



UDJAHORRESNET AND THE ROYAL NAME OF CAMBYSES: THE “DERIVATIVE SACRALITY” OF ACHAEMENIDS IN EGYPT

Ivan Ladynin

Lomonosov Moscow State University/National Research University “Higher School of Economics,”
Moscow

ABSTRACT

The article deals with a well-known fragment of Udjahorresnet’s autobiography describing his compiling an Egyptian royal titulary for Cambyses after his appearance in Egypt and Udjahorresnet’s elevation at his court. A comparison of Cambyses’ and Darius’ I solar prenomina (*Mswty-R^c* and *Stwt-R^c*, which can be understood as “the image of Re” and “the likeness of Re”) and an interpretation of the Fayum stela Berlin ÄS 7493 depicting Darius I in the image of the falcon Horus leads one to suspect that the theory finding an excuse to the rule of Achaemenids in Egypt postulated their “deriving” their qualities of sacral ritual rulers from gods incorporated in them. This theory must have been forwarded in Udjahorresnet’s time by his party loyal to the Persian rule.

One of the best-known phrases in Udjahorresnet’s autobiography is undoubtedly the following one in lines 12 and 13:









*wḏ n.ṯ ḥm.f i3wt wr sinw | rdit.n.f ḥpr.ṯ r-gz.f m
smr ḥrp-ḥ ir.n.ṯ nḥbt.f m rn.f n nsw-bity Mswty-
R^c*

His Majesty [Cambyses] ordered to me the rank of a head of physicians, he gave (that) I appeared aside of him as a “friend” administering the palace, (and) I made his titulary as his name of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Mesuti-Re.¹

Needless to say, the number of ancient Egyptian sources that describe compiling of royal names for


the kings of Egypt is meager,² so, even disregarding the situation of the Persian conquest, this statement is of paramount importance. It allows us to say that the task of such compilation could be personalized and given to a specific dignitary, probably renowned for his loyalty and having gained the special trust of a ruler. If Udjahorresnet’s self-attestation is true at least in its main points, all this can be fairly said of him.³ The importance of the task is defined not merely by its prestige but also by the nature of the message expected to be conveyed by royal names: in fact, they defined the divine nature of a king, his relationship to deities, his religious priorities, and the program of his reign. For a Persian newcomer gaining hold of Egypt, it was certainly an important and unique chance to define his legitimacy before his new subjects; however, it was also a similar

opportunity for the Egyptian elite (represented on this occasion by the compiler of the royal names) to define and declare Egypt's attitude to the new master. Of course, it is unlikely that such work would have been inspired by an actual opposition to a foreign sovereign (a person of such convictions would hardly have been employed for it); but there would be a possibility to indicate some difference in attitude towards this ruler in comparison to his predecessors or a nuance of his sacrality that would say nothing to foreigners but be a signal for educated natives of Egypt.

Quite notably, Udjahorresnet confined his work to the devising of Cambyses' solar prenomen: as his Horus name (*Zm³-t³wy*, "Unifying Two Lands") is attested only by the monuments of the Sefareum,⁴ one might suspect that it could be compiled deliberately to appear in the standard protocol of their texts and scenery. However, the solar prenomen on those monuments is the same as that arranged by Udjahorresnet (*Mswty-R^c*), which must indicate its all-Egyptian proliferation. For many decades its interpretation remained unquestioned: G. Posener translated it in his fundamental publication on the First Persian Domination as "Descendant de Ra,"⁵ reading its first part as *mstyw*,⁶ and this penetrated into most subsequent publications.⁷ However, the extant hieroglyphic writings of Cambyses' name do not show -y in this word, and its ending should be read as -wt/-wty rather than -tw/-tyw (the inscription of Udjahor-resnet, line 13: ; ⁸ the Apis stela of 524 BCE, scene at the top: ; ⁹ line 1:  emended by Posener with, perhaps, too much certainty into  ¹⁰; the sarcophagus of Apis:   ¹¹). The use of the sign Gardiner U33 (), with its standard phonetic meaning *ti*, might be in this case a group-writing that occurs from the Eighteenth Dynasty to denote a final component -t in a number of cases; adding this sign in two cases with an ordinary Gardiner X1 () might support this possibility, so the absence of -i/-y in the real phonetic structure of the word is plausible.¹² However, in the early 2000s, J. M. Serrano Delgado proposed a somewhat different interpretation: in his idea, Cambyses' prenomen "is unclear but could be translated as an 'offspring', 'descendant', 'son', or perhaps better as 'image' [i.e., *mswt*¹³]-of Re."¹⁴ He also pointed out that this epithet, although "an uncommon expression," on a text on the statue of Darius I discovered in Susa notably had the addition of a word with a definite meaning "image" (DSEG2, col. 1: *mwt Tm twt nh n*

