

Chapter 5: Repair & Restoration (543-525 B.C.)

Cyrus King of Egypt

In 550 B.C. Cyrus, king of Anshan, dethroned his maternal grandfather Astyages, son of Cyaxares, king of Media, uniting the adjoining kingdoms of Parsua and Media. Four years later, in 546 B.C., after a stalemate land battle near the Halys River in central Anatolia, Cyrus overran the Lydian capital at Sardis. Croesus, the Lydian king, was either captured or killed. Encouraged by his initial triumphs Cyrus laid plans to extend his fledgling Medo-Persian empire. He left to Harpagus, one of his generals, the task of defeating the Greek Ionian and Aeolian colonies of western Asia Minor. Meanwhile he laid plans for the ultimate conquest, the neo-Babylonian kingdom ruled by the eccentric Nabonidus. His was no idle dream, but a firm resolve backed by military and diplomatic skill that became the subject of legends for later generations. And he was ultimately successful. Within a decade of his initial success against Lydia, Cyrus ruled the Near East from the Aegean to India.

First on his agenda after Lydia were Egypt and Babylon. According to Herodotus:

"For Babylon was an obstacle (to his plans) as was the Bactrian nation and the Sacae and Egyptians; against these he purposed to lead his army personally and to send another commander against the Ionians." (Her. 1.153)

That these intentions were carried out is implied by Herodotus, who proceeds immediately in the narrative to describe the activities of Harpagus and then abruptly turns his attention to the conquest of Babylon. In the interim we can assume he conquered Egypt. There is a clear and systematic development in Herodotus, who describes the growth of the Persian Empire from west to east. We are not left to speculate on why Herodotus fails to describe the fall of Egypt. The rationale for its omission is spelled out.

Harpagus then made havoc of lower Asia; in the upper country Cyrus himself subdued every nation, leaving none untouched. Of the greater part of these I will say nothing, but *will speak only of those which gave Cyrus most trouble* and are worthiest to be described. When Cyrus had brought all the mainland under his sway, he attacked the Assyrians (=Babylonians). There are in Assyria many other great cities; but the most famous and the strongest was Babylon, where the royal dwelling had been set after the destruction of Ninus (=Nineveh) (Her. 1.177)(emphasis added)

There can be only one interpretation of Herodotus, namely, that Egypt was among the nations of the upper country subdued by Cyrus prior to his invasion of Babylon. Herodotus explains his failure to document the conquest. Apparently Egypt gave Cyrus no trouble and the (non-)event deserved no further comment. The Persian occupation of Egypt was unopposed. This is precisely what we expect if the revised history is correct. Egypt was a sparsely populated wasteland defended by a Babylonian army of

occupation, part of which, if we are to believe Xenophon, was sent across the Mediterranean to assist Croesus in his earlier battle with Cyrus. Many of these Egyptian mercenaries, whatever their nationality, remained permanently in Anatolia. Those left in Egypt would hardly be sufficient to contest the advance of the Persian army. Any native Egyptian conscripts are just as likely to have sided with Cyrus than to have opposed him. The invasion of Tanuatamon that immediately preceded the arrival of Cyrus informs us clearly that Egypt was not heavily defended.

But we do not have to depend on Herodotus for this conjecture. The change from Babylonian to Persian control of Egypt during the reign of Cyrus is explicitly stated by Xenophon.

Xenophon

Xenophon, an Athenian, was born around 444 B.C. As a youth he was a student of Socrates; rather late in life he joined the army. When Darius II died in 404 B.C. his son Artaxerxes II succeeded him. A second son named Cyrus, satrap in Anatolia, challenged the appointment and led an army against Artaxerxes. Xenophon was persuaded to serve in the Greek contingent of Cyrus' army. At Cunaxa a battle was engaged, Cyrus was killed, and the remnant of the mercenary army of Cyrus was dispersed. Xenophon's reputation is founded largely on his detailed description of the laborious retreat of the defeated forces along the Tigris through Armenia to Trapezus on the Black Sea and back home. This classic story, *The Anabasis*, was but one in an extensive list of the literary works of Xenophon. We are here concerned rather with his account of the life of Cyrus - the *Cyropaedia*.

Twice in this lengthy biography of Cyrus, once in the opening and once in the concluding sections, Xenophon describes the extent of the Persian Empire. At the outset of the book the claim is made that

Cyrus, finding the nations in Asia also independent in exactly the same way, started out with a little band of Persians and became the leader of the Medes by their full consent and of the Hyrcanians by theirs; he then conquered Syria, Assyria, Arabia, Cappadocia, both Phrygias, Lydia, Caria, Phoenicia, and Babylonia; he ruled also over Bactria, India, and Cilicia; and he was likewise king of the Sacians, Paphlagonians, Magadidae, and very many other nations, of which one could not even tell the names; he brought under his sway the Asiatic Greeks also, and, descending to the sea, he added both Cyprus and Egypt to his empire. (Cyr. I.1.4)

Again at the end of the narrative Xenophon states:

Now, when the year had gone round, he collected his army together at Babylon, containing, it is said, about one hundred and twenty thousand horse, about two

thousand scythe-bearing chariots and about six hundred thousand foot. And when these had been made ready for him, he started out on that expedition on which he is said to have subjugated all the nations that fill the earth from where one leaves Syria even to the Indian Ocean. His next expedition is said to have gone to Egypt and to have subjugated that country also. From that time on his empire was bounded on the east by the Indian Ocean, on the north by the Black Sea, on the west by Cyprus and Egypt, and on the south by Ethiopia. (Cyr. VIII.6.19,20)

The claim is made by scholars that these statements by Xenophon stand in conflict with the combined testimony of Herodotus and Ktesias, both of whom credit Cambyses, not Cyrus, with the conquest of Egypt. As a result, at least in respect to his remarks concerning Egypt, Xenophon is discredited. But we have already noted that Herodotus book one contains at minimum the suggestion that *Cyrus* conquered Egypt and we have previously argued that the Cambyses narrative in Herodotus chapter three is the product of a later age. We have also expressed the conviction, yet to be defended, that in fact Ktesias does not credit Cambyses with the conquest of Egypt, in spite of scholarly statements to the contrary. Ktesias has been misrepresented, as explained in the following chapter.

At the turn of the twentieth century Georges Radet expressed the opinion that scholars were overly dismissive of Xenophon's remarks vis-à-vis Egypt.¹⁸³ After all, he argued, "this summary of the enterprises of Cyrus and the listing of the limits of his Empire agree with all that we know of oriental history, except in one point". The exceptional point, of course, was Xenophon's claim of Persian suzerainty over Egypt. Radet, for one, was convinced that Xenophon must be taken seriously. He argued that since Egypt and Babylon were part of a coalition with Croesus of Lydia against Cyrus, it is incomprehensible that Cyrus would ignore Egypt in the sequel to the Lydian war. "L'abstention de Cyrus a l'égard d'Amasis est une anomalie qu'on peut difficilement s'expliquer." The solution for Radet - who believed, following the traditional history, that Amasis ruled Egypt at this time - was to assume that Amasis accepted a nominal submission to Persia in order to stave off an impending Persian military advance on the country. Tribute was paid, but the country remained essentially independent.

Radet's arguments are valid, but his conclusion must be modified. Xenophon speaks of an expedition to conquer Egypt. His statements imply a physical conquest of the country extending into Upper Egypt, as far as the border of Ethiopia. In the revised history we are at liberty to take Xenophon at face value. The introductory passage in the *Cyropaedia* suggests that Cyrus's conquest of Egypt followed his victories over the Asiatic Greeks. The second passage, rephrased, may well suggest that the Egyptian victory was among his first. Allowing three years for the military suppression of Asia

¹⁸³ Georges Radet, "La Première Incorporation De L'Egypte," *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 11 (1909) 201-210.

Minor, Phoenicia, and Cyprus, we can reasonably date Cyrus's conquest of Egypt to 543 B.C.

In our brief discussion of Tanuatamon's 543 B.C. invasion of the Delta we observed that Lower Egypt was then controlled by local officials subservient to the Babylonian occupation force. Of these princes only Pakruru was named. We must assume that Psamtik was among the otherwise anonymous officials who grovelled before the Ethiopian king, or, following Herodotus, that he had been temporarily removed from power in Sais by the Babylonian authority (see below). With the arrival of the mercenary army of Cyrus later that same year Tanuatamon fled to Thebes and perhaps exited Egypt altogether. Psamtik was elevated above his peers to govern the newly constituted Persian province. Thus began the 26th Saite dynasty.

Rise of Psamtik I

Psamtik According to Herodotus

Very few details are known of the 54-year reign of Wahibre Psamtik I. That fact alone should cause historians to wonder. He must have been a great military leader to have succeeded in repelling the powerful army of Ashurbanipal in 664 B.C., an army that had no problem driving from Thebes the enigmatic Tanuatamon, whose army numbered in the "millions and hundreds of thousands". If Psamtik's dates are correct, and he reigned from 664-610 B.C., then he must have been at minimum eighty years old in the years 616-610 B.C. when, according to the Babylonian Chronicle, the Egyptian army, now allied with Assyria, was assisting its former enemy against the rising power of Nabopolassar's neo-Babylonian empire. We can only imagine what military exploits filled the historical interlude between these two extremes.

Unfortunately Psamtik's modesty must have rivalled his assumed military prowess. He left to posterity not a single inscription boasting of his military achievements. When we examine below the few existing monuments and historical anecdotes related to his reign we will find recorded the activities of a skilled diplomat rather than the conquests of an ambitious king.

