of the fleet (4.167.1; 4.201; 4.203).<sup>78</sup> Following Herodotus' chronology, the execution of Aryandes must be dated to the time *after* Darius' return from Scythia (cf. 4.145.1). Darius' motives are doubtful: "... he [Aryandes] was to be executed for trying to claim equal status with Darius." Allegedly, he emulated Darius' famous golden coins by the minting of refined silver coins (4.166). The veracity of this information is notoriously debated in modern research.<sup>79</sup> Herodotus' report also raises further

questions. "When Darius found out what Aryandes was doing, he brought a different charge, that of sedition [ὥς οἱ ἐπανίσταιτο], against him, and had him executed" (4.166).

Since one of Polyaeus' *stratagems* mentions a rebellion in Egypt caused by Aryandes, the possibility of linking this testimony with the execution of the governor is also widely discussed. But, are the arguments convincing? According to Polyaeus, the cruelties committed by Aryandes led to a revolt of the Egyptians. Therefore Darius marched through the desert against Egypt. At Memphis, he met the people deploring the death of the Apis. Now the king proclaimed a reward for the one who would identify the new Apis. "The Egyptians were so impressed by the piety of the king, that they took decisive action against the rebels, and entirely devoted themselves to support of Darius" (Polyaeus 7.11.7, transl. by R. Shepherd). It seems that the framing of this story was deliberately made up to place Darius in a favorable contrast with his predecessor. This makes the story doubtful.<sup>80</sup> However, Polyaeus' story did not establish a connection between this rebellion and the execution of the governor.<sup>81</sup> The chronological problems within Herodotus' narration of Aryandes' deeds and his elimination on Darius' order still remain unsolved.<sup>82</sup> Nevertheless, the discrepancies between the stories about Aryandes told by Herodotus and by Polyaeus lead us to see once more the general problem: the lack of concrete information Herodotus provides on the situation in Egypt during the transition of power from Cambyses to Darius and the first years of his reign.

### 3) HERODOTUS' CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS RELATED TO THE FIRST YEARS OF DARIUS' REIGN

As already mentioned above, following Herodotus' chronology of events, Darius went to Egypt together with Cambyses in the position of a lance bearer and his first encounter with Syloson took place at Memphis. Next—not in the narrative order of the text, but in the chronological order of the narrated historical events—Darius appears at the moment when the six conspirators are planning their movements against the rule of the magi: "At this juncture, Darius the son of Hystaspes arrived in Susa from Persia [ἐκ Περσέων ἥκων], where his father was governor [ὑπαρχος], and the six Persian conspirators decided to recruit Darius too" (3.70.3).<sup>83</sup> It is a pity that no information is provided on how

and when he got from Egypt to Persia.

Soon after the seven conspirators had defeated the magi and Darius was appointed the new Persian king, Herodotus presents him as the great organizer of the tax districts (including Egypt). It is only thereafter that he tells the sad story about the elimination of one of the Seven, the noble Intaphrenes (3.118–119). The next measure taken against a high-handed vassal was Oroites' execution on the accusation, that he had not given support to the Persians at the time "matters were still unstable" [οἰδεόντων ἔτι τῶν πρηγμάτων] (3.127).<sup>84</sup> Herodotus now introduces Democedes, Oroites' former slave who was deported to Susa, and tells the picaresque story of the doctor. Then follows the second encounter between Darius and Syloson, which led eventually to the conquest of Samos (3.140). As we saw, this order of events is deliberately arranged by Herodotus in order to link the Democedes story with that of Syloson with a flashback to Darius' first appearance in Egypt (3.139).<sup>85</sup>

Until this point of his narration, which ended with the conquest of Samos, Herodotus remained very vague about the troubles during the period after Cambyses' death. But now follows the famous story of the revolt of the Babylonians. Its outbreak is connected with Otanes' expedition to Samos by a synchronism: "During the course of this naval expedition against Samos, the Babylonians revolted" (3.150.1). After a long-lasting siege, Darius was able to conquer the city in the 20th month (153.1).

While Herodotus highlighted the great challenge the Babylonian Revolt represented for Darius' authority, he gave no clear hint to any rebellion in Egypt in the years after Psammenitus' execution.<sup>86</sup> This lack of information provoked the search for traces of the rebellion led by King Petubastis IV, hidden in the background of Herodotus' colorful stories of Cambyses' failed campaigns.<sup>87</sup> However, we have to consider the highly hypothetic state of such speculations.<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, Herodotus' report on the Babylonian Revolt leads us to the Bisitun Inscription, where Darius declared, "While I was in Babylon [where he had killed the usurper Nadintabair], these are the people/ countries who/ which became rebellious against me: Persia, Elam, Media, Assyria, Egypt, Parthia, Margiana, Sattagydia, Scythia (Saca)" (DB §21; transl. by Kuhrt 2007).<sup>89</sup> Darius' claim to rule over Egypt is demonstrated in the catalogue of lands and peoples,

given in DB § 6. But the notorious silence of any measures taken against the rebellious Egyptians supports the hypothesis that it took a long time, until Darius was able to settle his government as King of Upper and Lower Egypt.<sup>90</sup> We know for sure that he was officially recognized as king by August 518 BCE.<sup>91</sup>

Meanwhile, Darius' narrative presents many details on the different rebellions he and his armies crashed, we find only a few hints on the places where he himself stayed during this period of troubles. A further problem is given by the fact that the chronological classification of the source material concerning the Usurper-Kings in Babylon presented in cuneiform texts is connected with the order of events told by Darius in the Bisitun Inscription.<sup>92</sup>

Following his chronology of events,<sup>93</sup> he killed the usurper Gaumata in Media on 29 September 522 (DB § 13).<sup>94</sup> The first rebellions in Elam and Media began in October. A battle in Babylonia was fought on 13 December 522 (§ 18). Afterwards Darius himself went to Babylonia, where a battle was fought near the Euphrates on 18 December 522 (§ 19). Then he came to Babylon and conquered the city (§20). It is at this occasion—"while I was in Babylon"—that he reports on nine rebellious countries, including Egypt (§ 21). At that time, Darius continues, he was "near Elam," and due to his presence the Elamites were afraid and killed the usurper king in Elam (§ 22–23). Next, Darius had to deal with revolts in Media and Armenia. Repeatedly, he declared that his victorious troops waited there, "until I arrived in Media" (§ 25, 28, 30). Eventually Darius left Babylon and went to Media. "Then we joined battle"; the given date is 7 May 521 (§ 31). About August 521, "while I was in Persia and Media," the Babylonians revolted once again (§ 49). Finally, Darius' general Vindafarna defeated the usurper Arakha; the given date is 27 November 521 (§ 50). As far as Darius presents his view of the order of events, there is no hint that he left the region of Persia and Media before the third year of his reign. The "third revolt" of Elam in Darius' second regnal year was crashed by his general Gaubaruva (§ 71); the Great King himself in his third regnal year led the famous Scythian campaign (§ 74).<sup>95</sup>

Eventually, we have to consider Udjahorresnet's testimony of his stay with Darius in Elam, written on the back plinth of his naophorous statue: "The majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Darius, ever-living, commanded me to return to

Egypt—when his majesty was in Elam and was Great Chief of all foreign lands and Great Ruler of Egypt—in order to restore the establishment of the House of Life..." (43–45; transl. by M. Lichtheim). Udjahorresnet took care to present his respected status and his important mission under the reign of Darius. He had no reason to specify the political and chronological circumstances of his journey to Elam. He may have left Egypt in 522 BCE together with Darius, but this is only a sound hypothesis.<sup>96</sup> That Darius sent him back to Egypt before the political situation was stabilized seems unlikely. So he could well have served for a longer timespan in his master's entourage outside Egypt, but he does not give further hints to this period of his life. Taken in sum, we are still confronted with serious chronological problems if we want to trace Darius' movements during this time of troubles step by step.