R^c; ¹⁵ cf. also the stela of Tell el-Mashutah, line 1: *twt n R^c* "the image of Re"; the statue of Susa, DSEG3, col. 1-2: *twt stwt r ntr nfr nb t³wy* "the image made similar to the Good God, the Lord of Two Lands,"¹⁶ i.e., undoubtedly, to the supreme god in his royal function). According to Serrano Delgado, the nuance of interpretation that he introduced does not make much difference with the earlier understanding of the title: "in the case of Cambyses, the name adopted intends to emphasize his divine genesis, the solar lineage of the Persian king and, subsequently, his legitimacy to claim the Egyptian throne."¹⁷ In fact, one should not be too sure about that: when an Egyptian king positioned himself as an incarnation of Horus or as a son of the solar god, this gave to him a nature different from all the other animated beings in the mundane world;¹⁸ however, this nature was his immanent belonging, and, having it, he was quite independent in his actions. The denotation of the god's "image" is, first of all, not an outright allusion to king's descent from a sacral marriage or to god's incarnation in him: these notions have to be deduced from the epithet, but, in its literal meaning, it states king's similarity to god. Second, this notion of similarity seems strongly backed with the idea that the extraordinary qualities, and especially the power, of a king are lent to him by a god: this is made especially clear by the quoted epithet of Darius I ("the image made similar to the Good God, the Lord of Two Lands") on his statue from Susa.

In fact, the Egyptian titulary of Darius I provides for a natural parallel to the solar prenomen of Cambyses. For Darius, this title is known in two forms, both of them attested only at the temple of Hibis in Oasis Kharga. One of them is *Mry-Imn-R^c-nb-Hbt* ("Beloved by Amun-Re, Lord of Hibis"), along with some additions (*wsr hpš* "strong with his arm"; *ntr ³ wsr hpš* "the Great God, strong with his arm") or in a shorter form (*Mry-Imn-R^c-Hbt* "Beloved by Amun-Re of Hibis"; *Mry-Imn-R^c* "Beloved by Amun-Re").¹⁹ There are Egyptian royal titles composed of the participle *mry* and the name of the sun-god (the solar prenomen of Pepy I *mry-R^c*; ²⁰ the Horus name of Shoshenq I, *k³ nht mry-R^c sh'y.f-m-nsu-r-zm³-t³wy* "Mighty Bull, Beloved by Re, [who] made his appearance as king to reunite Two Lands"; ²¹ the solar prenomen of Alexander the Great, *Mry-R^c Stp.n-Imn* "Beloved by Re, Chosen by Amun"²²); however, the names of Darius I based on the epithet *Mry-Imn* obviously just mark the protection given to him on behalf of Amun of Hibis and are void of any conceptual meaning. Things are different with the

solar prenomen *Stwt-R^c* () that appears in a unique five-component titulary of Darius I in the frieze of the western exterior wall of the temple. There it is repeated twice: in the left part of the frieze, over the image of Darius followed by his Double (*k3*) and Isis before Amun-Re, Monthu, and Khonsu; and in its right part, over the image of Darius followed by Hathor before Amun-Re and probably by Wadjet and Monthu (the images of these deities are badly preserved).²³ This titulary of Darius I is remarkable enough to deserve a detailed examination:

