

THE JOURNAL OF
Egyptian
Archaeology

VOLUME 94
2008

PUBLISHED BY
THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG
ISSN 0307-5133

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
COMMERCIAL COLOUR PRESS PLC,
ANGARD HOUSE, 185 FOREST ROAD,
HAINAULT, ESSEX IG6 3HX
AND PUBLISHED BY
THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG

ISSN 0307-5133
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

leur matériaux (basalte, diorite, calcaire, quartzite, 'albâtre', bois, et argile crue) offrent un remarquable panorama de la variété d'exécutions d'une trentaine d'œuvres royales, auxquelles s'ajoutent une série de statuettes de prisonniers étrangers et diverses petites effigies de calcaire ou de terre crue.

Parmi les amulettes et parures, examinées par Vivienne G. Callender, on retiendra la présence d'un petit cylindre 'votif', inscrit au nom de Sésostri III, au milieu de talismans généralement postérieurs à l'Ancien Empire. À ceci s'ajoute encore de nombreux fragments de faïence, inscrits ou décorés, catalogués par R. Landgráfová, et vraisemblablement utilisés à des fins d'ornementation d'éléments mobiliers. Viennent ensuite les contributions de P. Kočar, pour les analyses archéobotaniques, qui mettent notamment en évidence la présence de céréales, telles que l'orge carrée et l'épeautre; puis, celle de J. A. Svoboda, pour l'examen du matériel lithique et le rapport de E. Strouhal et A. Němečková, pour le matériel osseux, provenant de l'infrastructure du complexe. Des indices complètent et facilitent la consultation de ce volumineux rapport. L'intérêt de cette minutieuse présentation réside évidemment dans le regroupement de la totalité de l'information, jusqu'ici disséminée dans diverses publications. Il s'en dégage ainsi une contribution de valeur qui jette un éclairage neuf sur l'Ancien Empire et démontre parfaitement la pertinence des investigations conduites par le Professeur M. Verner et ses collaborateurs.

MICHEL VALLOGGIA

The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millennium BC (ca. 1070–180 BC): Trends and Perspectives. By ROBERTO B. GOZZOLI. Pp. xii + 398, figs (in text) 19. GH Egyptology 5. London, Golden House Publications, 2006. ISBN 0 9550256 3 X. Price £26.99.

This book by Roberto Gozzoli is actually an attempt to undertake a double task: both to give a general outline of what can be described as the writing of history in Late Period and Hellenistic Egypt (royal inscriptions, from the Libyan period to the Ptolemaic trilingual decrees, and what he defines as '(hi)stories', that is, traditions about the Egyptian past registered both in Greek and native texts) and also, at the same time, to provide this study with a conscious, well-motivated methodology.

The way it is postulated in the book's introduction perhaps requires most extensive discussion. Gozzoli is enthusiastic about the approach of 'contextualising the texts into their historical period' advocated by the cuneiformist M. Liverani,¹ and accepted in Egyptology by J. K. Hoffmeier;² he also provides a wider framework by referring to the schools of 'New Cultural History' and 'New Historicism' in modern historical research (pp. 8–11). The indifference, if not the idiosyncrasy, of Egyptology in general with respect to delineating its methods of research, whenever this research is not a purely formal description of monuments, is certainly not an advantage, and Gozzoli does well to attempt to change things in this respect. Nevertheless, more care should be taken when choosing the model for such change. Experience shows that M. Liverani's suggestion that one should 'view the document not as a "source of information", but as information in itself'³ goes much further than a realistic concern not to have it 'forced, dissected, plagiarized for our aims'. Disinclination to do so takes a number of scholars to the *a priori* presumption that the author of a document must have had aims and motives considerably, if not totally, different from ours; hence they feel it necessary to abstain from 'modernising' pragmatic interpretations, even when these arise from sources naturally, and form a system (as, for example, in the case of C. Mora on the Hittite–Assyrian,⁴ and P. Brand on the Egyptian–Hittite relations of the thirteenth century BC).⁵ The excesses of this approach might be especially dangerous when it is applied to traditions not considered historical in the strict meaning of the word (which is true, according to Gozzoli, of the Egyptian tradition: pp. 1–2).