Nevertheless, Udjahorresnet's testimony takes us back to Herodotus' noticeable remark in the story of Democedes: "Previously, it had always been Darius' practice to have at hand Egyptian doctors whose reputation as healers was unsurpassed" (3.129.3). However, that brings us not only to the discussion of how much knowledge about the personality and the deeds of Udjahorresnet could be detected in the background of Herodotus' picaresque story of the Greek physician, but also to the general problems with the chronology of Darius' actions related to Egypt before the year 518 BCE.<sup>97</sup>

We have to consider Udjahorresnet's testimony of his and his master's presence in Elam in full awareness of Herodotus' deliberately selective references to the history of Egypt after the conquest of the land by Cambyses. His chronology of events during the timespan between Cambyses' return from his Ethiopian campaign and Darius' Scythian campaign still raises more problems than it solves.

## V: SUMMARY

The topics studied in this paper are triggered by different aspects of Udjahorresnet's self-representation, beginning with his former position as "commander of the Royal navy" and his concern about the protection of Sais and the Sanctuary of Neith. The first section concentrates on the role Herodotus assigns to the Egyptian fleet in the *Histories*. He generally highlights its loyalty under Persian command during the "Persian Wars," although Xerxes had crushed a rebellion in Egypt. A look further back shows a striking contrast between

Herodotus' report of successful maritime policies under the last Saïtes and his silence about any actions of the Egyptian fleet over the long period from Cambyses' conquest until the outbreak of the Ionian Revolt. Section II presents a closer look at Herodotus' perspective on the role of foreign, especially Greek mercenaries in the service of the Saïte Kings. Three times they play a major role in the dynastic change of power. Regarding the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, Herodotus gives no indication as to whether the city of Sais had suffered any damages during the occupation. Cambyses' notorious deeds as a "mad dog" are linked to his stay at Memphis. The third section, inspired by Udjahorresnet's position as "chief physician," examines the curious role Egyptian physicians play in the *Histories*. Herodotus connects Cambyses' and Darius' first deeds as conquerors and overshadows their achievements with irony. In both cases, he presents a pair of dubious actors: on the one hand two physicians, a vengeful Egyptian eye doctor and a picaresque Greek doctor (Democedes), on the other hand a pair of dubious "political" actors, a traitorous deserter (Phanes) and an exiled troublemaker (Syloson). Finally, in section IV we are confronted with the chronological problems connected with the first years of Darius' reign. Therefore, Herodotus' order of events, including his reports on the Egyptian governor Aryandes, is examined step by step and compared with non-Greek source material. It is in full awareness of these notorious problems that we have to consider Herodotus' statement about the presence of Egyptian physicians at Darius' court as well as Udjahorresnet's testimony about his presence on his master's side in Elam.

#### REFERENCES

- Adiego, Ignacio J. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Handbook of Oriental Studies I/86. Leiden: Brill.
- Aigner, Heribert. 2008. "Der Tod des Themistokles." In Peter Mauritsch (ed.), *Aigner, Ausgewählte Schriften*, 83–90. Graz: Leykam.
- Asheri, David, Alan Lloyd and Aldo Corcella. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV*. Edited by Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno with a contribution by Maria Brosius. Translated by Barbara Graziosi, Matteo Rossetti, Carlotta Dus, and Vanessa Cazzato. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bichler, Reinhold. 2007. "Ein Königreich für ein Maultier oder der Sturz vom hohen Roß?" In Robert Rollinger (ed.), *Bichler, Historiographie—Ethnographie—Utopie*, 247–258. Gesammelte Schriften I. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2016. "Der Lyder Inaros, Über die ägyptische Revolte des Ktesias von Knidos." In Rollinger and Kai Ruffing (eds.), *Bichler, Historiographie—Ethnographie—Utopie*, 15–28. Gesammelte Schriften IV. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2018a. "Herodotus' Book II and the Unity of the Work." In Thomas Harrison and Elizabeth Irwin (eds.), *Interpreting Herodotus*, 75–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- . 2018b. "Herodotus the Geographer." In Ewen Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian*, 139–155. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.
- . Forthcoming a. "Numbers in Herodotus." In Kerstin Droß-Krüpe, Sebastian Fink, Robert Rollinger, and Kai Ruffing (eds.), *Societies at War: Proceedings of the Tenth Symposium of the Melammu Project Held in Kassel September 26–28 2016 and Proceedings of the Eighth Symposium of the Melammu Project held in Kiel November 11–15 2018*.
- . Forthcoming b. "A Comparative Look at the Post-Herodotean Cambyses." In Alexander Schütze and Andreas Schwab, *Herodotean Soundings: The Cambyses Logos*. Classica Monacensia. Tübingen: Narr/Franke Attempto Verlag.
- Bowie, Angus. 2018. "Herodotus the Story-teller." In Ewen Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian*, 25–36. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Brehm, Johannes. 2013. *Generationenbeziehungen in den Historien Herodots*. Classica et Orientalia 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Bresciani, Edda. 1985. "Ugiahorresnet a Menfi." *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 8: 1–6.
- Briant, Pierre. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- . 2017. "Herodotus, Udjahorresnet and Darius' Palace at Susa." In Pierre Briant, *Kings, Countries, Peoples" Selected Studies in the Achaemenid Empire*, 249–250. Translated by Amélie Kuhrt. Oriens et Occidens 26. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Cawkwell, George. 2005. *The Greek Wars: The Failure of Persia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruz-Uribe, Eugene. 2003. "The Invasion of Egypt by Cambyses." *Transeuphratène* 25: 9–60.
- Dan, Anca. 2013. "Achaemenid World Representation in Herodotus' Histories: Some Geographic Examples of Cultural Translation." In Klaus