LEFT PART: *z3 Imn stp.n-R^c m-hnw ifdw.sn Hr [nbw] nb hbw-sd mry-ntrw-ntrywt nbw nw T3-mry nsw-bity Stwt-R^c z3 R^c n ht.f mry.f In-ti-rw-y-3i-33 nh dt ...*

RIGHT PART: *z3 I[mn stp.n-R^c m-hnw] ifdw.sn Hr nbw nb hbw-sd mry-ntrw-ntrywt nbw nw T3-mry nsw-bity Stwt-R^c z3 R^c n ht.f mry.f In-ti-rw-y-3i-33 nh dt ...*

SUMMARIZED TRANSLATION: "...son of Amun, Chosen by Re inside their four, Golden Horus, Lord of Sed-feasts, Beloved by all gods (and) goddesses of Beloved Land, king of Upper and Lower Egypt *Stwt-R^c*, son of Re of his body, beloved by him, Darius, living forever..."

The central part of the wall is destroyed, so the Horus name, which must have been part of this titulary, is not preserved. The title "Two Ladies" is not preserved, either, but the first epithets of the titulary obviously belong to this name; the names of the Two Ladies and of the Golden Horus (especially the former) are unusually expanded and composed of peculiar epithets (such as "son of Amun" in the name of the Two Ladies, probably referring to the local cult of Hibis²⁴). The epithet "Chosen by Re inside their four" probably alludes to the four cardinal points²⁵ and, thus, shows that Darius was chosen by the god as a sacral ruler among all the beings in the mundane world, inside and outside Egypt. Such meaning of this epithet is supported by the words of Isis following Darius in the scene in the left part of the frieze: "The south has been given to you as far as the wind (blows), the north, to the limits of the Great Green, west to the course of the sun-disk, [east] to his shining as Shu" (*rdi n.k rsy[t] r-^c t3w mhyt r-drw w3d-wr imntt r hp[t] itn [i3btt r] wb(n)] f m*

šw).²⁶ In a similar way, the epithet "lord of Sed-feasts" in the Golden Horus name coordinates with the words of Hathor following Darius in the scene on the right: "May you repeat Sed-festival like Tatenen!" (*whm.k hbw-sd mi T3tnn*).²⁷ Probably the uniqueness of this titulary should be explained in light of its coordination with the words of the goddesses in the scenes below the frieze: it seems possible that these royal names were compiled with the specific purpose of placing them in this part of the temple of Hibis.

One cannot but notice the affinity of Darius' solar prenomen *Stwt-R^c* in this titulary with that of Cambyses: they both consist of only two components, and this marks a definite rupture with the tradition of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, when the royal titularies were made of three components, with the word *ib* ("heart") in the middle.²⁸ As in the case of Cambyses, the interpretation of Darius' title is ambiguous: the difficulty is the absence of determinative in the word *stwt*, which allows its understanding as both "radiance, rays, gleam"²⁹ and "likeness" (a feasible participle of the verb *stwt* "make similar").³⁰ Notably, these two meanings seem somehow to overlap: the word *stwt* with the basic meaning of "radiance" was used during the Eighteenth Dynasty to designate a royal statue (the "likeness" of the king), the glow of which is visible.³¹

Probably, the affinity between the solar prenomina of Cambyses and Darius I makes it possible to understand the former one, *Mswty-R^c*, as "the image of Re" and the latter one, *Stwt-R^c*, as "the likeness of Re."³² In such case they are really similar both in structure and meaning and express the concept of "copying" the sun god in the person of the king, which means deriving his specific qualities of a sacral ruler from those of the god. Probably, shaping these titularies of two—and not three—components was intended to mark the introduction of this concept instead of the earlier Saite tradition.