However, this danger is more or less counterbalanced in Egyptology by the contributions of

¹ M. Liverani, 'Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts', *Orientalia* 42 (1973), 178–94.

² J. K. Hoffmeier, 'The Problem of "History" in Egyptian Royal Inscriptions', in S. Curto (ed.), *Atti del Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia* (Turin, 1992), I, 291–9.

³ Liverani, *Orientalia* 42, 179.

⁴ E.g. C. Mora, *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Hattuša* (HANEM 7; Padua, 2004); id., 'Grands rois, petits rois, gouvernants de second rang', *Res Antiquae* 2 (2005), 309–14.

⁵ P. Brand, 'Ideology and Politics of the Early Ramesside Kings (13th Century BC): A Historical Approach', in W. Bisang, T. Bierschenk, and D. Kreikenborm (eds), *Prozesse des Wandels in historischen Spannungsfeldern Nordostafrikas/Westasiens: Akten zum 2. Symposium des SFB 295, Mainz, 15.10.–17.10.2001* (Würzburg, 2005), 23–38.

G. Posener⁶ and D. B. Redford,⁷ assessed by Gozzoli quite positively (pp. 12–14). Without bounding themselves with definitions, these scholars (especially Posener, with the vivid literary tradition at hand) treated the Egyptian texts as re-accentuating, and sometimes reinterpreting, the past to conform to ideological needs, but neither irreparably deforming nor reforging *e nihilo* their real historical background. This has bearing on the definition of Egyptian knowledge of the past given by Gozzoli: his doubts, with J. Van Seters,⁸ about its ‘national’ and ‘corporate’ character, are hardly reasonable. Indeed, there was a ‘corporation’, which elaborated and preserved Egyptian traditions about the past, and this actually coincided with the ‘nation’ (naturally, not in the modern sense): it was the Egyptian sacrosanct monarchy itself, the knowledge of the past being part of its ideology. No better proof is needed of this than the character of sources studied by Redford, including Manetho’s *Aegyptiaca* which Gozzoli discusses.

The variations of *Königsnovelle* and *iw.tw*-reports in the royal inscriptions of the first millennium, and their dependence on earlier texts and on each other, are studied throughout Part One of the book. These problems have been largely brought to light by A. Spalinger⁹ and P. Der Manuelian,¹⁰ and Gozzoli makes lavish use of their contributions. For the Libyan period, the traditionalism of the Palestine inscriptions of Sheshonq I (pp. 25–35; cf. also the ‘update’ of his topographical list: p. 34, and pp. 311–17) and the jubilee inscription of Osorkon II (pp. 35–40) seems less remarkable than the detailed royal lineage in the *Chronicle of Prince Osorkon* Text A, lines 12–17 (p. 44, and more generally pp. 42–50). This dynastic, and not personal (derived from divine birth), proof of legitimacy must be a feature of the Libyan period, which is unsurprising considering the split of the Tanite dynasty by the late eighth century into several lines, all of them royal in terms of their mutually recognised rank. This was not the norm for Egyptian ideology, and Piye’s monuments confronted this situation exactly from the traditional position of personal legitimacy. Gozzoli considers Piye’s sandstone stela as the sign of his accepting the *de facto* decentralisation of Egypt, and compensating for it with his mission of mediation to the god (pp. 51–3). In fact, the accent should be placed elsewhere: Piye does accept the existence of many rulers in Egypt, but sees in it no problem, for they can derive their might only from him, as the god’s son (and this is the reason to stress his divine birth). How it happens is clear from the sandstone stela (‘He to whom I say, “You are chief!” he is to be a chief... He to whom I say, “Make appearance (as king!)” he shall make his appearance...’), and it is also clear in the lunette of the triumphal stela (pp. 54–67). Nimlot is presented there facing Piye with sistrum and horse, unlike the other rulers prostrate, to mark not his ‘sin and justification’ (p. 56), but probably just his being initially Piye’s vassal and gaining through it his might (cf. lines 66–7 of the stela). Similar ideas must underlie the other Nubian texts, including Kawa V (pp. 67–74): the ‘four wonders’ do show Taharqo as a unique ruler (among the other ones, not mentioned but present in Egypt in his time!), but here this is as a result of his divine birth, and not to the alleged ‘covenant’ with god (p. 72), which was superfluous for father and son. The victories gained by his army, as if by himself (pp. 82–4), are due to the same fact, making him able to confer his might to subordinates (as in Piye’s case: cf. p. 57). More might be said on the same *topos* found in the Elephantine Stela of Amasis also treated by Gozzoli (pp. 102–3): the mutineer king seems to found his legitimacy on Apries’ inability to grant success to his army (cols 5–6), but it is wiser to reserve this judgement till the publication of the stela (now in preparation by A. I. Blobaum).