- Geus, Elizabeth Irwin, and Thomas Poiss (eds.), *Herodots Wege des Erzählens: Logos und Topos in den Historien*, 83–121. Zivilisationen und Geschichte 22. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Degen, Julian. 2019. "Alexander III., Dareios I. und das speererworbene Land (Diod. 17,17,2)." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 6: 53–95.
- Demont, Paul. 2018. "Herodotus on Health and Disease." In Ewen Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian*, 175–196. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Fischer-Bovet, Christelle. 2013. "Egyptian Warriors: The 'Machimoi' of Herodotus and the Ptolemaic Army." *Classical Quarterly* 63: 209–236.
- . 2014. *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt. Armies of the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gallo, Paolo and Olivier Masson. 1993. "Une stèle 'hellénomemphite' de l'ex-collection Nahman." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 93: 265–276, pls. I–IV.
- Garvie, Alexander F. 2009. *Aeschylus: Persae, with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giangiulio, Maurizio. 2011. "Greeks and Persians in Cyrenaica." In Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschneegg, and Reinhold Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, 705–716. Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gozzoli, Roberto B. 2009. *The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millenium BC (ca. 1070–180 BC): Trends and Perspectives*. London: Golden House Publications.
- Griffiths, Alan. 1987. "Democedes of Croton: A Greek Doctor at the Court of Darius." In Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Amelie Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources*, 37–51. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Harrison, Tom. 2000 *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Henkelman, Wouter F.M. 2002. "Exit der Posaunenbläser: On Lance-guards and Lance-bearers in the Persepolis Fortification Archive." *Achaemenid Research on Texts and Archaeology* 7: 1–35.
- . 2011. "Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Elamite: A Case of Mistaken Identity." In Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschneegg, and Reinhold Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, 577–634. Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Irwin, Elizabeth. 2017. "Just Why Did Cambyses Conquer Egypt? Herodotus' Logos of Cambyses' Egyptian Campaign: His Story as History." In Robert Rollinger (ed.), *Die Sicht auf die Welt zwischen Ost und West (750 v. Chr. – 550 n. Chr.)*, 95–141. Classica et Orientalia 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jacobs, Bruno. 2011. "'Kyros, der große König, der Achämenide': Zum verwandtschaftlichen Verhältnis und zur politischen und kulturellen Kontinuität zwischen Kyros dem Großen und Dareios I." In Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschneegg, and Reinhold Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, 635–663. Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jansen-Winkeln, Karl. 2014. "Die Siegesstele des Amasis." *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 141: 132–153.
- . 2017. "'Libyerzeit' oder 'Postimperiale Periode'?" Zur historischen Einordnung der Dritten Zwischenzeit." In Claus Jurman, Bettina Bader, and Davis A. Aston (eds.), *A True Scribe of Abydos: Essays on First Millennium Egypt in Honour of Anthony Leahy*, 203–238. Peeters.
- Kammerzell, Frank. 1993. *Studien zu Sprache und Geschichte der Karer in Ägypten*. Göttinger Orientalforschungen IV 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kaper, Olaf E. 2015. "Petubastis IV in the Dakhla Oasis: New Evidence about an Early Rebellion against Persian Rule and Its Suppression in Political Memory." In Jason M. Silverman and Caroline Waerzeggers (eds.), *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*, 125–149. Ancient Near Eastern Monographs 13. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Konstantakos, Ioannis M. 2016. "Cambyses and the Sacred Bull (Hdt. 3.27–29 and 3.64): History and Legend." In Vasileios Liotsakis and Scott Farrington (eds.), *The Art of History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*, 37–72. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. 2007. *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*. London: Routledge.
- Lenfant, Dominique. 2009. *Les Histoires perses de Dinon et d'Héraclide: Fragments édités, traduits et commentés*. Persika 13. Paris: de Boccard.
- Lloyd, Alan B. 1975. *Herodotus Book II, Volume I: Introduction*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lloyd, Alan B. 1976. *Herodotus Book II, Volume II:*

- Commentary 99–182. Leiden: Brill.
- Lloyd, Alan B. 1988. *Herodotus Book II, Volume III: Commentary 99–182*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lopez, Francesco. 2015. *Democede di Crotone e Udjahorresnet di Sais: Medici primari alla corte achemenide di Dario il Grande*. Pisa: University Press.
- . 2020 (this volume). “Udjahorresnet, Democedes, and Darius I: The Reform of the House of Life as Consequence of the Egyptian Physicians’ Failure to Heal the Achaemenid Ruler.” *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 26.
- Maisonnette, Christine. 2011. “Polyen de Bithynie.” In Dominique Lenfant (ed.), *Les Perses vus par les Grecs: Lire les sources classiques sur l’empire achéménide*, 339–355. Paris: Armand Collin.
- Masson, Olivier. 1978. *Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqara and Buhen*. Texts from Excavations Memoir 5. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Meiggs, Russell and David Lewis (eds.). 1969. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions: To the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Müller, Sabine. 2016. “Die Perser und das Meer: Eine Analyse der Inschriften der frühen Perserkönige.” In Ernst Baltrusch, Hans Kopp, and Christian Wendt (eds.), *Seemacht, Seeherrschaft und die Antike*, 219–231. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Pasek, Steve. 2011. *Griechenland und Ägypten im Kontext der vorderorientalischen Großmächte*. München: Martin Meidenbauer.
- Quack, Joachim Fr. 2011. “Zum Datum der persischen Eroberung Ägyptens unter Kambyses.” *Journal of Egyptian History* 4.2: 228–246.
- . 2013. “Quelques apports récents des études démotiques à la compréhension du livre II d’Hérodote.” In Laurent Coulon, Pascale Giovanelli-Jouanna, and Flore Kimmel-Clauzet (eds.), *Hérodote et l’Égypte: Regards croisés sur le livre II de l’Enquête d’Hérodote*, 63–88. Lyon: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée.
- Rollinger, Robert. 1993. *Herodots Babylonischer Logos: Eine kritische Untersuchung der Glaubwürdigkeitsdiskussion*, Innsbruck 1993. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 84. Innsbruck: Verlag des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft.
- . 1998/1999. “Der Stammbaum des achaimenidischen Königshauses oder die Frage der Legitimität der Herrschaft des Dareios.” *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 30: 155–209.
- . 2014. “Thinking and Writing about History in Teispid and Achaemenid Persia.” In Kurt Raaflaub (ed.), *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, 187–212. Malden, MA: Wiley.
- Rottpeter, Marc. 2007. “Initiatoren und Träger der ‘Aufstände’ im persischen Ägypten.” In Stefan Pfeiffer (ed.), *Ägypten unter fremder Herrschaft zwischen persischer Satrapie und römischer Provinz*, 9–33. Oikumene 3 (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Antike).
- Ruffing, Kai. 2006. “Salamis—Die größte Seeschlacht der Alten Welt.” *Grazer Beiträge* 25: 1–32.
- . 2009. “Die ‘Satrapienliste’ des Dareios: Herodoteisches Konstrukt oder Realität?” *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 41: 323–340.
- . 2018. “Gifts for Cyrus, Tribute for Darius.” In Thomas Harrison and Elizabeth Irwin (eds.), *Interpreting Herodotus*, 149–161. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 2009. *Die altpersischen Inschriften der Achaimeniden*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2011. *Iranische Personennamen in der griechischen Literatur vor Alexander d. Gr. Iranisches Personennamenbuch* VA. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Schwab, Andreas. Forthcoming. “‘This Was an Unholy Thing to Do...’: Reconsidering Cambyses’ Treatment of Amasis in Saïs (Hdt. 3.37).” In: Alexander Schütze and Andreas Schwab (eds.), *Herodotean Soundings: The Cambyses Logos*. Classica Monacensia. Tübingen: Narr/Franke Attempto Verlag.
- Schwinghammer, Gundula. 2011. “Die Smerdis Story—Der Usurpator, Dareios und die Bestrafung der ‘Lügenkönige.’” In Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschnegg, and Reinhold Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, 665–687. Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Shayegan, M. Rahim. 2012. *Aspects of History and Epic in Ancient Iran: From Gaumāta to Wahnām*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smoláriková, Kveta. 2015. “Udjahorresnet: The Founder of the Saite-Persian Cemetery at Abusir and His Engagement as Leading Political Person during the Troubled Years at the Beginning of the Twenty-Seventh Dynasty.” In Jason M. Silverman and Caroline Waerzeggers (eds.), *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*,