All that is known of the rise of Psamtik comes from the "*Saite history*" of Herodotus (II.1.147-155). We are informed from this *history* that Psamtik's father Nikos was killed by the Ethiopian king Sabacos, that Psamtik subsequently sought refuge in Syria from whence he was later summoned by the inhabitants of Sais. At the time of his return Egypt was governed by twelve kings, of whom only the name of Psamtik is preserved. These rival chieftains subsequently challenged Psamtik's authority and he was driven from Sais into the marshes of the western Delta. From this temporary exile, and with the help of Ionian and Carian soldiers who by chance arrived on the Egyptian coast, Psamtik returned to defeat his deposed rulers and claim for himself sole rule of the country.

From this lengthy tale, considerably embellished with folkloric anecdotes, the traditional history is able to salvage only the barest of detail in defence of its hypothetical reconstruction. Psamtik's flight to Syria, his secondary installation in Sais at the behest of its inhabitants, and his subsequent banishment by delta kinglets, are totally inconsistent with the historical situation which prevailed while the Assyrians ruled Egypt prior to 664 B.C. Contemporary historians reject them outright. The lack of any mention of the occupying Assyrian army is equally problematic. In but a single point can the reputation of Herodotus be partially rehabilitated. He claims that Psamtik came to power the last time with the assistance of Ionian Greeks and Carians, and it is argued that this reflects a memory of the troops sent by Gyges, the Lydian king, to assist Psamtik in his successful coup. But we have already expressed our disdain for that highly questionable interpretation of the Assyrian annals. And we wonder why Herodotus refers specifically to Ionian and Carian, rather than Lydian troops.

In the revised history it is immediately apparent that Herodotus has access to reliable historical records. Nikos, the father of Psamtik, could well have been killed by Shabataka (not Shabaka) many years before Psamtik's sole reign. Shabataka died in 569 B.C. Psamtik's reign began 26 years later and lasted 54 years (543-489 B.C.)¹⁸⁴ Having said that, we believe it more likely that Psamtik's father died at the time of Nebuchadrezzar's invasion. Some confirmation of this fact is forthcoming later in this chapter, where we argue that Psamtik, at least once in his life, dated his reign from 563 B.C., rather than 543 B.C., a possible reference to the date of his father's death.

Neither is there a problem in Psamtik's Syrian exile, his summons to return to Sais as king, or in his later flight from the Delta kings. The twenty-year rule of Babylon over Egypt (564-543 B.C.) must have witnessed considerable variation in administrative structure. Psamtik's return to Sais as a local administrator would pose no problem for Babylon so long as tribute was collected and routinely paid. Withholding those taxes might well have necessitated subsequent flight and temporary exile.

If Psamtik's elevation to power with the help of Ionian and Carian troops can be claimed as partial vindication of the traditional history it can, *a fortiori*, substantially argue the case for the revised history. When Cyrus overran Egypt in 543 B.C. it was precisely Ionian and Carian troops that he had at his disposal. And we can be certain that if Psamtik had recently been driven from Egypt by a syndicate of Delta chieftains, the arrival of Cyrus's Ionian and Carian army was his vehicle to reinstatement. This coincidental mention of Ionians and Carians by Herodotus deserves special mention. We digress momentarily to set the stage.

It is Herodotus who provides the details concerning the makeup of Cyrus's army. He tells us that following his victory over Croesus in 546 B.C., Cyrus left his general

¹⁸⁴ If Psamtik was born ca. 575 B.C. then he would have been 86 when he died. There is no problem with this advanced age in the revised history. It accords well with the activities of his son Wahemibre Neco discussed in a later chapter of this revision.

Harpagus to complete the subjugation of the Ionians of western Anatolia¹⁸⁵. He then describes in great detail the ensuing fall of the Ionian and Aeolian city-states.¹⁸⁶ Then, moving south and east, Harpagus proceeded to invade Caria.

Harpagus, after subduing Ionia, made an expedition against the Carians, Caunians, and Lycians, taking with him Ionians and Aeolians. Now among these the Carians were a people who had come to the mainland from the islands (Her I.171)

This Carian expedition (Her. I.171-177) was followed by the conquest of the balance of the Anatolian states bordering on the Mediterranean eastward. While Harpagus was thus engaged in southeastern Asia Minor, Cyrus proceeded to conquer the nations of the upper country, which included Egypt according to the argument proposed earlier in this chapter.

Thus we are informed by Herodotus that only months before Cyrus invaded Egypt his army was augmented by mercenary troops of seafaring Ionians and Carians. The time was midway between the fall of Lydia in 546 B.C. and the fall of Babylon in 539 B.C., thus around 543 B.C. According to the revised history, also informed by Herodotus, Psamtik I rose to power in Egypt with the assistance of Ionian and Carian mercenary troops. In the revised history the time was 543 B.C. Coincidence?

At minimum we are encouraged by the correspondence between Herodotus and the revised chronology.

Recovery and Restoration

With the arrival of Cyrus in Egypt, and the installation of Psamtik as a puppet king/governor with residence in Sais, there began a prolonged period of restoration in Egypt. In the monuments left by those engaged in this recovery effort we find clear testimony to the widespread destruction wrought by Nebuchadrezzar and to the prolonged Babylonian occupation of the country that followed. The intent of the balance of this chapter is to document these eyewitness accounts. But there is a problem.

In the traditional history the reign of Psamtik I began immediately following the Assyrian invasions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. It follows therefore that monuments dated to the early years of Psamtik I should be expected to contain references to pervasive destruction and the occupation of Egypt by a foreign army. Unless we can somehow distinguish the Assyrian and Babylonian invasions we will not be able to use the invasion references to further our argument positively. Thus the following tables (Tables 10 & 11) which contrast the history of the recovery period in the traditional and revised histories.

¹⁸⁵ Her I.153

¹⁸⁶ Her I.154-170

Table 10: End of the 25th Dynasty – Traditional History

671	Esarhaddon invaded Egypt and established twenty "kings" as local administrators, including Mantimanhe (Mentuemhet?) in Thebes.
667	Ashurbanipal invaded Egypt (1st invasion) to put down an insurrection fomented by Tarqu (Taharka?). There is no indication in the Assyrian annals that Thebes was invaded at this time, much less that the temples of the Nile valley were looted or destroyed. (Based entirely on one secondary source - the inscriptions of Mentuemhet - the claim is made by some scholars that the Assyrians did in fact decimate and plunder the south of Egypt, including Thebes, at this time. If so, then Mentuemhet immediately set about restoring Upper Egypt.)
666	Several of the local kings/administrators planned yet another coup, sending representatives south to Taharka to seek his assistance. It appears that Taharka at this time resided in Thebes. The planned rebellion was discovered and the Assyrian reprisal was severe, but limited to the Delta. Niku, Sharruludari, and Pakruru were taken to Thebes. Taharka is not mentioned again in the Assyrian annals.
665	Niku was returned to Sais with increased authority and prestige.
664	Early in the year Urdamanie (Tanuatamon?) led an army from the south (Thebes?) to invade the Delta. Ashurbanipal responded (2nd invasion) and drove the intruder from the Delta, following him south to Thebes. Thebes (recently restored by Mentuemhet?) was (once again?) sacked and looted and Tanuatamon escaped into Nubia, only to return when the Assyrians lost control of Egypt later in the year. There is no record in the Assyrian annals of any destruction to cultic centers in central Egypt between Memphis and Thebes. Some scholars date these events to 663 B.C., rather than 664 B.C.
664/3	Late in the 664 B.C. or early the next year, according to the scholars, Psamtik son of Niku wrested control of the Delta from the lightly defended Assyrian garrison and began his lengthy reign of 54 years.
664/3-656/5	Urdamanie (Tanuatamon?) continued to hold power in Thebes until shortly before Psamtik's 9th year, the time of the well-documented enthronement of Psamtik's daughter Nitocris as protégé of the god's wife in Thebes. During this time Psamtik is considered to be consolidating his authority in Lower Egypt.
656	Psamtik assumed control of Upper Egypt in his 9th year. It is not known what became of Tanuatamon.

Table 11: End of the 25th Dynasty – Revised History

564	Nebuchadrezzar invaded Lower Egypt late in Taharka's 6th year. Resulting death and deportation decimated the population. Temples were destroyed. Priests were murdered or exiled. Taharka was driven south into Thebes.
563	Cultic centers in Egypt from Memphis to Thebes were looted and plundered as Nebuchadrezzar moved south. The priesthood was all but annihilated. Thebes was attacked and destroyed. Taharka escaped into Nubia. Babylonian garrisons were established at Old Cairo (Egyptian Babylon) in Lower Egypt and in Syene/Elephantine in Upper Egypt. There may well have been additional troops stationed in Marea and Migdol in the western and eastern Delta respectively.
563-543	Egypt remained desolate with a sparse population, heavily taxed by the Babylonian authorities. Temple worship all but ceased, though a few priests survived the invasion. Limited activity is registered in the Serapeum. Details are lacking concerning the nature of the administrative structure of the occupation force, but from Herodotus and the Dream Stela of Tanuatamon there might well have been twelve "kings" (or mayors) functioning much as did the twenty "kings" in the days of Ashurbanipal. Many surviving Egyptians may have been conscripted into the Babylonian army garrisoned in Egypt. Some of these forces were sent to assist Croesus in Lydia in 546 B.C. They did not return.
543	Death and defection of Egyptian mercenaries in Anatolia had seriously weakened the Babylonian garrisons in Egypt. Additionally some troops may have been recalled to defend Babylon, leaving the local administrators/mayors with little military support. Taharka died early in this, his 27th year. Tanuatamon invaded Egypt and received a hero's welcome. The first phase of the exile had ended. Cyrus sent a Persian army to Egypt, augmented by a combined Ionian/Carian naval force. Tanuatamon retreated to the south, probably exiting Egypt entirely. Egypt became, throughout its length, a Persian province. Cyrus set up Psamtik as governor. From the outset Psamtik was a king, inheriting pharaonic titles from his father. He dated his rule from 543 B.C. A fort was built at Daphne and manned with Greek mercenaries. Old Cairo, Marea, and Elephantine were garrisoned.
543-525	Restoration work was underway. Temples were rebuilt and temple worship re-instituted. Petesi, Mentuemhet, and Petosiris were active in Teuzoi, Thebes, and Hermopolis Magna respectively, and their monuments provide vivid testimony to the extent of the destruction wrought by Nebuchadrezzar.