However the most telling illustration of the concept of "derivative" sacral kingship is provided by a stela from the Fayum now preserved in Berlin (ÄS 7493).³³ The beneficiary of the stela is an individual named Pa-di-Usir-pa-Re (*P[3]-di-Wsir-p[3]-R^c* "(Whom) Osiris (and) Re have given"): it shows this man genuflecting before the falcon, the upper surface of the scene being formed with the winged sun disk. Behind the man there is his name with the epithet *im3h(y)*, i.e., an indication that he has been granted a posthumous cult and afterlife,³⁴ the epithets behind the falcon are

“Good God, Lord of Two Lands Darius” (*nṯr nfr nb t3wy In-ti-rw-š3*), so the falcon represents the king, Darius I. The inscription in the horizontal lines below the scene reads: “This Horus,³⁵ Great God, giving life (to) Pa-shepu, son of Haha (?), this Horus, giving life (to) Pa-di-Usir-pa-Re, son of Pefchau-emaui-Neith, born by the mistress of house Ta-wah-Usir” (*Hr pn p[3] nṯr 3 di nḥ P[3]-šp z3 H3h [?]Hr pn di nḥ P[3]-di-Usir-p[3]-R3 z3 P3y.f-t3w-[m-3wy]-Nt ms n nbt-h[t] T[3]-w3h-Usir*). Symptomatically, the inscription does not mention the king at all.

According to U. Rössler-Köhler, this stela attests to a posthumous worship of Darius as a benevolent king likely to be juxtaposed with his successor, Xerxes, who was much more hostile towards Egypt.³⁶ This idea does not seem quite plausible. According to Rössler-Köhler, when a Late Egyptian ruler seemed unacceptable as a sacral king designated to perform ritual, his status could be transferred to a divinity or, much less often, to a non-royal individual. However, there are no examples of the rejection of the royal status of a living ruler in order to transfer it to his deceased predecessor, and, in the case of Xerxes’ “impious rule” over Egypt,³⁷ those reluctant to accept him as pharaoh would have rather transferred this status to an Egyptian god than to Darius. Besides, the idea of Rössler-Köhler does not consider the twofold specifics of the artifact: it shows a Persian ruler of Egypt with traditional pharaonic designations in the image of falcon, i.e., with the characteristic of the god Horus, and at the same time its text highlights not this ruler but the deity. Tellingly, the text says specifically “this Horus,” probably in order to make it clear that the reference is not to “Horus in general,” the divinity residing in transcendence, but to its terrestrial embodiment in the person of the king. This must also indicate that the stela discussed must have certainly been erected in Darius’ lifetime, when he was “physically” present in the mundane world.

H. Sternberg-el Hotabi was willing to explain the peculiarities of this stela with a supposition that its beneficiary was not an Egyptian but rather an Egyptianized Persian;³⁸ however, the irregularities of its shape and design are hardly other than what can be reasonably expected of an artifact in a rather marginal area of Egypt, and the unique names attested on it are not necessarily non-Egyptian. Moreover, a remarkable analogy to it is likely to be detected in the well-known sculpture compositions of Nectanebo II showing him with the falcon Horus