- 51–164. Ancient Near Eastern Monographs 13. Atlanta: SBL Press.
  - Sommerstein, Alan H. 2008. *Aeschylus: Persians, Seven against Thebes, Suppliants, Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge, MA: Loeb.
  - Stronk, Jan P. 2017. *Semiramis' Legacy: The History of Persia According to Diodorus of Sicily*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
  - Thomas, Rosalind. 2000. *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  - Tuplin, Christopher. 2018. "Dogs That Do Not (Always) Bark: Herodotus on Persian Egypt." In Thomas Harrison and Elizabeth Irwin (eds.), *Interpreting Herodotus*, 99–123. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  - Vittmann, Günter. 2011. "Ägypten zur Zeit der Perserherrschaft." In Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschegg, and Reinhold Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, 373–429. Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
  - Wallinga, Heribert T. 2005. *Xerxes' Greek Adventure: The Naval Perspective*. Leiden: Brill.
  - Wasmuth, Melanie. 2017. *Ägypto-persische Herrscher- und Herrschaftsrepräsentation in der Achämenidenzeit*. Oriens et Occidens 27. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
  - . 2020 (this volume). "The Statues of Udjahorresnet as Archaeological Artifacts." *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 26.
  - West, Martin L. (ed.). 1991. *Aeschyli Persae*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
  - West, Stephanie. 2003. "Croesus' Second Reprieve and Other Tales of the Persian Court." *Classical Quarterly* 53: 416–437.
  - . 2007. "Rhampsinitos and the Clever Thief (Herodotus 2.121)." In John Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Literature II*, 322–327. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
  - . 2011. "Herodotus' Sources of Information on Persian Matters." In Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschegg, and Reinhold Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, 255–272. Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
  - Wiesehöfer, Josef. 2011. "Herodot und Zypern." In Robert Rollinger, Brigitte Truschegg, and Reinhold Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich*, 717–734. Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
  - Wijnsma, Uzume Z. 2019. "The Worst Revolt of the Bitun Crisis: A Chronological Reconstruction of the Egyptian Revolt under Petubastis IV." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 77.2: 157–173.
  - Wiotte-Franz, Claudia. 2001. *Hermeneus und Interpret: Zum Dolmetscherwesen in der Antike*. Saarbrückener Studien zur Archäologie und Alten Geschichte 16. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.
- NOTES
- <sup>1</sup> Cf. Cruz-Urbe 2003, esp. 14: "Udjahorresnet, in any case, is particularly silent on this issue and thus any comments about the location and actions of the Egyptian fleet are pure speculation."
  - <sup>2</sup> Cf. Vittmann 2011, esp. 378 on the title "Vorsteher der königlichen *kbnt*-Schiffe": "Noch nicht ganz geklärt ist dabei, ob es sich dabei um eine militärische Funktion handelt ... oder eher um eine zivile, die Kontrolle des Seehandels betreffende."
  - <sup>3</sup> The lack of information does not prevent speculation. See, for example, Pasek 2011, 48: Udjahorresnet's cooperation with Cambyses "könnte die ägyptische Flotte entscheidend geschwächt haben."
  - <sup>4</sup> Cf. Garvie 2009, liii–lvii; Ruffing 2006, esp. 8–9 with further references.
  - <sup>5</sup> Thus it does not take into account the importance of fleet operations at the time of Darius. The decisive land battle at Plataea which was led by Sparta is mentioned only in passing. But that also applies to Athens' victory at Marathon. It has been discussed controversially whether this is more than a consequence of the dramaturgical conception, which paints a largely positive image of Darius or if it was politically motivated and thus directed against the followers of Cimon and his late father Miltiades. Cf. Garvie 2009, xviii–xix.
  - <sup>6</sup> Cf. below, NOTE 14.
  - <sup>7</sup> Translations from the *Persians* are taken from Sommerstein 2008.
  - <sup>8</sup> Cf. Sommerstein 2008, fn. 62; Garvie 2009, 175. H. T. Wallinga, who highlights that Aeschylus was well informed about the battle off Salamis, assumes that "the mention of 207 fast ships suggests the width of an attacking line" and "that the three files represent a marching order that had to enable the fast ships (three times

- sixty nine) to reach their position in as short time as possible"; cf. Wallinga 2005, esp. 4 and 115.
- <sup>9</sup> Cf. West 2011, esp. 262–265; Dan 2013, esp. 106–115.
- <sup>10</sup> Cf. Tuplin 2018, esp. 107: "...we should not infer from use of Egyptian forces in Greece five years later that it had been storm in a teacup." A short survey of the different rebellions in Egypt under Persian rule is given by Rottpeter 2007.
- <sup>11</sup> Translations of Herodotus in this paper are taken from Robin Waterfield.
- <sup>12</sup> Thus, the Egyptians and Phoenicians provided the ropes for the pontoon bridge across the Hellespont (7.25; 34). There were no Egyptians in Xerxes' infantry, but the Calasirians and Hermotybians served as combat troops on the ships (cf. 9.32).
- <sup>13</sup> But see also Wallinga 2005, 138: "...the disembarking of the battle-scarred marines was a precaution against their absconding with the ships and leading, or reinforcing a new rebellion."
- <sup>14</sup> Cf. Cawkwell 2005, 267 (Appendix 4, conclusion): "A fleet of 300 sufficed at all times, 480 BC included I suspect. For proper understanding of Persian power one must emancipate oneself from the Navy-List as well as the Army List of Herodotus." On the typical number of 600 ships cf. Bichler, forthcoming a.
- <sup>15</sup> On the role of the Cyprians cf. Wiesehöfer 2011, esp. 721–722 with further references.
- <sup>16</sup> Cf. the discussion that follows here (IV.1).
- <sup>17</sup> Cf. Cawkwell 2005, 255: "After Egypt had been conquered, the naval forces of that kingdom were available to the King, which had been considerable enough in the first half of the sixth century to engage the Tyrians in battle."
- <sup>18</sup> Cf. Cruz-Uribe 2003, 28: "... there is no other naval activity as part of the actual invasion [...] We may suggest (but can never prove) that the invasion of Cambyses may have been principally land based." On the date of the invasion see Quack 2011.
- <sup>19</sup> Cf. Briant 2002, 53: "We may say that Cambyses was the real creator of the Persian Navy, which was built with men and material from both, Phoenicia and Asia Minor." Cf. also Müller 2016), 222: "Die Erfordernisse des Ägyptenfeldzugs hinterließen erstmals Spuren einer persischen Flottenpolitik."
- <sup>20</sup> That could also be an allusion to the role of Samian ships in the Athenians' fatal engagement in the revolt of Inaros: cf. Meiggs and Lewis 1969, 76–77 no. 34, in combination with Thuc. 1.104.2.
- <sup>21</sup> Cf. the discussion that follows here (IV.1) and NOTE 69.
- <sup>22</sup> On the chronological problems, see the discussion that follows here (IV.2).
- <sup>23</sup> Cf., for example, Briant 2002, 141; Giangiulio 2011, with further references.
- <sup>24</sup> On Aryandes/Ἀρυάνδης, see Schmitt 2011, 131–132 no. 92; on Badres/Βάδρης, Schmitt 2011, 158–159 no. 117: Persian, belongs to the tribe of the Pasargadae; his identity with the son of Hystaspes, a Persian commander in Xerxes' land army (Hdt. 7.77), is possible but not corroborated; on Amasis / Ἀμασις, cf. Schmitt 2011, 69–70, no. 16: Persian, belongs to the tribe of the Maraphians, mentioned also by Aeneas Tacticus 37.6.
- <sup>25</sup> On the further development of the tradition and its critical tendency against King Darius cf. Lloyd 1988, 19. Sesostris' successful campaign against the Ethiopians (Hdt. 2.110) also contradicts Cambyses' debacle; cf. discussion that follows (IV.2) and NOTE 74.
- <sup>26</sup> On the well-composed ensemble of those stories, cf. Bichler 2018a, esp. 76–79; Bichler 2018b, esp. 142–144.
- <sup>27</sup> Herodotus' picture of this ambitious project is ambiguous. Although the technical achievements are depicted as thoroughly impressive, the death of 120,000 workers dramatically reveals the dark side of despotism. But in the end Necho acts wisely and puts an end to the construction of the canal due to the outcome of an oracle (2.158.5). According to this oracle, it was understood that Necho's efforts to build the canal merely served as preparatory work for the barbarians. In fact, in Herodotus' opinion, it was King Darius who completed the canal (2.158.1). Cf. Gozzoli 2009, 177: "There is no archaeological proof that the canal ordered by Darius was the conclusion of the one begun earlier by Necho." For a comprehensive analysis of Darius' great