Petition of Petesi

In the John Rylands library in Manchester reside a group of nine papyri dated to the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. Their dates are determined by their connection to Saite dynasty kings from Psamtik I through Amasis. In the revised chronology they date therefore from the late 6th through the 5th century. The papyri are part of a single collection of a priestly family, which settled at Teuzoi, a site on the eastern bank of the Nile south of Memphis, better known in antiquity as el-Hibeh. Our attention focuses on a single one of these papyri. In the words of the editor F. Ll. Griffith "by far the most important of the papyri from El Hibeh is the great roll of the Petition or memorial of Petesi, nearly 4 1/4 metres or 14 feet in length, and closely written over the whole of the recto and five-sixths of the verso."¹⁸⁷ There are four principal divisions of this lengthy document. Three are of interest.

The first five columns describe the harsh treatment afforded a certain priest Petesi in the years immediately following the 9th year of Darius. Griffith summarizes their content as:

Events of the 9th and following years of Darius, viz. Petesi's unwilling evidence on the causes of the ruin of Teuzoi, his sufferings and imprisonment, followed by a murderous attack on him by the priests: his petition to the "Governor" or satrap (?) for protection, the revengeful burning of his house, the end being his return to Teuzoi, after more than a year's absence, under a guarantee of safety and protection, but without compensation for the injuries done to him or any attention to the rights which he claimed through his ancestors in the temple of Teuzoi. Petition 30

This portion of the narrative, from the point of view of the present revision, raises but a single question. Is this harsh treatment afforded Petesi taking place in the reign of Darius I or Darius II. The question is not actually raised by Griffith. Assuming a history in which Egypt is ruled sequentially by Amasis, Cambyses and Darius, it must be Darius I since the second part of the narrative mentions the 44th year of Amasis in some connection with an individual named Kamoze (kmdj?) who, in this context, can only refer to Cambyses. We have the same problem occurring here as was seen in the Demotic Chronicle (cf. chapter 2). This is not the place to pursue the matter. We will return to the subject in chapter 11. For the record it should be stated, however, that in the opinion of this author the incident took place in the reign of Darius II.

This first portion of the narrative makes reference to a petition sent to the Governor or satrap by Petesi (III). This petition apparently reviewed significant events in the Petesi

¹⁸⁷ F. Ll. Griffith, *The Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, 1909, p. 60. Griffith provides a translation of the entire papyrus on pages 60-112 and quotations from this translation are subsequently noted simply as Petition (page no.).

family history that were considered crucial in establishing Petesi's right to the priesthood at Teuzoi, a central issue in his complaint. The second or ensuing portion of the narrative appears to be a copy of that petition. This family history continues for sixteen columns, documenting events from the 4th year of Psamtik through the entire Saite dynasty to the 4th year of Kamoze. It is highly entertaining reading. It is also at times confusing. There are many Petesi's and Essemteu's, a hereditary sequence of patronyms in the Petesi family. We avoid the problem by restricting our discussion to the first generation, that of Petesi I, the great-great-grandfather of Petesi III. Thus the petition of Petesi III begins:

To inform the governor of the events that happened unto my father (= forefather Petesi I): In the 4th year of Per'o Psammtek the elder, Ptores was in the charge of Peteesi, son of 'Ankhsheshonk, the Master of Shipping, from the southern guard-house (?) of Memfi unto Suan.

We have seen all these place names before. Psamtik I has appointed a certain Petesi, son of Ankhsheshonk, to regulate shipping between the two garrisons at Memphis (Memfi) and Syene ((As)suan/Elephantine). Ptores is the Pathros of Jeremiah, usually translated Upper Egypt. The 4th year of Psamtik in our reconstruction is 540 B.C. We are twenty-four years into the Egyptian exile.

Petesi, son of Ankhsheshonk, is not the patriarch Petesi I, and is mentioned in our discussion primarily because he features in secondary problem to be considered later. The patriarch Petesi (I), son of Ieturou, appears immediately as the assistant of Petesi, son of Ankhsheshonk, the master of shipping. The master of shipping is old and asks Psamtik for relief, recommending his assistant Petesi (I) for the job. Already, in his duties under the shipping master, Petesi (I) has been able to increase food production and state revenue by fifty percent.

I have a colleague named Peteesi son of Ieturou; he it is that administers (?) Ptores and fosters its silver and its boti-corn: and it hath come to pass that Ptores is very prosperous; its silver and its boti have made one into one-and-a-half. Let him be brought before Per'o, let a good thing be said unto him before Per'o, let it be said unto him, Ptores is committed unto thee," it being committed unto me also ... Petition 78-9

In spite of his request for relief the master of shipping retained his job, but Petesi (I) assumed most of the work load, including the inspection of sites along the Nile from Memphis to Syene. Petesi, the shipping master, went into semi-retirement in Hnes.

Peteesi son of Ieturou came southward, inspecting, from the southern guardhouse unto Suan; (but) Peteesi son of 'Ankhsheshonk, the Master of the Shipping, settled in Hnes and report was rendered to him of everything that happened in Ptores.

The narrative quickly focuses on Teuzoi, the ancestral home of Petesi (III).

Peteesi son of Ieturou reached Teuzoi: he went to the temple and inspected every place that was in the temple of Teuzoi. And behold he found the temple of Teuzoi to be in the style of a very large House, but that it was *short of men*: he found *not a man in the temple except one aged priest* and a (shrine)-opener. And Peteesi son of Ieturou caused the priest to be brought, and said to him, 'Behold, since thou art not deficient in age, tell me, I pray, *the manner in which this town hath been destroyed.*' And the priest said unto him, 'The thing hath happened (in this wise?): No man was priest here except the priests of Amenra'senter; but your ancestors were priests here, and they made this fane glorious with all things: endowment-estates in abundance were appropriated to Amun of Teuzoi, and this House was spoken of as the first (?) seat of Amenra'senter. When that *evil time* came the great fanes (i.e. temples) of Kemi (=Egypt) were made to pay taxes, and this town was burdened, and they departed away. And behold, though discharge hath been made unto the great fanes of Kemi, they come to us saying, "Produce (your) taxes " until now. Petition 79,80 (italics added)

Several things are clear from the narrative to date. Egypt has endured an "evil time" before which the temples were prosperous and for the most part exempt from taxes. During this "evil time" taxes were re-imposed. The priests "departed away." After this "evil time", and synchronous with the arrival of Psamtik I, the tax-exempt status of the temples was reintroduced. But by some oversight, or mischief, taxes continued to be levied on Teuzoi. The fact that Psamtik I initiated the taxation reforms is made clear on a stela inscription described later in the Petition: "His Majesty was comforting the land, suppressing the rebels (?) in it, provisioning all the temples of the South and North lands." (Petition 108)

If this is what the Petition says, then under no circumstance can it be squared with the traditional history, wherein Psamtik I, within a year of the battle between Urdamanie and Ashurbanipal, drove the Assyrians out of Egypt. That circumstance would leave no time for the imposition of taxes on the temples of Upper Egypt. Ashurbanipal's second invasion in 564 B.C., which must have resulted *inter alia* in the destruction of Teuzoi, occurred only months before the successful coup of Psamtik I.

The narrative in the Petition produces the distinct impression that the "evil time" was of long duration. An entire generation is missing from the record. Peteesi appears ignorant of what has transpired in Teuzoi, though his ancestors were formerly priests there. Where was he when these events transpired? Why did he not learn the details from his father Essemteu? In fact, where is Essemteu? Later in the narrative Petesi meets an itinerant priest named Haruaz son of Peftu'ubasti, who claims that his father was also at one time a priest in Teuzoi. He is young and anxious to marry a daughter of Peteesi. All he can do to prove his heritage is produce documents which attest his father's priesthood. "My father used to be priest here in Teuzoi, and I will show unto his Honour that he used

to be priest here, I will bring the patents of my father before his Honour" (Petition 83) What happened to Peftu'ubasti, the father of Haruaz? In the quoted portion of the narrative, the solitary aged priest holding the fort in Teuzoi laments that all the priests in all the "great fanes (=temples) of Kemi (=Egypt)" departed away. Where did they go? Does the narrative not suggest some mass exodus or endemic slaughter? If we are in the time of the Assyrian occupation and the priests have fled the scene only months before, why do they not simply return?