The evidence of Psammetichus I’s stela VII from Dahshur (pp. 93–5) is the most tantalising: the mention of Amenemhat I (evoking not only his Tjehenu wars, but also Ameni’s image in the *Prophecies of Neferty*), and of the Ma as Psammetichus’ foes (p. 94) might show his self-presentation as a new founder, distancing himself from his Libyan descent.

As for the Persian and Ptolemaic evidence summarised by Gozzoli, the Serapeum stelae (pp. 112–15, treated here divorced from their necessary complement, the Classical tradition on Cambyses’ murder of the Apis bull, judged to be unreliable: pp. 185–7), and even the canal inscriptions of Darius

⁶ G. Posener, *Littérature et politique dans l’Égypte de la XIIe dynastie* (BEHE SHP 307; Paris, 1956).

⁷ D. B. Redford, *Pharaonic Kinglists, Annals and Day Books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History* (SSEA Publication 4; Mississauga, 1986).

⁸ J. Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven, 1983).

⁹ A. J. Spalinger, *Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians* (YNER 9; New Haven, 1982).

¹⁰ See P. Der Manuelian, *Living in the Past: Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty* (Studies in Egyptology; London, 1994).

(pp. 116–20), present fewer problems than the statue of that ruler from Susa (pp. 121–4). Actually, its *Sitz in Leben* for Egyptians (but not the conquerors!) remains unexplained, though the words ‘... to make his ka remembered at the side of the father Atum...’ (inscription no. 3, line 3) allow the parallel with votives from the Karnak *cachette* (e.g. the statue of prince Sheshonq, JE 37881).

Dealing with Ptolemaic texts (pp. 126–52), Gozzoli is right to note the Hellenised formulae of the priestly decrees (p. 148), and wrong to doubt the resistance of the priests to the Ptolemies’ ideological innovations, and the need for concessions to promote them (pp. 150–1; here an issue untouched by Gozzoli is the difference in the Ptolemies’ temple policy before and after the Third Syrian War of 246–241 BC). An innovative, and originally extra-Egyptian, theme is that of returning the cult effigies from Asia. This is present in Ptolemaic royal decrees (pp. 134–7), and contradicts the conclusion of their traditionalism (p. 152).

As for the Satrap Stela (pp. 126–32), although its protocol ostensibly confers formal kingship on Alexander IV, it in reality demonstrates the qualities (might and ability to rule) of Satrap Ptolemy and the god Horus (for the present no less than for the past). Such transfer of kingship to a god or a non-royal person, known from late private monuments,¹¹ is unique in the Satrap Stela as an official text, and seems to tie it strictly to the time of its appearance.

In Part Two of the book, dealing with ‘(hi)stories’, the scrutiny of Herodotus’ (Chapter 5) and Manetho’s (Chapter 6) evidence is especially significant. Gozzoli’s major points, which seem well founded, are the following: the Herodotus ‘proto-history’ of Egypt (prior to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty) consists of a number of blocks (pp. 172–3; if they are of native origin, which can hardly be otherwise, their composition is not as voluntary as it might seem); Manetho’s work gave not just the sequence of reigns but also ‘glossae’ on their events (pp. 208–9), and their quotation by Flavius is authentic (pp. 192, 213); except for occasional mistakes, the preserved fragments reproduce Manetho’s scheme accurately (p. 224). Incidentally (p. 194 n. 17), Gozzoli revisits a sound suggestion that Diodorus’ Book I is based mostly on Hecataeus of Abdera, and the latter faithfully reproduced the Egyptian evidence. However, it is doubtful that Egyptian informers would have eagerly confirmed, and even developed, Herodotus’ own Scythian (II, 110; cf. 104–5) or Homeric (II, 112–20)¹² associations (pp. 160, 162), which would have been alien to them.