- canal project and its documentation see Wasmuth 2017, esp. 125–156, 263–269.
- <sup>28</sup> Lloyd 1988, 159–160, is confident on the fact: “Gk. responsibility for the introduction of the type would provide a particularly potent reason for H.s interest.” For details, see Lloyd 1975, 32–38, esp. 37: “... the current of available evidence runs strongly and insistently in favour of the traditional view that Necho’s triremes were Greek.”
- <sup>29</sup> In a later tradition, these victorious military operations are described in a somewhat exaggerated manner; cf. Diodorus 1.68.2.
- <sup>30</sup> Cf. Lloyd 1988, 172: “His (Herodotus’) reasons for mentioning these events were probably Gk. mercenary participation and the fact that Eg. operations against Phoenicia and Cyprus left a profound impression on the Gks. themselves.”
- <sup>31</sup> Cf. Gozzoli 2009, 182: “... that Amasis conquered the island is not confirmed by any Egyptian inscriptions, but contributes to create the image of a conqueror pharaoh.” Lloyd 1988, 240, calls “Amasis’ conquest an entirely credible component of what seems to have been a grand strategy of defending Egypt’s interests, military and economic...” but it remains unclear how long lasting the conquest had been: “The most we can say is that Cyprus was under Persian suzerainty by 525...”
- <sup>32</sup> On the (Ionians and) Carians in Egypt see especially Masson 1978, Gallo and Masson 1993, Kammerzell 1993, Adiego 2007.
- <sup>33</sup> Herodotus considers the translators in Egypt the offspring of those foreigners with Egyptian women (2.154.3). Generally, we are confronted with the “Tatsache, dass Herodot der einzige griechische Geschichtsschreiber ist, der ägyptisch-griechische Dolmetscher der Zeit vom 7. bis zum 5. Jh. v. Chr. erwähnt”: Wiotte-Franz 2001, 21. On the Egypto-Carian funerary stelae from Memphis, some of which date back to the 7th century BCE, see NOTE 32.
- <sup>34</sup> Herodotus links the change of power from the dodecarchy to Psammetichus and from Psammetichus to Amasis by symbolic episodes: A helmet used as a drinking cup became the symbol of Psammetichus’ future monarchy and the fall of his eleven opponents (2.151.2–3). And a helmet also became the symbol of the future kingship of Amasis, the man of the people (2.162.1–2; 172.2). Cf. Bichler 2018a, esp. 93–94.
- <sup>35</sup> The literary motif of this kind of punishment reappears in the history of Darius’ vassals Intaphrenes (3.118) and Zopyrus (3.154). See also the discussion that follows here.
- <sup>36</sup> On the important Egyptian testimony for Apries’ defeat, the Amasis stele, see Jansen-Winkel 2014.
- <sup>37</sup> Cf. on the Egyptian sources for Apries’ foreign mercenaries Lloyd 1988, 180; on the localization of Momemphis, Lloyd 1988, 181–182.
- <sup>38</sup> Herodotus finally emphasizes the high esteem in which the Lacedaemonians hold their own warriors (2.167.2) and so foreshadows Apries’ defeat. Cf. on Herodotus’ excursus on the Egyptian class structure Lloyd 1988, 182–184; esp. on the problems of his ideas about the warrior-class see Fischer-Bovet 2013; cf. also Fischer-Bovet 2014, 38: “... there was no concept of class within Egyptian society, and no population group was obligated to devote its time exclusively to military matters.”
- <sup>39</sup> On the division of the warriors in two classes see Lloyd’s critical commentary in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 364–365. A special thesis is brought by Jansen-Winkel 2017, 230 fn. 180: “Es ist unstrittig, dass Herodots ‘Machimoi’ libyschen Ursprungs sind”; Jansen-Winkel assumes the existence of a hereditary status of warriors (erblicher Kriegerstand). Herodotus in 2.168 let us see that the class of the warriors lives “von der Produktion anderer.”
- <sup>40</sup> But cf. Gozzoli 2009, 182: “... that Amasis conquered the island is not confirmed by any Egyptian inscriptions, but contributes to create the image of a conqueror pharaoh.”
- <sup>41</sup> See the first appearance of this motif in Herodotus’ judgment of the fatal role of King Croesus: “the first non-Greek we know of to have subjugated Greeks to the payment of tribute, though he made alliances with one of them” (1.6.1).
- <sup>42</sup> Cf., on Phanes, III.1.
- <sup>43</sup> Ritual slaughter of children usually foreshadows military debacles: Cf. 1.73: Cyaxares’ son (culprit: the Scythians); 1.119: Harpagus’ son (culprit:

- Astyages); 4.84: three sons of Oiobazus (culprit: Darius); 7. 38: the eldest of the five sons of Pythius (culprit: Xerxes); 7114: 2x9 children (culprit: Xerxes; cf. a similar deed ordered by Amestris); cf. also 2.119: two Egyptian boys, sacrificed by Menelaos.
- <sup>44</sup> Cf. Cruz-Urbe 2003, 26–30, esp. 27–28: "... the city of Pelusium did not exist at the time of the Persian invasion [...] If we are to believe Herodotus, the battle for Egypt began on the banks of the Pelusion branch of the Nile, not at the city of Pelusium [...] We may suggest (but can never prove) that the invasion of Cambyses may have been principally land based."
- <sup>45</sup> Polyaeus 7.9 offers a grotesque version on the battle. As Cambyses besieged the city of Pelusium, the Egyptians fiercely fought back. Cambyses therefore placed different sacral animals in front of his army, so the Egyptians avoided to wound them, stopped fighting and Cambyses conquered Pelusium and marched into Egypt. Cf. generally on the image of the Persians in Polyaeus' stratagems: Maisonneuve 2011, esp. 341.
- <sup>46</sup> Cf. Briant 2002, 60, on the "real" political considerations of both Cambyses and Psammetichus: "It is clear that Cambyses never dreamed of returning the government of Egypt to Psammetichus [...] So it seems clear that the pharaoh had never agreed to recognize the one who claimed to be his successor."
- <sup>47</sup> The death-sentence—drinking bull's blood—probably let Herodotus' audience think on Themistocles' destiny. Cf. on the letter Aigner 2008.
- <sup>48</sup> Cf. Schwab, forthcoming. He underlines the fine nuances within Herodotus' description of the mistreatment of Apries' corpse; therefore we should not simply take his text as factual report.
- <sup>49</sup> J. M. Konstantakos tries to differentiate various mythological layers within Herodotus' narrative; besides the evident elements of Egyptian traditions, he detects analogous motifs and elements of Mesopotamian and Iranian stories; cf. Konstantakos 2016. On Herodotus' reasoning about the different causes for Cambyses' madness, esp. in comparison with the Spartan king Cleomenes, see Demont 2018, esp. 187–190; on the relation between Cambyses and Croesus in Herodotus' skillful narration, see Brehm 2013.
- <sup>50</sup> For details see Bichler, forthcoming b.
- <sup>51</sup> On the skillful order of the narrative and its relation to the chronological order of the narrated "facts," see Bowie 2018, esp. 33–36.
- <sup>52</sup> E. Irwin establishes a connection between this passage as well as the passages in the *Histories* dealing with the issue of legitimacy and inheritance with respect to the Persian royal offspring and the debate on Pericles' Citizenship law; cf. Irwin 2017, esp. 108–116.
- <sup>53</sup> Esp. cf. Herodotus 7.3, on Demaratus, Atossa and Xerxes' succession on the throne of his father Darius, and Irwin 2017, as quoted above.
- <sup>54</sup> As documented by Athenaeus (13 p560d–f), Ctesias of Cnidus offered an enlarged story, based on Herodotus' "Persian version" (F 13a Lenfant), whereas Dinon and Lyceas of Naucratis preferred the "Egyptian version" (Dinon F 11 Lenfant). Cf., on Dinon, Lenfant 2009, 149–151.
- <sup>55</sup> Cf. the previous discussion here (II.3).
- <sup>56</sup> On the matter of the memory of Udjahorresnet and his deeds in 4th-century Egypt, see Wasmuth in this volume; cf. already Bresciani 1985.
- <sup>57</sup> Cf. Asheri in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 399 on Hdt. 3.1.
- <sup>58</sup> At this point of his narration, Herodotus' audience knew the famous story of Rhampsinitus' treasury and the tricks of the master-thief (2.121). Cf. on the complex structure of the story West 2007; see also Lloyd in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 326–328.
- <sup>59</sup> Cf. the references by Schmitt 2011, no. 174 on Kombaphis; Asheri in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 414 on Hdt. 3.16.1.
- <sup>60</sup> Cf., for example, Griffiths 1987.
- <sup>61</sup> Riding accidents could be seen as a motif used to counteract the Persian nobles' proud being excellent horsemen. Darius was injured as he leaped from his horse. Cambyses was deadly wounded as he leaped on his horse (3.64). Cf. also the fatal "riding accidents" of Artybius (5.11–112), Pharnouches (7.88), Masistius (9.22), and Mardonius (9.63). Cf. Bichler 2005.

- <sup>62</sup> She wished to get women of Laconia, Argus, Attica, and Corinth as her servants (3.133–134).
- <sup>63</sup> Cf. *in extenso* Lopez 2015.
- <sup>64</sup> On Darius' title and its prestige, cf. Degen 2019, esp. 21–22; for a general documentation of the title of a lance-bearer, see Henkelman 2002.
- <sup>65</sup> Cf., on the episode told above and the character of such "divine chances" within the *Histories* in general, Harrison 2000, 73–74.
- <sup>66</sup> Cf., on Herodotus' hidden critic against Athens' imperialistic policies in his portrayal of Darius as creator of the famous tax districts, Ruffing 2018.
- <sup>67</sup> On Syloson's encounter with Darius, see also the discussion here (IV.3).
- <sup>68</sup> Cf. Briant 2002, 161: "Herodotus' brief reference is at least a reminder that the Achaemenid history of this period cannot be reduced to the Greek problem. But it also confirms, to the despair of the historian, that in the eyes of Herodotus all that really counted was the Greek perspective on the Persian Wars."
- <sup>69</sup> Cf. Ruffing 2009, esp. 328–332 with table 2; on the geographic disposition of lands and peoples and the possible connections with the Persian lists see Dan 2013, esp. 112–115; cf. also Asheri in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 538–542 (= appendix II).
- <sup>70</sup> On the potential identification of the island Elbo see Quack 2013, 80.
- <sup>71</sup> On Herodotus' famous commentary on the heap of skulls of the fallen Egyptians and Persians, a dubious curiosity, cf., for example, Thomas 2000, 30–32. Herodotus' sense for irony should not be overlooked, if one considers his report about the ritual battle fought in Papremis between priests: "A fierce stickfight ensues. Heads are broken and, I think, a lot of them die from their wounds. However, the Egyptians said that no one dies" (2.63.2–3). On the tradition of ritual battles in Egypt cf. Lloyd 1976, 285.
- <sup>72</sup> Cf. Asheri in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 413: "Psammenitus' attempt to revolt could have taken place during Cambyses' campaign in Ethiopia."
- <sup>73</sup> As proving examples Herodotus points at Thannyras, the son of Inarus, and Pausiris, the son of Amyrtaeus. They regained their kingdoms, although their fathers did the Persians a lot of harm (3.15.1–3). On the first case cf. Lloyd 1975, 47 fn. 189: "Libya was eventually restored to the family of Inarus.... Doubtless the Persians took this action when the province was thoroughly pacified"; cf. Briant 2002, 576: Inarus' son "was to some extent a client king, as were Amyrtaeus and his son. In addition to other obligations, they were required to send the famous Egyptian marsh soldiers, whom Herodotus calls the Hermotybians and Calasirians [...] they were even included among the *epibates* ('marines') in Mardonius' elite army (IX 23). It is practically certain that this system had been in place since the time of Cambyses' conquest." On the case of Pausiris, cf. Lloyd 1975, 49 with fn. 201: "... it is quite clear from Herodotus that his [Amyrtaeus'] independent ἀρχή was eventually terminated by Persian military action [...] They could not have established his son Pausiris as ruler unless they controlled the ἀρχή itself."
- <sup>74</sup> Cf. also the previous discussion. The conquest of the rebellious city was only enabled by the heroic deeds of Zopyrus, Darius' brave supporter. He had mutilated himself, but pretended to have been punished by the despotic King, his enemy. The Babylonians accepted his services as a deserter, but Zopyrus outwitted them. The story of this nobleman's self-mutilation by cutting off ears and nose (3.154.2; 157.1) should also remind Herodotus' audience of the unjust punishment of the noble Patarbemis, a deed foreshadowing King Apries' fatal destiny. On Herodotus' irony in his version of Zopyrus' tricky self-mutilation, see West 2003, esp. 428ff.
- <sup>75</sup> On the problems of Ctesias' version of the rebellion led by Inarus, given in full contrast to Herodotus, see Bichler 2016, 15–28.
- <sup>76</sup> For a survey of Darius' presence in Egyptian sources, see Vittmann 2011, esp. 382–395; on the first documents dated to Darius' appear in Egypt, cf. Wijnsma 2019, esp. 160 with table 1.
- <sup>77</sup> Not only does Herodotus bring the story of Darius's unsuccessful campaign against the Scythians to mind (4.97–142), but he also alludes here to another Persian debacle when he

highlights that Sesostris was the only ruler of Egypt to reign over Ethiopia (2.110.1), that is, he succeeded in something that Cambyses was to fail spectacularly to achieve (3.17–26). Cf. Bichler 2018a, esp. 95–96.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. the previous discussion (I.3).

<sup>79</sup> “If the cause of the punishment was truly the minting of a coin that emulated that of Darius, then this would stand as confirmation of a later dating”; cf. Corcella in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 692–693, with further references.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Wijnsma 2019, esp. 170–172 with further references. The author underlines that one should be reluctant to interpret Polyaeus’ story as a fitting testimony for the Petubastis revolt: “Whether the story is literary trope or whether it (uniquely) preserves the memory of a real historical episode therefore cannot be definitively judged. In the absence of further and earlier evidence, the story cannot *prove* Darius’ alleged invasion of Egypt in 518 BC” (Wijnsma 2019, 172).