Even the phrase "evil time" is problematic. Griffiths, in a footnote, remarks:

The Coptic equivalent means "famine" but at this time the meaning may have been wider and the expression may refer to some of the disasters that had lately overtaken Egypt at the hands of invaders, which might well have produced famine also. The exaction of tribute by the Assyrians probably involved the taxation of the temples. Teuzoi, as devoted to Ammon, may have sided with the Ethiopians against Necos and his son Psammetichus, who were nominally supported by the Assyrians, and this may have led to the contribution from Teuzoi not being remitted. But historical facts do not count for much in this part of the narrative. Petition 80

We understand why Griffith is compelled ultimately to discount the historicity of the Petesi narrative. It does not fit the circumstances of the 7th century context in which it is wrongly placed.

Petesi III discovered the sacred city of Teuzoi destroyed. That destruction must have involved an associated loss of life. It was followed by a prolonged period of famine and excessive taxation that combined to decimate the remaining population. And the narrative is clear that Teuzoi was not alone in suffering this fate. It is incomprehensible why Griffith would restrict his comments to that one locale. Priests vacated "all the temples of Egypt." The scene thus pictured suits the revised history; it conflicts significantly with the current history. Griffiths is uneasy about the translation. He changes "famine" to "evil time" to fit his conception of history. But he remains unconvinced. The reliability of the narrative is finally called into question.

We recall the warning of Jeremiah to the survivors of the Judaeian disaster:

If you are determined to go to Egypt and you do go to settle there, then the sword you fear will overtake you there, and the famine you dread will follow you into Egypt, and there you will die. Indeed all who are determined to go to Egypt to settle there will die by the sword, famine and plague... Jer 42:15-17.

There is no need to emend "famine" to "evil time".

The narrative continues. During the next decade Petesi is busy restoring the fortunes of the temple of Teuzoi. He had to go far and wide to find the appropriate help.

Peteesi son of Ieturou came to Teuzoi, he caused the men to be brought who did handicraft, and gave them 200 pieces of refined(?) silver and 20 pieces of gold, he caused them to make them into cups of silver and gold for Amun, he caused them to make the shrine of Amun upon-the-great-place. He caused the priests, the shrine-openers, and the other classes (?) of men who (are qualified to?) enter the temple to be brought to Teuzoi; (even) if there was a man among them who had gone as far as No [Thebes] he caused all to be brought. He caused the endowment-estates which he found to have been appropriated to Amun to be given, and he caused 1000 aruras to be added to the endowment-estates of Amun. He caused offerings and linen to be laid before Amun and before Usiri of Ieruoz(?). He made Teuzoi glorious like one of the great fanes of Ptores. He made his children priests of Amun of Teuzoi ... Petition 81

By the 14th year of Psamtik (530 B.C.) the restoration is complete, and Petesi

"caused a tablet of stone of Ieb to be quarried and the blocks for two statues of temgy-stone, and caused them to be brought to Teuzoi. He came north and reached Teuzoi, he caused the granite-workers, the engravers, the scribes of the House of Life, and the draughtsmen to be brought. He caused the good deed that he had done in Teuzoi to be put upon the tablet..." Petition 81-2

We are nearing the end of the Egyptian exile. Restoration is underway elsewhere in Egypt that invites our attention. Mentuemhet is active in Thebes, but before moving to Thebes two further items from the Petition need to be mentioned.

Psamtik's 34th Year

The stone tablet erected by Petesi in the 14th year of Psamtik (tablet A) was maliciously destroyed in Psamtik's 31st year. In that same 31st year the two sons of Haruaz, grandsons of Petesi, were murdered by the same delinquent priests who damaged the year 14 stela. In the course of pursuing the prosecution of these priests Petesi took time to order the construction of a replacement stela, altered slightly to include the priestly offices he had omitted from the original. In the narrative this commissioning of a new stela (tablet B) preceded the burial of the two youths. Since, according to Egyptian practice, burial took place seventy days following death, allowing time for mummification, we can assume the youths were buried that same 31st year. It is surprising therefore to read Griffith's footnote to the passage which describes the erection of the replacement stela:

This is the inscription of Athyr of year 34 ... The date is two and a half years after the outrage, and that although the inscription was engraved before the boys were buried. Petition 91 n.9

What is happening? To understand Griffith's remarks we are forced to look at the third division of the Petition, heretofore ignored. That section records the content of the two stelae mentioned above, those of the 14th and the 31st years, tablets A and B. The Petesi family records are thorough. Both stela inscriptions were meticulously copied and records preserved, rather fortunate since even the second stela was damaged later. The problem that confronted Griffith was two-fold. In the first place, the second stela inscription was dated to Psamtik's 34th year, not his 31st. But the narrative that gave rise to the footnote states that the two sons of Haruaz had yet to be buried at the time the stela was erected. In the second place, the two stelae were identical save, as the narrative stated, the addition of some previously omitted particulars regarding Petesi's former offices on the second stela. There was nothing inscribed on tablet B to indicate that it was a replacement and that the date recorded on it was unrelated to the circumstances it described. Both tablets are worded as if written in the year 14.

The first problem Griffith handled by assuming that the second stela was actually created in Petesi's 34th year, the year actually inscribed on the stela, and that, therefore, the burial of two boys had been delayed for 2 1/2 years!

Regarding the second problem he could only lament:

But if these tablets are genuine and correctly copied it is a very serious matter to students of Egyptian history to find that the date on a tablet can have so little to do with the time of the events recorded upon it, as must be the case in B. The date turns out to be merely the date when the inscription was engraved, and the events recorded on it had taken place at least sixteen, perhaps thirty, years before. Petition 107

Griffith's problems can be dealt with routinely in the revised history. When Psamtik was installed in office in 543 B.C., however that happened, he was succeeding no-one. Pharaonic rule in Egypt had been in abeyance for over twenty years. According to Manetho, Psamtik was the son of a king Neco. As previously argued, Neco may have perished in Nebuchadrezzar's assault or have been driven from the Delta along with his infant son Psamtik. In either case we can assume he died in 563 B.C. It is entirely possible that Psamtik, at some time between his 14th and 31st year, decided to backdate the years of his reign, as sole surviving son, to the last year of his deceased father. On the second stela he recorded what was formerly his 14th year, as his 34th year. The two dates on the respective stelae are the same; they are merely calculated in different ways. Both refer to the 14th year of Psamtik. Griffith's fears are unfounded.

There is, accordingly, no need to assume a delay of over two years in the burial of the sons of Haruaz. The second stela was erected in the 31st year of Psamtik as anticipated by the narrative. The date on stela B does not refer to the date of erection of that stela.

Psamtik was not the only Pharaoh to variously date events in his reign. Nothing is amiss. The Petition history is vindicated.

Samtoutefnakht & The Nitocris Stela

The second problem is related to an event that took place in Psamtik's 18th year. In that year, according to the Petition, Peteesi, son of Ankhsheshonk, the master of shipping died, and "Per'o made Semtutefnakhti Master of the Shipping, and Ptores was committed to him again even as it had been to his father". (Petition 85) It is possible, of course, that the 18th year date is recorded in error, but there is independent confirmation in the Petition that the date is reasonably correct.¹⁸⁸ And therein lies the problem.

There are few monuments extant from the reign of Psamtik I. Thus the importance of a large red granite stela, 6 foot high and 4 1/2 foot wide, found by Legrain at Karnak in 1897. "It records the adoption of Nitocris, the daughter of Psamtik I, by a Shepnupet, daughter of Taharka, the Divine Votress or sacerdotal princess, at Thebes." and it functions as a formal "decree of adoption and property-conveyance." Its value for history lies in revealing "that Psamtik had gained full control of Thebes by his ninth year..." (BAR 935-937)

For reasons that will soon become apparent we question the dating of the Nitocris stela. It is our opinion that the events it portrays took place in Psamtik's 30th year (514 B.C.) rather than his 9th year (535 B.C.). The argument is not essential to the revised chronology, but since we are revising history, we should set the record straight in all respects. Part of the proof of our claim is related to Samtoutefnakht.

The introductory portion of the stela is missing. The visible portion begins with the statement:

In the year 9, first month of the first season (first month), day 28, went forth his eldest daughter from the king's family apartments, clad in fine linen, and newly adorned with malachite. The attendants conducting her were legion in number, and 8 marshals cleared the path, for beginning the goodly way to the harbor, to turn up-stream for Thebes. The vessels bearing her were very numerous, the crews were mighty men; and they were deeply laden [to the decks] with every good thing of the king's palace. The commander thereof was the sole companion, nomarch of Heracleopolis, commander in chief of the army, chief of the harbor, Somtous-Tefnakhte. ... BAR 944

The problem is readily apparent. Somtous-Tefnakhte of the Nitocris Stela is the same as Semtutefnakhti of the Petition and he is in office in the 9th year of an unnamed king. If this king is Psamtik I then the installation of Samtoutefnakht as master of shipping must

¹⁸⁸ The fact that Samtoutefnakht was installed in office in the 18th year of Psamtik is supported by the two tablet discussed in the previous section. On both of the stela inscriptions A and B, which are dated in Psamtik's 14th (= 34th) year, Petesi son of Ankhsheshonk is still alive and functioning as the shipping master. His death and the installation of Samtoutefnakht as Master of Shipping must certainly postdate Psamtik's 14th year.

have occurred a decade earlier than indicated by the Petesi family records. It is assumed by scholars that the error lies in those family records, but in fact the error lies in the interpretation of the Nitocris stela.¹⁸⁹ There is nothing in that stela that clearly specifies whose 9th year is being discussed. No king's name is mentioned in the dateline. Psamtik's name occurs elsewhere in the inscription. The identification of the dateline with Psamtik is an inference made by scholars, not one demanded by the inscription. In fairness to the interpreters there was no alternative. In the traditional history, where Psamtik was the uncontested ruler of Egypt, the dateline must relate to him. But that is not the case with the Saite dynasty correctly positioned in the first Persian domination. The dateline must refer to the years of Darius I (522-486 B.C.) not Psamtik I (543-489 B.C.). The 9th year of Darius, 514 B.C., is the 30th year of Psamtik I. Samtoutefnakht has been in office, as the Petition of Petesi claims, since Psamtik's 18th year (524 B.C.), that is, for over a decade. His titles have clearly expanded in the interim. The prosperity of Egypt has at least partially returned. The exile has ended.