Manetho’s account on the ‘lepers’ and the Hyksos (*Against Apion* I, §§ 237–50) is treated by Gozzoli as a contamination of Amarna with reminiscences of the Hyksos (p. 215). An important argument for this, suggested by Redford,¹³ is the literal understanding of *mnt* (‘disease’) in Tutankhamun’s *Restoration Stela* in the light of the ‘lepers’ *topos* and the evidence of pestilence in the Near East at the end of the Amarna epoch (p. 218). Such an interpretation is indeed unfortunate for study of this fragment, since *mnt* in this context in fact denotes a fatal imbalance in Egypt’s relations with its deities as a result of Akhenaten’s activities (cf. *mnt* in the *Teaching for Merikare* E142,¹⁴ and the *Prophecies of Neferty* 8e and 12a).¹⁵ In addition, it has not been pointed out that the Amenophis of the ‘lepers’–Hyksos story is actually placed in Manetho’s dynastic sequence *after* Ramesses Miamun. Hence, there is just as much reason to consider the synthetic personality of Amenophis’ heir Sethos-Ramesses not as an inexplicable repetition of the historical early Nineteenth Dynasty, but instead as a reflection of Sethnakhte and Ramesses III at the start of the Twentieth Dynasty. In such a case, suggesting that the Sea Peoples’ invasion forms in fact the historical kernel for the whole of Manetho’s fragment would be natural, and no less plausible than other interpretations.

In most late Middle Egyptian and Demotic ‘stories’ (Chapter 7), Gozzoli discerns a ‘rather heavy irony against the pharaoh’ (p. 279). Its explanation should perhaps be looked for in the Libyan concept of dynastic legitimacy, which does not preclude the possibility that the royal offspring might display a negative character (this is actually the case with Pedubastis in the Demotic epic, and probably this notion affected the literary tradition in general). Gozzoli is certainly right to redefine the late ‘apocalyptic’ tradition (Chapter 8) as ‘messianic’, with its *topos* of a saviour king’s return (pp. 303–4). One could perhaps go a step further, and say that the repetition of the pattern of disasters and ‘salvation’

¹¹ See U. Rößler-Köhler, *Individuelle Haltungen zum ägyptischen Königtum der Spätzeit: Private Quellen und ihre Königswertung im Spannungsfeld zwischen Erwartung und Erfahrung* (GOF IV/21; Wiesbaden, 1991).

¹² For which passages, see A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 99–182* (Leiden, 1988), 21–6, 36–7, and 43–52.

¹³ D. B. Redford, ‘The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition’, *Orientalia* 39 (1970), 47.

¹⁴ Edition: J. F. Quack, *Studien zur Lehre für Merikare* (GOF IV/23; Wiesbaden, 1992).

¹⁵ Edition: W. Helck, *Die Prophezeiung des Nfr.tj* (2nd edn; KÄT; Wiesbaden, 1992).

(by Ameni, by Manetho's Sethos-Ramesses, and by the much-expected 'post-foreign' ruler of the 'apocalyptic texts' themselves) actually shapes Egyptian history into a cyclic process, not unlike the cycles of individual reigns starting with the restoration of *sp tpy* at each new accession.

Assessing the book as a whole, one can say that its task, that of comprehensively investigating first millennium Egyptian knowledge of the past, is perhaps as close to being achieved as it can be in any one study. The theories which the author offers on each type of his diverse material are not all equally valid, but they do provide for the better classification of the material. Hence, the very appearance of this book should serve as an impetus, which Gozzoli doubtless hoped to give, towards promoting greater methodological rigour in the historical analysis of Egyptian texts, as discussed in his introduction.

IVAN A. LADYNIN

The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb, Commander-in-Chief of Tut'ankhamun, III: The New Kingdom Pottery. By JANINE BOURRIAU, DAVID ASTON, MAARTEN J. RAVEN, and RENÉ VAN WALSEM, with a contribution by COLIN HOPE. EES Excavation Memoir 71. Pp. 117. London, Egypt Exploration Society, 2005. ISBN 0 85698 167 2. Price £35.