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Corcella in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 693: “In any case, it is only modern scholars, not Herodotus or Polyaeus, who establish a link between the king’s visit and the deposition of the satrap, which may also have occurred in the first decade of the 5th cent.”

<sup>82</sup> Cf., for example, Briant 2002, 409–410, with further references and his statement: “Herodotus’ text raises more questions than it securely and verifiably answers.”

<sup>83</sup> Following Herodotus, Darius had been in Persia under the severe eyes of his father during Cyrus’ fatal campaign against the Massagetae (1.210). And he is presented as a true Achaemenid from the beginning (1.209.2). Cf., on the reasons for Darius’ claim to be a true Achaemenid, Henkelman 2011, esp. 577–582; Jacobs 2011, esp. 636–653; Brehm 2013, esp. 233–257.

<sup>84</sup> Cf., on the “Intaphernes Affair,” Briant 2002, 131–132; on the “Rebellion of Oroetes,” Briant 2002, 122.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Briant 2017, 249–250: “Herodotus, who sets two stories, which are generally, on his authority, placed at the beginning of Darius’ reign, in Susa: the transfer of Oroites’ confiscated property (III 129) and Sylosons’ arrival at the

gates of the Susan palace (III 140). [...] they do not seem to represent the necessary degree of reliability.”

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Tuplin 2018, 112–115 and Appendix 2 (122–123); esp. cf. 114: “... there is no way to mitigate the dissonance between Darius’ feeling that he had to mention an Egyptian revolt in 522 and Herodotus’ failure to mention any such thing.”

<sup>87</sup> On Petubastis IV see Kaper 2015. Kaper suggests that Herodotus’ Ammonians in 4.181.2 are the inhabitants of Dakhla and a campaign ordered by Cambyses against the “powerbase” of Petubastis IV in Dakhla failed. He assumes that Persian propaganda spread the story of the army’s end in a sandstorm. Cf. also Stronk 2017, 150 with fn. 42.

<sup>88</sup> See the skeptical remarks in Wijnsma 2019, 172 with fn. 69.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Schmitt 2009, 51 on DB § 21: “Einen Aufstand in Ägypten—die nach der elamischen Version vorgenommene Ergänzung ... ist jedoch sicher—erwähnt DB sonst nirgends.” On the chronology of Darius’ accession to the throne, cf. Kuhrt 2007, 140–141 appendix.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. esp. Wijnsma 2019 on the revolt of Petubastis IV with the concluding statement: “It is clear from the minimal length of Petubastis’ reign (at least two years, perhaps more than three years) and the archaeological traces which he left behind (in numbers comparable to those found for Cambyses in Egypt) that the Egyptian rebellion must have been a significant episode in the early history of Persian Period Egypt.”

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Wijnsma 2019, esp. 159–161.

<sup>92</sup> Esp. cf. Rollinger 1993, 214–217 (Exkurs III): “Diese äußerst schwierige Lage zwingt dazu mit problematischen Annahmen zu arbeiten” (Rollinger 1993, 214).

<sup>93</sup> For the dates given above, cf. the appendix in Kuhrt 2007, 140–141.

<sup>94</sup> On the notorious question whom he killed and how he established his own genealogy cf., for example, Rollinger 1998/1999, Schwinghammer 2011, 665–687, with further references. On the tradition of the usurper-brothers see Shayegan 2012.

<sup>95</sup> On the ideological background of the Scythian

campaign see Rollinger 2014, esp. 197–200.

<sup>96</sup> Cf., for example, Smoláriková 2015, 152: “Cambyses left Egypt in 522 B.C.E., perhaps accompanied by Udjahorresnet who consequently did not mention the situation in Egypt during the interregnum between Cambyses and Darius I.”

<sup>97</sup> Lopez 2015, within his comprehensive documentation about the cultural interactions as well as the differences between Egyptian and Greek medicine, is confident to trace the tradition of Udjahorresnet in Herodotus' story of Democedes;

esp. cf. 55–65, 159–165, 281–303; cf. also Lopez in this volume. Lopez suggests that Herodotus' story of the failure of the Egyptian physicians to heal Darius' dislocated ankle is a consequence of the rotten state of Egyptian medicine in the period of troubles between 522 and 519 BCE, and that the Great King therefore ordered Udjahorresnet, who was with him in Elam between the second half of 520 BCE and the first months of 519 BCE, to go back to Egypt with his mission to restore the House of Life.

#### APPENDIX I: CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS, BASED (ONLY) ON HERODOTUS' NARRATIVE

##### THE PERIOD OF THE SAITE KINGS

- Psammetichus defeats the other Dodecarchs, supported by Ionian and Carian mercenaries and settles them at Leukonteichos (2.154.1)
- Necho's canal-project marks the beginning of a new period in the maritime history of Egypt (2.159)
- Apries attacks Sidon and fights a sea battle against the king of Tyre (2.162.2)
- Amasis, with his Egyptians, defeats Apries and the foreign mercenaries at Momemphis (2.169)
- Amasis makes those mercenaries his personal guard “against the Egyptians” (2.154.3)
- Amasis conquers Cyprus and orders the payment of tribute (2.182.2)
- Cambyses' army defeats the Egyptians and their foreign mercenaries in the battle near the Pelusian mouth of the Nile (3.12)

##### CAMBYES' CONQUEST OF EGYPT

- Battle near the Pelusian mouth of the Nile → proleptic reference to the battle at Papremis: Achaemenes killed by Inarus (3.12.4)
- Cambyses in Memphis: Psammenitus' trial and final destiny → proleptic reference to the rebellion of Inarus and Amyrtaeus and to the “kingdoms” of their sons (3.15)

- Cambyses in Saïs: the mutilation of Amasis' mummy

##### EVENTS TO BE PLACED EITHER SHORTLY BEFORE, DURING OR SHORTLY AFTER CAMBYES' ETHIOPIAN CAMPAIGN

- ← flashback: Aryandes appointed *hyparchos* in Egypt (4.166)
- ← flashback: Syloson, brother of Polycrates, meets Darius in Memphis (3.139)
- ← flashback: Polycrates of Samos, eliminated by Oroites, *hyparchos* of Sardis (3.120–125)
- Smerdis killed by Prexaspes (3.30.3; 62)

##### CAMBYES' FINAL DESTINY AND THE REIGN OF THE MAGI

- After the Ethiopian campaign: Killing of the Apis and other legendary evil deeds in Memphis (3.27–37)
- Pseudo-Smerdis' usurpation (3.61)
- Cambyses' death on the way home when he got the news (3.62–66)
- The reign of the magi (3.67)
- Darius, coming from Persia, joins the conspiracy of the Seven in Susa (esp. cf. 3.70.3)
- ← flashback: Oroites eliminated Mitrobates, *hyparchos* in Daskyleion (3.126)

##### THE FIRST YEARS OF DARIUS' KINGSHIP

- Darius creates twenty tax districts [νομοί] and demands tribute [φόρος]
- Egypt and the Libyan neighborhood, Cyrene and Barke, are included in the sixth

nomos / special taxes back the Persians and their mercenaries in Leukonteichos (3.91.2–3)