The revised dating of the Nitocris stela has been made not merely to defend the integrity of the Petition of Petesi. There is a secondary purpose. For were we to read on in the Nitocris inscription we would find among the list of celebrities greeting Nitocris on her arrival in Thebes, the 4th prophet of Amun, Mentuemhet. It is imperative that the record be set straight on the life of this important dignitary.

Mentuemhet

Twice already Mentuemhet has appeared in this revision. In the traditional history he was identified as the Mantimanhe of the Assyrian annals, established as the nominal king of Thebes by Esarhaddon in 671 B.C. and affirmed in that office by 'Ashurbanipal in 667 B.C. In the Nitocris Adoption Stela he was present in Thebes to greet Nitocris, daughter of Psamtik I, in what was purported to be Psamtik's 9th year, 656 B.C. At that time he is identified as the 4th prophet of Amun. He has left to posterity a considerable

¹⁸⁹ The stela needs to be completely reappraised. Several of the key figures have been misidentified. Pediamennebnesttawy, the third prophet of Amun, is not Pediamennebnesttawy C, father of the third prophet Hor xvii, but instead Pediamennebnesttawy D, Hor's son (cf. the genealogy in R.A. Parker, *A Saite Oracle Papyrus From Thebes*, 1962, p. 23). Nesptah, chief of the prophets of Thebes and son of Mentuemhet, is arguably Nesptah C rather than Nesptah B, with whom he is usually identified (cf. the genealogy in Kitchen TIP 196). One of these sons with the title 4th prophet (probably Nesptah B) predeceased Mentuemhet according to two abnormal hieratic papyri (Vienna 12.002 and 12.003). He died some time prior to year 17 of Psamtik. For details cf. Parker, *op.cit.* signature 33, p.24. We assume Mentuemhet took the title of 4th prophet at this time and passed it to his second son, the Nesptah of the Nitocris stela, at his death. The scholars have also incorrectly identified the god's wives alluded to, but not named, in the stela. Nitocris is being adopted by Amenirdis II, not Shepenupet II. The latter either died at the time of the invasion or while in exile in Nubia. The entire argument deserves a separate treatment.

number of monuments, primarily in the vicinity of Thebes, and lengthy and detailed wall inscriptions in his spacious tomb in the Asasif, east of Hatshepsut's temple at Deir el Bahari. Nowhere does he refer to the Assyrians, and nowhere does he consider himself a king. But he does refer to a recent disaster which has severely damaged the southland. And he describes in detail the lengthy process of restoration and renewal which has consumed years of his life.

Assuming for the moment that Ashurbanipal's "king" and the 4th prophet are one and the same, and that the Nitocris stela refers to Psamtik's 9th year, then Mentuemhet's political life spanned at minimum the years from 671 B.C. to 655 B.C. He is associated with Taharka on several monuments, and the assumption is made that the majority of his restoration activity occurred prior to Taharka's death. The reason is obvious. For upwards of eight years after Taharka's death and Psamtik's assumption of power in Lower Egypt, Tanuatamon is assumed to have held power in Thebes. But in his many inscriptions Mentuemhet refers to himself as governor of Upper Egypt, and he appears to make decisions independent of any higher local authority. He certainly does not mention Tanuatamon. His apparent independence suits best the interval in which he is "king" of Thebes, i.e. between 671 B.C. and 664 B.C. And those dates can be narrowed even further. Since restoration assumes destruction, and since Thebes was definitely not violated by Esarhaddon in 671 B.C., Mentuemhet's renewal activity must be dated between the 667 B.C. and the 664/3 B.C. invasions of Ashurbanipal, dates accepted by the majority of authors.¹⁹⁰[7] The Egyptologist Henry Breasted summarizes the reconstruction activity of Mentuemhet.

The activity of Mentemhet in the building and restoration of the monuments under Taharka at Thebes renders his rule there notable. This work was all done before Taharka's death, and the renewal of so many costly cultus images of the gods, besides references to the purification of all the temples in the South, and vague allusions to a great catastrophe, make it extremely probably that the mooted capture and sack of Thebes (667 B.C.) in Ashurbanipal's first campaign, although not certain from his confused records, actually took place.
BAR IV 902

We underscore the fact that Mentuemhet's acts of restoration are all dated within a four year period immediately prior to the 1st year of Psamtik I. Any time frame earlier or later than these dates would introduce a unique set of problems.¹⁹¹ But there are at least

¹⁹⁰ Jean Leclant is a rare exception to the rule in his *Montouemhat, Quatrieme Prophete D'Amon*, (1961), p.236, though he cites in support H. von Zeissl, *Aethiopen und Assyrer in Aegypten (1944)*, p.43f, and he notes (n.3) that some doubts had been expressed previously by G. Steindorff, *Beitrage zur Assyriologie*, I (1890), p. 355 and G. Reisner, *The Harvard Theological Review*, XIII (1920), p.36.

¹⁹¹ Sufficient here to remark that not a single author, following the traditional history, has dated Mentuemhet's activity in the Saite period which supposedly followed Ashurbanipal's 664/3 B.C. invasion., in spite of the evidence from the Petition of Petesi that repairs to at least one temple

three major difficulties with this dating of Mentuemhet's work, specifically, 1) the altogether unwarranted assumption that Ashurbanipal destroyed the south of Egypt in 667 B.C.; 2) the very narrow window of opportunity during which the extensive repairs took place; and 3) the absence of any discernible motivation for extensive rebuilding at this time. We examine these three issues in the order named.

The Destruction of Thebes

All scholars are sensitive to the initial objection, including Breasted in his comments previously quoted. The Assyrian annals not only fail to describe a destruction and looting of Thebes in 667 B.C., but seem to rule out the fact when they make the point elsewhere that Thebes was destroyed and looted during Ashurbanipal's second invasion, dated 664 B.C. In spite of that fact the majority of scholars assume otherwise and continue to adhere to the 667-664/3 B.C. dates for Mentuemhet. A solitary objection is raised by no less an authority than Jean Leclant:

If the text of Montuemhet is actually concerned with a series of restorations undertaken after the passage of the Assyrians, it is necessary to suppose that Thebes was taken a first time within the reign of Taharka, that is, a few years before its final fall, corresponding to the (time of) the flight and the death of its sovereign. But the Assyrian texts in no way allow such a conjecture (Or les textes assyriens ne permettent nullement pareille conjecture); there was but a single taking of Thebes in 663 B.C. (il n'y a eu qu'une seule prise de Thebes en 663).¹⁹²

Against the majority view Leclant, following von Zeissl, points out that Mentuemhet's work included repairs to the sacred lakes of the temples of Montou, of Mut, and of Isis, and that this damage can hardly be attributed to invading armies.¹⁹³ He notes additionally that in the inscriptions of Mentuemhet there is no clear reference to a foreign war, to a conquest, to a siege or even to pillage. The inscriptions contain only vague references to a time "when the entire land was turned upside down." In Leclant's opinion the damage that Mentuemhet set about restoring was caused several decades earlier, in the decadence and troubles that characterized the end of the 8th century.¹⁹⁴ There is no time to analyze Leclant's argument. He has a point. Mentuemhet does speak in generalities and some of Mentuemhet's energy may have been spent on objects damaged as much by neglect (the sacred lakes) as by maliciousness. But Leclant's interpretation is also open to criticism.

were underway at that time. The misdating of the Nitrocris stela is a contributing factor.

¹⁹² Leclant, *Montouemhat*, p. 236.

¹⁹³ Ibid. cf. von Zeissl, *Aethiopen und Assyrer*, p.59.

¹⁹⁴ Leclant, *Montouemhat*, p. 237.

In the first place the cause of damage cited by Leclant is as incapable of demonstration as the conjectured destruction caused by Ashurbanipal's 667 B.C. invasion. Disturbances in the late 8th century there may have been, but evidence is lacking of damage to temple and town such as that encountered by Mentuemhet. Secondly, Leclant misrepresents the language of Mentuemhet. Even a cursory reading of the text suggests that the damage resulted from some catastrophic event and that the entire cultic apparatus of Upper Egypt has been in suspension till reinstated by Mentuemhet. Breasted quotes extensively from the same temple of Mut inscription used by Leclant as the basis of his comments. We reproduce selected statements from Breasted's translation:

I fashioned [the sacred barge of Amon] of 80 cubits in its length, of new cedar of the best of the terraces. The "Great House" was of electrum, inlaid with every genuine costly stone... I *purified all the temples in the nomes of all Patoris*, according as one should purify [violated] temples, --- after there had been [an invasion of unclean foreigners in] the Southland... I satisfied her lord (Amon) with the things of his desire, bulls of the largest, and calves of the best. I gave my lord...good things...food, and divine offerings... His granaries swelled with the first fruits [which came to] him down-stream in their season, and up-stream in their time. They made festive ... to celebrate the feasts; that he might provision the prophets, priests, -- and lay priests of the temples --- in the nomes, great and small ... --- it being divine chastisement. [In] the protected Southland in its divine way, while *the whole land was overturned*, because of the greatness ... coming from the South.... I repelled the wretches from the southern nomes --- I spent the day in searching and the night in seeking, searching, [summoning] them that passed, calling them the ---, and revising the rules that had begun to be obsolete. BAR IV 904-908 (italics added)

The inscription continues to describe Mentuemhet fashioning the divine images of Hathor, Amon, Horus, Min and Khonsu for the multiple temples of these gods. He ordered the construction of a (replacement) statue of Amenhopet I of electrum and costly stone "as done before". He rebuilt the protective brick flood wall around the Karnak temple, remoulded a sacred bull and rebuilt the M'd precinct to house the bull "more beautiful than what was therein [before]. He appears also to have rebuilt the entire temple of Montu and a barge for Osiris of new cedar.