L'ouvrage collectif présenté ici concerne exclusivement la céramique datée du Nouvel Empire découverte pendant les fouilles qui se sont déroulées entre 1975–1983 dans la tombe memphite d'Horemheb, située au cœur d'une large concentration de tombes datées du Nouvel Empire sur le site de Saqqara. Cet ouvrage clôt la série des volumes consacrés à la publication de cette tombe.¹ On ne peut que se réjouir de la parution de ce livre qui offre un nouveau catalogue de la céramique memphite funéraire au Nouvel Empire de la fin de la XVIII^e dynastie et de la première partie de la XIX^e dynastie (Ramsès II).

Dès la préface, les auteurs soulignent cependant une première difficulté à laquelle ils ont dû faire face: il s'agit de celle qui consiste à publier une fouille déjà ancienne sans retour possible sur les objets. La méthode d'analyse et d'inventaire des céramiques qui avait été mise en place à l'époque de la fouille de la tombe d'Horemheb à partir de 1975 par J. Bourriau d'abord, puis plus tard par D. Aston, à partir de 1982, est un traitement du mobilier céramique devenue maintenant 'classique' mais novateur à l'époque. L'examen du mobilier céramique prend en compte le récipient céramique à travers sa forme, sa pâte ('fabric'), la technologie, son traitement de la surface, et la décoration ('ware'). Rappelons que cette méthode était expérimentale en 1975. En effet, il ne faut pas oublier qu'il faut attendre les années 70 pour que la céramologie égyptienne devienne une nouvelle discipline de l'archéologie, discipline qui a connu un parcours très chaotique après des débuts pourtant prometteurs. Il faudra cependant attendre les années 70, avec des personnalités comme J. Bourriau, Dorothea Arnold, H. Jacquet-Gordon, H.-A. Nordström et R. Holthoer, pour fédérer les énergies et mettre en place tous les outils morphologiques et technologiques, et leur uniformisation.² Si au départ, l'époque pharaonique est incontestablement privilégiée dans cette démarche, et notamment le Nouvel Empire, les autres périodes chronologiques, notamment les époques tardives byzantine et proto-islamique ne sont pas en reste avec les travaux pionniers dans les années 70 de M. Egloff³ et de M. Rodziewicz.⁴

Le plan de l'ouvrage est le suivant:

- a) Introduction (pp. 1–10).
- b) Corpus de la céramique du Nouvel Empire, avec dans le texte l'appareillage des dessins (pp. 11–75).

¹ G. T. Martin, *The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb, Commander-in-Chief of Tut'ankhamun, I: The Reliefs, Inscriptions, and Commentary* (EES EM 55; London, 1989); H. D. Schneider, *The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb, Commander-in-Chief of Tut'ankhamun, II: A Catalogue of the Finds* (EES EM 60; London, 1996).

² Afin d'apprécier le chemin parcouru, on consultera Dorothea Arnold and J. Bourriau (eds), *An Introduction to Ancient Egyptian Pottery* (Mainz, 1993); D. Aston, *Die Keramik des Grabungsplatzes Q I, I: Corpus of Fabrics, Wares, and Shapes* (Mainz, 1998), 7–59; J. Bourriau, P. Nicholson, and P. Rose, 'Pottery', in P. Nicholson and I. Shaw (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology* (Cambridge, 2000), 121–47; J. Bourriau, 'Technology in the Pottery of the Middle and New Kingdoms: An Underrated Tool in the Archaeologist's Armoury', in B. Mathieu, D. Meeks, and M. Wissa (eds), *L'apport de l'Égypte à l'histoire des techniques* (BdE 142; Cairo, 2006), 31–43.

³ M. Egloff, *Kellia: La poterie copte. 4 siècles d'artisanat et d'échanges en Basse-Égypte* (Geneva, 1977).

⁴ M. Rodziewicz, *Alexandrie, III: Les habitations romaines tardives d'Alexandrie à la lumière des fouilles polonaises à Kôm el-Dikka* (Warsaw, 1984).