- Darius orders Oroites' execution ← he had not given support to the Persians / at the time "matters were still unstable" [οἰδεόντων ἔτι τῶν προηγμάτων] (3.127)
- Democedes, Oriotes' former slave, deported to Susa / Darius' accident (3.129.1)
- Democedes' successful deeds / his way home and the return of the Persian "spies" (3.139.1)
- Syloson meets Darius in Susa (3.140) → Ontanes' campaign against Samos
- Outbreak of the Babylonian revolt "during that campaign" — conquest of the city in the 20th month due to Zopyrus' legendary deeds → proleptic reference to Megabyzus' campaign in Egypt against the Athenians (3.160.2)
- Darius' Scythian campaign / Aryandes' Libyan campaign (both campaigns took place approximately at the same time) (4.145.1)

#### THE PERIOD AFTER DARIUS' RETURN FROM THE SCYTHIAN CAMPAIGN

- Aryandes' execution ordered by Darius (4.166)
- Darius meets the priests of Hephaestus in Memphis—In contrast to Sesostris, he was not able to defeat the Scythians (2.110)
- Darius had the construction of Necho's canal project completed (2.158)

#### THE LAST PERIOD OF DARIUS' REIGN AND THE SUCCESSION OF HIS SON XERXES

- Egyptian ships fight in the battle off Lade
- A rebellion in Egypt breaks out in the year before Darius' death
- Xerxes crushes the rebellion and appoints Achaemenes as governor of Egypt → proleptic reference to Achaemenes' death, caused by Inarus (7.7)
- Catalogue of Xerxes' navy: 200 Egyptian ships, led by Achaemenes (7.89.3; 97)
- Egyptian ships fighting in the battle off Artemision and the battle off Salamis
- Hermotybians and Calasirians recruited in Mardonius' land army at Plataea (9.32)

#### APPENDIX II: THE COMMANDERS CONNECTED WITH EGYPT IN AESCHYLUS' *THE PERSIANS*

The first time commanders in the Egyptian squad appear in the parodos: "The great, nurturing stream / of Nile sent others: Susiscanes; / the Egyptian-born Pegastagon; / great Arsames, the ruler / of holy Memphis, and Ariomardus / who governs ancient Thebes; / and dwellers in the marshes, rowing ships, / formidable and in numbers past counting" (V 33–40).

The first two, Suscanes and Pegastagon, may possibly be persons whose names date back to Egyptian name forms, but it is more likely that the two names were invented by Aeschylus himself.<sup>1</sup> Pegastagon is expressly referred to as a native Egyptian [Αἰγυπτογενής], but he certainly also fits in with the overall picture of the Persian commanders. A person named Susiscanes is also lamented among the casualties in the exodos (V 960), together with a bearer of a good Egyptian name, Psammis.<sup>2</sup> But it remains doubtful whether he is to

be considered identical to the commander mentioned in the parodos. Susiscanes and Psammis died when falling off a ship from Tire (V 963–965).<sup>3</sup> In addition, and this weighs heavier, Susiscanes went from Agbatana [Σουσισκάνης τ' / Αἰγβάτανα λιπών (V 969–961)], which could refer to him as a Mede. At any rate, there is no connection between Susiscanes, Pegastagon, and Psammis and the commanders in Herodotus' catalogue of troops.

The role of Arsames and Ariomardus as governors of Memphis [Μέμφιδος ἄρχων] and of Thebes [Θήβας ἐφέπων] is given special importance. Their names are of Iranian provenance.<sup>4</sup> Arsames is likely identical with the fallen commander of the same name (V 308). On the other hand, his being identical with the commander mentioned in Herodotus' catalogue (7.69.2) who carries the same name is rather questionable.<sup>5</sup>

Things are more complicated with Ariomardus. Aeschylus mentions bearers of the same name twice more among the fallen (V 321, 968). Herodotus' catalogue of troops also features two army leaders of the same name (7.67, 78). Their functions imply quite clearly that neither of the two is likely identical with the governor of Thebes who is mentioned by Aeschylus.<sup>6</sup>

The question of whether Aeschylus had the governor of Thebes in mind each time when mentioning the name Ariomardus is a lot trickier.<sup>7</sup> To begin with, there is an important passage in the messenger

report, the text of which has not been handed down uniformly. The noble Ariomardus is lamented among the fallen, and his death—in a frequent reconstruction of the text—was a major cause of grief to the people of the city of Sardes [Σάρδεσιν / πένθος παρασχών].<sup>8</sup> Sommerstein now suggests the reading “who dispensed grief with his arrows” [ἄρδεσιν / πένθος παρασχών]. This reading would fit in harmoniously with the previous passage. There is mourned the death of Amphistreu, “who wielded spear that caused much trouble” (V 320–321). In this case, nothing stands in the way of identifying the governor of Thebes as the person whose death is mourned. The reading, which implies a connection of the fallen army leader with the city of Sardes, would rather speak against such a conclusion, however.

Furthermore, in the exodos, the passing of Ariomardus is lamented by the chorus together with a certain Pharnuchus (V 966–967). In all probability, this refers to the governor of Thebes, since in the messenger report Pharnuchus is referred to as a fallen commander “whose home was near the stream of Egyptian Nile” [Πηγαῖς τε Νείλου γειτονῶν Αἰγυπτίου / Φαρνοῦχος] (V 311/313).<sup>9</sup> In addition, Arsames' death is also mentioned in the same context (V 308). The name Pharnuchus is also of Iranian provenance,<sup>10</sup> as is that of Arsames and of Ariomardus.

However, there are two names that look very Egyptian: the name of Psamnis, which has already been dealt with above, and that of someone called Memphis who is listed among the fallen men along with Pharnuchus and Ariomardus in the exodos (V 971).<sup>11</sup>

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Schmitt 2011, no. 308 (Σουσιस्कάνης) and 271 (Πηγασταγών); Garvie 2009, 60–61.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Schmitt 2011, no. 374.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Garvie 2009, 351–352, on the problems with the text in the catalogue V 955–961; the relation between Susiscanes, here coming from Agbatana, with Susiscanes in the parodos remains unclear.

<sup>4</sup> On Arsames / Ἀρσάμης see Schmitt 2011 no. 52c; on Ariomardus / Ἀριόμαρδος no. 43 c.

<sup>5</sup> Herodotus points to Arsames, son of Darius, as commander of the Arabians and the Ethiopians in Xerxes' land army (7.69.2). That does not fit well with the rank of an officer of the fleet in the battle off Salamis. Garvie 2009, 60, nevertheless considers them as the same person; Schmitt 2011, 95, on no. 52d, is reluctant: “möglichlicherweise mit c identisch.”

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Garvie 2009, 60: “The governor of Egyptian Thebes can hardly be the Ariomardus who commanded the Caspians (Hdt. 7.67), or the son of Darius who commanded the Moschi and Tibareni from the Caucasus (Hdt. 7.78).”

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Schmitt 2011, no. 43c: “... daß in V 38, 321 und 968 derselbe Mann gemeint ist, läßt sich nicht beweisen, ebensowenig dessen Historizität.”

<sup>8</sup> West 1991 and Garvie 2009 offer the passage 321–322 as follows: ... Ἀριόμαρδος, Σάρδεσιν / πένθος παρασχών; cf. on this Garvie 2009, 69.

<sup>9</sup> Garvie 2009, 165–166 zu V 311/313/312: “Φαρνοῦχος will reappear at 966, but is otherwise unknown.”

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Schmitt 2011, nr. 365.

<sup>11</sup> Garvie 2009, 352: “Μέμφις is known as an Egyptian place-name (36), and occurs elsewhere as a proper name”; cf. Schmitt 2011, nr. 258: the name is based on the Egyptian toponym.