Even if we delete Breasted's reference to " an invasion of unclean foreigners" - the inscription is damaged and the reading is supplied - it is clear that something catastrophic has happened in the southland. Temples have been violated, buildings destroyed, the physical apparatus of the priestly cult removed - divine statues, sacred barges, the stables for festive feasts - effectively ending the temple worship. Law and order have long been in abeyance. It is hard to agree with Leclant that this state of affairs endured through the first two decades of the 7th century till set right by Mentuemhet.

But even the damaged reference to “an invasion of unclean foreigners” cannot be readily dismissed. Elsewhere, on the base of a granite statue of Mentuemhet and his son Nesptah, there is a similar reference to "the violence (nšn) (done by) the foreigners". The boast is made on that same statue inscription that the Egyptians no longer live in fear of these "enemies", and are now able to pass the night in safety (lit. with fortress doors open).¹⁹⁵ Elsewhere still a statue from the Karnak cache refers to Mentuemhet as "one who dispels disorder (nšn) from the palace"¹⁹⁶. We have encountered this term already. The cosmic upheaval in the 15th year of Takeloth II was called a nšn, an upheaval/catastrophe. It resulted in unspecified physical damage (nšn) to the land of Egypt and ultimately resulted in social disruption (nšn). Both physical and social/political disruption are alluded to by Mentuemhet in his use of this term. And this violence clearly resulted from the intrusion of enemies from foreign lands.

We temporarily rest our case. Traditionalist historians and Egyptologists appear to be correct in ascribing the devastation of Thebes and vicinity to an invasion by enemies from foreign lands. But the intrusion of foreigners can hardly be equated with the 667 B.C. invasion by Ashurbanipal. Leclant's objection that the Assyrian annals can under no circumstance be so interpreted still stands. And besides, we wonder what circumstance could provide for the Egyptians the sense of security described by Mentuemhet when, in the years following the assumed 667 B.C. destruction of Thebes, the Assyrians remained in the country, threatening violence.

Before resolving the apparent disagreement between Leclant and the majority position, we glance briefly at the two other reasons cited earlier for denying a destructive invasion of Egypt in 667 B.C., namely, 1) the very narrow window of opportunity during which the extensive repairs of Mentuemhet supposedly took place; and 2) the absence of any discernible motivation for extensive rebuilding at this time. We examine these two issues together.

Four Years Reconstruction

In the traditional history four years are available for the reconstructive activity of Mentuemhet. Even were we to assume that the badly damaged temple of Mut inscription contained references to no other items than those outlined above, we wonder at Mentuemhet's efficiency. He was able to rebuild barges, construct walls, rebuild/repair and purify temples, restore food production (including replenishing the necessary herds of cattle and granaries), supervise the construction of temple statuary, and recodify laws - and all this within a few brief years while the country remained occupied by the Assyrian army. He must have been an extremely resilient and resourceful man to organize such an efficient enterprise so soon after such devastating losses.

¹⁹⁵ Leclant, *Montouemhat*, document 12, p. 84.

¹⁹⁶ Leclant, *Monouemhat*, document 1, p. 6-8.

Where, we enquire, did he obtain the necessary supplies - cedar for the barges, granite, electrum, and precious stones for the statuary, cattle and grain to replenish the food supply, limestone for the temple and wall construction? Were not the Assyrians stationed nearby, the same enemy who had just recently dispossessed the Thebans of all that was valuable? Did the Assyrians supply the precious stone and electrum? It is conceivable that the Assyrians might allow the resumption of planting and harvesting, and even of the reconstitution of herds of livestock, with appropriate taxation. But there was insufficient time to bring about the abundance about which Mentuemhet boasted.

We enquire finally, what would motivate Mentuemhet to engage in such renovations? It is unthinkable that such an astute politician would replenish the resources that the Assyrians had only recently looted while the Assyrians were nearby and posing a continued threat. Electrum, precious stones, cattle and grain were no less desirable to the foreigners after than they were before the assumed 667 B.C. invasion. The fact that Thebes was (again?) looted in 663 B.C. is proof that the threat was real. Mentuemhet's actions must be likened to a banker refilling the till while the robbers remain in the bank. The entire scenario defies reason.

Mentuemhet in the Revised History

It is not difficult to resolve the problem of Mentuemhet's activity. With the dynasties repositioned, and Mentuemhet, a contemporary of Psamtik I., correctly placed in the years immediately following the arrival of Cyrus in Egypt, the conflict between Leclant and traditional historians disappears.

Leclant is correct. There was no destruction and looting of Thebes in 667 B.C. And the destruction repaired by Mentuemhet did in fact take place two decades before his repairs were begun. But the despoiling of Egypt did not occur in the turmoil of the late 8th century; it must be attributed to Nebuchadrezzar in the mid 6th century.

The traditionalists are correct. The destruction and looting of Thebes and vicinity must be credited to foreign enemies invading from the northland. But the intruders were Babylonian, not Assyrian. And the year of the invasion was 564 B.C., not 667 B.C.

In the revised history Mentuemhet served as governor of the south while Psamtik functioned as pharaoh and governor in the north of Egypt. Both were semi-autonomous authorities, though Mentuemhet may well have had, from the beginning, a lesser status. Both Psamtik and Mentuemhet held offices sanctioned by, if not established by, the Persians. The Petition of Petesi seems to attribute to Psamtik control of both Lower Egypt and Upper Egypt (Patores) early in his reign. There is no contradiction. Mentuemhet's office and activity may have begun later than Psamtik's 4th year, the first date mentioned in the Petition.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁷ The fact that Mentuemhet "repelled the wretches from the southern nomes" seems to indicate

With Mentuemhet dated to the early Persian period, engaged in repairing the damage done to Upper Egypt by Nebuchadrezzar over twenty years earlier, the problems associated with his inscriptions disappear entirely. His reconstructive activity is no longer confined to a brief few years. The reinstatement of temple worship, which finds its counterpart in central Egypt in the work of Petesi at Teujoi, may have encompassed the better part of three decades, from the arrival of Cyrus in 543 B.C. to the installation of Nitocris, daughter of Psamtik I, in 513 B.C. Even if we were wrong in our redating of the Nitocris Adoption stela, he would have nine years, rather than four years, to accomplish his work. And there is no longer a problem identifying the source of supplies. The reputation of Cyrus in providing financial assistance for rebuilding activity within his empire is well documented in the case of the reconstruction of the Jerusalem temple following the Judean exile. A similar benevolence may be assumed for the Egyptian recovery effort. And with the expulsion of the remaining Babylonian troops in Upper Egypt, and the installation of Persian auxiliaries in Syrene, there was instituted in Upper Egypt a Persian peace that lasted for almost a century. The country need no longer fear the anarchy that prevailed in the early decades of the exile.¹⁹⁸

As for the motivation behind the activities of Mentuemhet, there exists a perfectly satisfactory explanation. There is no need to question the sanity of a costly renewal of the Theban temples. There was absolutely no fear of subsequent pillage. In the case of Judah Cyrus actually returned to the Judaeans the valuable temple utensils confiscated by Babylon a half-century earlier, in all 5400 articles of gold and silver. (Ezra 1:7-11) And severe sanctions were imposed on those who interfered with the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple. It is probable that Mentuemhet was similarly directed to undertake the reforms he initiated and that the security of his work was guaranteed by the Persian authorities.

Menuemhet, the Nubian

According to the current revision Mentuemhet began his tenure as governor of Upper Egypt sometime after the death of Taharka in 543 B.C. And Taharka, at the time of his death, lived and ruled in Napata, hundreds of miles upriver from Thebes. How do we explain, therefore, the proven connection between Mentuemhet and the 25th dynasty pharaoh? From whence did Mentuemhet arrive in Egypt to assume his post as governor of the southland?

that he arrived early, while Babylonian troops remained in the Theban area. It must be admitted however, that these "wretches" could be any of the carpetbaggers who took advantage of the conditions of the exile to loot and pillage. When Udjahorresne arrived in Egypt in the days of Cambyses he had to evict intruders who had taken up residence in the temple of Neith in Sais.

¹⁹⁸ At least under Cyrus there was security within the Persian empire. Under his successors the situation was more precarious as we learn from affairs in post-exilic Judah, where conflict was commonplace for the returnees, making it necessary for Nehemiah to post armed guards while rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem.