behind him.³⁹ The meaning of these sculptures is clear from an inscription on the base of one of them found at Tanis: it gives the royal titles of Nectanebo II with the epithet “divine falcon issued from Isis” inserted into his name of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt (*nḥ Hr mry-t3wy nsw-bity bik ntr[y] pr m St nb t3wy Snḏm-ib-R3 stp-n-Imn z3 R3 šhtp ms sw nb ḥ3w Nḥt-Hr-Hbyt mry-Imn mry Hr nb Msn di nḥ ḏd mi R3* “Be alive, Horus Beloved of Two Lands, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, divine falcon issued from Isis, Lord of Two Lands Senedjem-ib-Re, Chosen of Amun, Son of Re, pleasing the one that born him Nectanebo, Beloved of Amun, beloved of Horus, Lord of Mesen, given live, stability like Re”).⁴⁰ The inclusion of the epithet alluding to the image of falcon in the formal title of the king makes clear that these sculpture groups were intended to express their identity, and there are also other reasons to think so.⁴¹ However, the very proportions of the figures of the falcon and King Nectanebo in the sculpture groups, the god being about three times bigger than the king, show that in this identity the god definitely prevailed: though embodied in the king, he at the same time existed independently of and exterior to him and was undoubtedly superior to him in the hierarchy of the world. The sacrality that Nectanebo II had to possess as a pharaoh seems to be presented in this sculpture composition as a projection of god’s qualities on him: without this, he probably would have been perceived as a mere human being.⁴² If so, the status of sacral ruler must have been vested not in the king Nectanebo per se but rather in the god who found his manifestation on earth in the king’s person, and this seems to be demonstrated by the direct inclusion of Horus’ epithet (“divine falcon issued from Isis”) in the royal title of Nectanebo II on the base of the sculpture from Tanis.

This concept of god’s embodiment in the king might provide a satisfactory explanation to the scene of the stela from the Fayum showing the worship of Darius. The practical purpose of this stela was, undoubtedly, to provide for the afterlife to its beneficiary Pa-di-Usir-pa-Ra: his epithet *im3h(y)* shows that by the time of the stela’s erection he must have been dead. At the same time, in Egyptian notion the effect described by this epithet is granted to a deceased human by a deity,⁴³ and the inscription in the lower part of the stela makes it clear that for Pa-di-Usir-pa-Ra this deity was Horus. In such a case, the genuflection of the man before the falcon

should be motivated by this deity's granting the afterlife to him: nevertheless Pa-di-Usir-pa-Ra makes his obeisance not before the god Horus as such but before his embodiment in the king Darius. We will hardly ever know what sort of personal motives led Pa-di-Usir-pa-Ra to connect somehow his posthumous existence with the Persian ruler of Egypt;⁴⁴ however, the religious essence of this connection is clear enough: the man addressed the king as the terrestrial embodiment of the god Horus, who was likely to provide for his afterlife. The depiction in the upper part of the stela of the god in transcendence, the winged solar disk Horus the Behdetite⁴⁵ forming the boundary of the sky makes it clear that the king is the embodiment of the divine on earth and that the scene of obeisance to him is located in the mundane world; the effective prevalence of the god in his identification with Darius is emphasized by representing the latter in the image of falcon. In this situation the king as a person served a mere mediator in a contact with god: his personal "mundane" qualities were almost irrelevant in providing for the effect expected from deity he incarnates, hence the absence of his mention in the inscription in the lower part of the stela, which specifically denotes this effect.

The proposed interpretation of the stela from the Fayum can be better understood with a quick look at the place that Persian rule in Egypt must have occupied in the development of its royal ideology. In Egyptian notions, the existence of a ruler able to perform rituals for the gods was critical for maintaining the stability of the universe: a ruler's ability to perform ritual was determined by his personal connection to gods that vested sacrality on himself.⁴⁶ The earliest way to describe this connection was to grant a king a specific name asserting that, during his lifetime, he served as a temporary terrestrial incorporation of the sky- and sun-god Horus; later this notion was augmented with the idea of the king's connection to another solar deity, Re, as described by the solar prenomen and the title "son of Re."⁴⁷ However, it cannot be said that in the earlier Egyptian notions of the 3rd and the 2nd millennia BCE the sacrality of the ritual-king depended on the goodwill of the gods, who were eager—or not—to support these connections to him: rather, the king was born as a being of special nature, who was appropriate to perform ritual, to rule, and therefore and thereby to remain throughout his life in connection with gods. The sacrality of the king was

seen as inherent in his person, and, indeed, this was the situation registered by the traditional pharaonic titles as long as they were assigned to the rulers of Egypt, i.e., until Roman times.