The inscription of Mentuemhet that has absorbed the lion's share of our attention was inscribed on the walls of a small enclosure in the temple of Mut, close by the Karnak temple in Thebes. On the walls of this enclosure, in addition to the inscription previously excerpted, there exists a depiction of Taharka leading in procession the figures of Nesptah the elder, father of Mentuemhet, followed by Mentuemhet himself, and finally by Nesptah, one of Mentuemhet's sons by that name. The impression left by this procession is that the elder Nesptah was a contemporary of Taharka. We conjecture that Nesptah the elder was a casualty of Nebuchadrezzar's invasion or that he and his son Mentuemhet together accompanied Taharka into Nubia. In either case Mentuemhet lived out the next twenty years in Nubia. It is conceded by scholars that Mentuemhet had Nubian blood.¹⁹⁹ The last of his three wives, Udjarenes (or Wedjarenes), was Nubian. Mentuemhet likely served Taharka while in exile, returning to Egypt with Tanuatamon, accompanied by his Nubian wife. He remained to serve the Persians.

We cannot establish these facts beyond question, though some confirmation is forthcoming from Mentuemhet's tomb, "one of the largest and most lavishly decorated private monuments ever made in ancient Egypt."²⁰⁰ Analysis of this massive structure by Edna Russmann suggests that it was constructed in two stages, one portion attributed to the 25th and later additions to the 26th dynasty.²⁰¹ There is clear indication that some temporal disruption separated the two phases of the tomb's construction.

It thus seems clear that the walls of the two courts and the rooms in front of them were decorated in sequence from west to east, with the change from Twenty-fifth to Twenty-sixth Dynasty style occurring within the first court, at its west end. Precisely at the point of this stylistic shift, however, we also encounter a significant change in the decorative program: from the orthodox registers of raised relief under the west portico to the large-scale, overall design of the north and south facades. This disjuncture is so complete as to raise the possibility of a larger disruption in the work on the tomb. One must, in fact, ask whether the major part of the first court, east of the portico, and the entrance complex, including the first room, were not merely the last areas to be decorated, but whether they may actually have been constructed later. This possibility seems to be supported by certain aspects of the tomb's architecture.
Pp. 17-18

¹⁹⁹ Cf. R.A. Parker, *A Saite Oracle Papyrus From Thebes* (1961), p. 6 who bases his remarks on the skin tone of Mentuemhet who is pictured in the vignette on the papyrus. He also cites comments by Serge Sauneron and Jean Yoyotte, "La campagne Nubienne de Psammetique II et sa signification historique," *BIFAO* 50 (1952), p. 201 n.5. This papyrus, dated in year 14 of Psamtik I, describes the installation Harsiese, son of Peftjau, as priest of Amon. In the revised history we interpret the installation as part of the work of Mentuemhet in renewing the Theban priesthood.

²⁰⁰ Edna R. Russmann, "Relief Decoration in the Tomb of Mentuemhat (TT34)," *JARCE* 31 (1994) p.1.

²⁰¹ "Mentuemhet's is the only major tomb at Thebes to have spanned the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties" *Ibid.*, p. 19

This interruption in the construction of Mentuemhet's tomb is easily explained in the revised history. We assume that late in the reign of Shabataka or early in the reign of Taharka, Mentuemhet, still a young man, began the construction of his tomb (though the possibility remains that the tomb was begun by and intended for Nesptah the elder). Work abruptly ceased when Nebuchadrezzar invaded Thebes in 563 B.C. and resumed when Mentuemhet returned, whether in 543 B.C. or later. During those twenty years there occurred a dramatic stylistic change, in part attributable to the death of the earlier generation of Egyptian artisans.

It is interesting to note the almost complete absence of mention of Mentuemhet's first two wives, Neskonsu and Shepenmut, in the inscriptions of the finished tomb. There is no evidence that either wife was buried there. The attention is focussed almost entirely on Wedjarenes, his Cushite wife. It is conceivable that neither of his first wives survived the invasion. We must assume he married Wedjarenes while in Nubia. Her status may have had something to do with his selection as the southern governor by the Persians. "Wedjarenes was of Kushite royal descent: her father was the 'king's son Pi(ankh)y-har'"²⁰²

Excavations in Mentuemhet's tomb are ongoing. Perhaps some development will shed further light on his rise to power. Meanwhile, we turn our attention further north, to south central Egypt, where Petosiris is beginning to re-establish temple worship in Hermopolis Magna.

Tomb of Petosiris

While Mentuemhet was re-establishing temple worship in the area of Thebes and Petesi was restoring Teuzoi in north central Egypt, Petosiris, high priest of Thoth, was performing similar repairs in Hermopolis, roughly mid-way between the other two centers, on the west bank of the Nile. We must admit at the outset that our dating of his family tomb to the Saite period is conjectural, and the argument from its inscriptions is weakened on that account. But if only to set the record straight, and provide direction for further research, the inscriptions from Petosiris' tomb need to be re-examined. The brevity of our discussion belies the importance of the inscriptions, reflecting instead their uncertain dates.

²⁰² Edna R. Russmann, "Mentuemhat's Kushite Wife (Further Remarks on the Decoration of the Tomb of Mentuemhat, 2)," *JARCE* 34 (1997), 21-22.

The Dating of the Tomb.

The tomb was discovered in 1919 and excavated by M Gustave Lefebvre, who published his results in a series of preliminary reports and finally in his comprehensive *Tombeau de Petosiris* in 1924. From the outset he dated the tomb to the late 4th and early 3rd centuries B.C. It was his belief that Petosiris functioned as lesionis of the temple of Thoth for seven years during the brief second Persian occupation of Egypt (343-332 B.C.), and that the desecration of Egypt he described occurred during his term in office. The tomb continued to be used by successive family members through the brief reign of Alexander and into the Ptolemaic period.

We note, however, that his dating of the tomb is very subjective. Lefebvre notes in his initial preliminary report that the tomb contained no cartouche, no sovereign's name, nor any other element which would allow him to propose, a priori, even an approximate date.²⁰³ Only on stylistic and artistic grounds did he claim to arrive at his conclusions. The hieroglyphic inscriptions were, according to him, of the late period (i.e. post 28th dynasty). But he admits that the hieroglyphs themselves bear only the slightest resemblance to those of the Ptolemaic era. The style of writing is also early - pedantic, stylistically correct, and syntactically accurate. Based on linguistic criteria alone he considered that the tomb must date to the earliest part of this late period, near the time of Nectanebo. The artistic elements in the tomb, however, lead him to lower his dates toward the Ptolemaic period. He saw in the several artistic representations many indications of Greek influence. Notable among these were the long tunics worn by the men and robes reminiscent of those worn by Greek women. But as he himself admits, these garments are not distinctive of the 4th century B.C. Similar garments could be seen by Lefebvre in the near east of the twentieth century A.D. And the garments are not Greek; they reflect a Persian influence. "Voici maintenant un manteau, grec d'origine, mais modifié sous une influence étrangère, persane ou asiatique, et qui ne s'est pas encore rencontré hors d'Égypte."²⁰⁴

In the final analysis, while Lefebvre claims to date the tomb on the basis of the style of writing and on the apparent foreign influence on the costumes of the artistic figures, his date is based primarily on the content of the inscriptions. They speak of an invasion and destruction of Egypt by a foreign army, the subsequent occupation of the country by foreigners, and Petosiris' extensive repairs of the devastation caused by the foreigners. Those descriptive elements do not fit the destruction of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 B.C., the only other dating possibility entertained by Lefebvre. Petosiris' father is depicted as living under an indigenous pharaoh, while Petosiris' term in office, in Lefebvre's

²⁰³ G. Lefebvre, "Le Tombeau de Petosiris: Preliminary Report," ASAE 20 (1920) p. 114. "Il ne renferme ni cartouche, ni nom de souverain, ni, d'une façon générale, d'élément qui nous permette de proposer *a priori* même une date approximative. Il faut donc procéder par déduction, et interroger les divers documents, épigraphiques et archéologiques, susceptible de nous fournir quelque indication."

²⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 116

understanding at least, was contemporary with the last seven years of the foreign domination, clearly a chronological impossibility if the inscriptions relate to the 120 year long first Persian occupation of Egypt. The possible identification with the 27th Persian dynasty was considered and immediately rejected. Petosiris must belong to the second Persian domination.²⁰⁵

But artistic considerations are notoriously suspect for dating purposes. Persian costume and Persian influence did not change appreciably from the first to the second periods of Persian rule in Egypt. And we know that the Saite dynasty, which in the revised history overlaps the first Persian domination, was characterized by considerable Greek influence.

The Tomb Inscriptions

Lefebvre's dependence on the chronology of the traditional history was a mistake. Regrettably his erroneous dating of the Petosiris inscriptions has not only seriously affected their interpretation, it has also influenced their translation. The matter must be set right.

The tomb inscriptions speak frequently of a period of foreign rule over Egypt. For Lefebvre this could only refer to the time of the second Persian domination (343-332 B.C.). In the same context in which Petosiris speaks ill of this calamitous era he applauds his seven years as lesionis of Thoth. Therefore, Lefebvre reasoned, Petosiris must have been priest during the time of this foreign rule. His translations reflect that understanding. The only alternative, dating the priesthood of Petosiris subsequent to the brief Persian domination, was rejected on other grounds, among them the belief that his reforms took place in a Persian context. In general most scholars have agreed with Lefebvre. Olmstead is typical:

"Petosiris became head of the most important family at Hermopolis in 339, less than four years after the Persian re-conquest. He, too, made his peace with the powers that were, but writing during the reign of the Macedonian Philip Arrhidaeus he has much to say of Persian misrule."²⁰⁶

Before proceeding we pause to put Petosiris in his true historical context. He does not belong to the 2nd Persian occupation of the country; he belongs to the first. Petosiris'

²⁰⁵ "Mais encore de quelle domination persane s'agit-il? De la premiere, qui dura cent bingt ans, couvrant tout le v^e siecle, et se termina vers 404 par la verolte d'Amyrtee, - ou de la seconde, qui commença en 342, a la chute de Nectanebo II, et prit fin en 332 apres les victoires d'Alexandre? Assurement de la seconde, qui est la plus proche de l'epoque ptolemaïque, au dela de laquelle is paraît impossible de faire remonter la decoration du tombeau de Petosiris." Op.cit., p. 120.

²⁰⁶ A.T. Olmstead, *A History of the Persian Empire* (1948), p.441

father lived in the last days of 25th dynasty rule over Egypt. The invasion and subsequent rule of foreigners about which Petosiris speaks must be attributed to the Babylonians under Nebuchadrezzar. The seven years during which Petosiris functioned as lesionis of Thoth followed the arrival of Cyrus and the beginning of the 1st Persian domination. The insistence of Lefebvre and Olmstead in placing the recovery efforts of Petosiris in a Persian context was correct but misplaced. His work was done early in the 1st Persian domination. It is because of the errant traditional history that Lefebvre was unable to find correspondences between the inscriptions of Petosiris and the Egyptian 27th dynast.

There are several significant texts among the tomb inscriptions. We restrict our analysis to Lefebvre's inscription no. 81, found on the east wall of the main chapel and considered by him to be the most important. Petosiris introduces this lengthy biographical inscription with a brief genealogical reference to his father Seshou and his brother Zedthotefankh, to whom a portion of the tomb is dedicated. We are not informed what happened to them? They apparently had constructed no tombs of their own, since Petosiris feels compelled to create speeches on their behalf within his own mortuary space. The father, at least, functioned under a native pharaoh. The fate of the elder brother is obscure. Did one or both perish in the time of trouble, when burial within Egypt was denied them?

I built this tomb in this necropolis, beside the great souls who are there, in order that my father's name be pronounced, and that of my elder brother. A man is revived when his name is pronounced!²⁰⁷

Petosiris continues in lines 28-33 of the inscription - after a brief outburst of religious sentiment - to detail significant events in his life, beginning with a brief overview:

I spent seven years as controller for this god, administering his endowment without fault being found, While the Ruler-of-foreign-lands was Protector in Egypt, And nothing was in its former place, Since fighting had started inside Egypt, The South being in turmoil, the North in revolt; The people walked with [head turned back] All temples were without their servants, The priests fled, not knowing what was happening.

Then begins a lengthy description of the reforms instituted by Petosiris, rivalling if not eclipsing those claimed by Mentuemhet:

When I became controller for Thoth, lord of Khnum, I put the temple of Thoth in its former condition. I caused every rite to be as before, every priest (to serve) in his proper time. I made great his priests, advanced his temple's hour-

²⁰⁷ Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature vol. III*, p 45-48. All quotations of inscription 81 are taken from Lichtheim's translation, except where noted.

priests. I promoted all his servants. I gave rule to his attendants. I did not reduce the offering in his temple. I filled his granaries with barley and emmer, his treasury with every good thing. I increased what there had been before ... I gave silver, gold, and all precious stone ... I made splendid what was found ruined anywhere. I restored what had decayed long ago, and was no longer in its place.

There follows a description of specific acts of restoration: the construction of a temple of Re, with doors of pinewood inlaid with Asian copper; the rebuilding of a house for the goddesses within the Khnum temple, of white limestone, elegantly finished; the construction of an enclosure surrounding the temple park in an area "damaged by wretches and traversed by intruders". Other ruins were left as Petosiris found them, with appropriate memorials:

Now when I was before this goddess, Heket, lady of Herwer, at her beautiful feast of the year's last month, I being controller of Thoth, she went to a spot in the north of this town, to "House of Heket," as it is called by all, which was ruined since time immemorial. The water had carried it off every year, till its foundation plan was no longer seen. It only was called "House of Heket," while no brick nor stone was there. Then the goddess halted there.

It is apparent from these few excerpts that the events described by Petosiris fit perfectly the circumstances which prevailed in the years immediately following Cyrus 543 B.C. conquest of Egypt. There had existed a tumultuous time during which both the north and south of Egypt were destroyed, men wandered about aimlessly (or were taken away captive?) while priests abandoned the temples. There must have elapsed a considerable time to account for "years" of damage by water and ruins neglected "since time immemorial". When Petosiris arrived on the scene following years of exile there was need to initiate the temple service from the ground up. The majority of priests did not return. Men of lower rank were elevated to the priesthood. The temple apparatus was re-established "as had been before."

We should not be surprised if Lefebvre's translation of the text does not agree entirely with our hypothetical reconstruction. Lefebvre, who positions the lesionis of Petosiris during, not following the time of the devastation of Egypt, punctuates the text to reflect his interpretation. Recently Bernadette Menu has re-examined the texts that mention the seven-year lesionis of Petosiris. She has determined, based on "the logical coherence and chronology of events", that the priesthood of Petosiris' took place after, not during the Persian domination, i.e. after the time of trouble.²⁰⁸ Her analysis and rephrasing of lines 28-33 serve to establish a more reasonable sequence of events.

²⁰⁸ Bernadette Menu, "Le tombeau de Petosiris: Nouvel examen," BIFAO 94 (1994) p. 323.

Menu sees a three-fold division of lines 28-33, including the text which follows.

1. Petosiris states how he has exercised the office of *lesionis* of Thoth for seven years. "I passed seven years as administrator of this god Thoth administering his goods without any fault being found in my administration."

2. Petosiris describes the lamentable state of the temple of Hermopolis during the period of trouble that immediately preceded his nomination:

...whereas a king of a foreign land had exercised his protectorate over Egypt. There remained nothing which was in its former place, since the struggles took place in the midst of Egypt. The South was in turmoil and the north was in revolt, men walking about in disarray. There remained no temple available for (the use of) its officiates. The priests were far removed (from the sanctuaries) and were ignorant of what was transpiring.

3. Petosiris assesses his (subsequent) activity as administrator (beyond verse 33):

I exercised the function of administrator of Thoth, lord of Khnumu, for seven years. Men of a foreign land ruled Egypt. I did everything well in his temple while men of a foreign land ruled Egypt. No work had been done (in the temple) since the foreigners came and invaded Egypt.

While we agree with Menu on the sequence of events, we suggest an alternative division of the text. We believe with Lefebvre that Petosiris exercised his office of *lesionis* "while a king of a foreign land exercised his protectorate over Egypt." We also agree that this king of a foreign land was Persian. But in the revised chronology Persian rule followed the destruction of the temples of Egypt and the exile of its priests. But Persian rule was not its cause. Lefebvre's text should therefore be partitioned as follows:

1. Petosiris describes his activity under Cyrus in the first Persian occupation:

I spent seven years as controller for this god, administering his endowment without fault being found, While the Ruler-of-foreign-lands (Cyrus) was Protector in Egypt,

2. Petosiris describes the state of affairs that greeted his arrival back in Egypt:

And nothing was in its former place, since fighting had started inside Egypt, The South being in turmoil, the North in revolt; the people walked with [head turned back] All temples were without their servants, The priests fled, not knowing what was happening.

3. Petosiris proceeds to assess his activity as *lesionis*.

With the tomb inscription wrongly assigned to the 4th century we can readily see the source of the confusion. There are two distinct groups of foreigners alluded to in the text. No wonder Lefebvre was perplexed. Menu as well. The first group, whom we believe to be the Babylonians, invaded the country, killed or exiled the priests, plundered and destroyed the temples, and left Egypt in a state of anarchy. Their actions are viewed by Petosiris as entirely destructive. No ruler of these foreign intruders is ever mentioned. The second group of foreigners, whom we believe to be the Persians under Cyrus, "ruled Egypt" benevolently, and provided the context in which the reforms of Petosiris might proceed. With the activity of Petosiris viewed in the context of the revised chronology, Menu's argument with Lefebvre is moot. Lefebvre's translation requires little emendation, only reinterpretation. His tomb inscription 59 lines 2,3 is a case in point.

I exercised the function of administrator (lesionis) of Thoth, lord of Khumunu for seven year while men of a foreign land (the Persians) governed Egypt. I found the temple of Thoth [fallen in ruins ... I called the scribes] (who) were found (in) this temple; I gave them money and grain, filled their hands, in order to raise up again monuments in his temple - since for a long time no work had been done, since foreigners (the Babylonians) came and invaded Egypt.²⁰⁹
(insertions mine)

We need not assume that Petosiris arrived in Hermopolis at the very beginning of the first Persian period. His seven year tenure as lesionis and the associated reforms may be dated any time during the interval 543-525 B.C., or even beyond. Without doubt restoration activity was underway in other Egyptian centres during these 18 years. But as we will see in the chapters that follow, when Cambyses arrived in Egypt in 525 B.C. even the temple of Neith in Sais - the west Delta town with which Psamtik is historically connected, and which ultimately became the capital of the country - remained in ruins. Much of the recovery from the lengthy forty year exile was underway, but much remained to be done.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p.321-2. For the complete text of inscription 59 and related inscriptions 61, 62, 81 and others from the south wall, cf. Lefebvre, *Le Tombeau de Petosiris, Premiere Partie*, p.79ff.