However, the denomination of these titles was largely a matter of tradition, while even the specific names that accompanied them might have reflected a more dynamic situation, and this dynamics in the perception of kingship is also seen in other evidence. Already in the New Kingdom a greater stress was made on the fact that the sacral component in the king's personality is actually exterior to him and located in transcendence, although this component was thought unceasingly connected (that is to say, "resonating") with the king's self.⁴⁸ A step further is seen on the eve of the Persian era in Egypt, in a justification that Pharaoh Amasis contrived for his usurpation of kingship from Apries: the sacrality of Apries and his ability to rule effectively were considered to have abandoned him from a certain moment (probably due to divine will), and after that the usurpation by an able ruler (who therefore showed himself possessing the sacrality) was not only legitimate but in fact necessary for the sake of the country.⁴⁹ One cannot be sure if this train of thought was in all its parts an innovation of Amasis (although this is not impossible), but, regardless, it forms a close background to the situation in Persian times.

The stela of Pa-di-Usir-pa-Re from the Fayum shows two important distinctions from the earlier notions of the king's relation to gods. First, although the embodiment of Horus in the king was a triviality of Egyptian ideology from its very beginning, this monument stressed Horus' prevalence in this relationship as strongly as had never been done before.⁵⁰ According to the stela from the Fayum, the sacrality that must have belonged to Darius I as a ritual king seems to have been completely derived from the god Horus; without embodying the god, Darius would probably be perceived as void of sacrality. Second, as the purpose of the stela from the Fayum was to provide for Pa-di-Usir-pa-Re a life in the hereafter, it is likely that the falcon in its scene represented the hypostasis of the Horus specifically "responsible" for this function in the Egyptian religion, i.e., Horus, son of Osiris and Isis,⁵¹ and not the sky- and sun-god Horus, with whom an Egyptian king was identified through the standard meaning of his Horus name. Here the analogy with the "falcon" sculpture of Nectanebo II comes handy

again: the inscription on the base of this sculpture composition from Tanis showed exactly the epithet of Horus, son of Isis, inserted into Nectanebo's royal title. It is unlikely that the identity of Darius I with Horus, son of Osiris and Isis, could be postulated especially for the Fayum stela, due to its connotations in the posthumous cult; more likely, such connotations must have manifested themselves in it due to an equation of the king with the god already established in the official ideology. In fact, replacing the celestial Horus with the son of Osiris and Isis was a natural step in the religious pattern of the Late Egyptian kingship,⁵² as by that time the cult of Osiris and the deities connected to him has already become the most popular in Egypt's mass religious conscience.

To sum up, the stela from the Fayum seems to assert that the sacrality of Darius I as a ritual king was not inherent to his person: it totally depended upon its being an embodiment of Horus. One can say that, according to this concept, the royal ritual functions were in fact enacted by the god in the role of the paramount ruler of the world, who was thought "encapsulated" in the body of the Persian ruler of Egypt. Needless to say, the meaning of Cambyses' and Darius' solar prenomina postulated above is another echo of the same concept. Thus, what might be called "the derivative sacrality" of these kings in Egypt appears a well-considered idea of their time and probably its innovation.

The emergence of this idea must have resulted from the internal development of the Late Egyptian royal ideology (certainly a thing too complex to be discussed in this article in any details), but the immediate impetus for it could have been exactly the Persian conquest. The Achaemenids were not the first foreign dynasty to hold the sway in Egypt in the 1st millennium BCE, but they must have been considered even more strangers than the Libyans or the Nubians, as they did not belong to the cultural continuum formed by the Egyptian civilization. Hence, there may have been a greater psychological difficulty for the Egyptians to believe that the sacral status of a ritual king could be personally inherent within a Persian dynast. Things might have become easier if he appeared not as a bearer of personal sacrality but instead as a human "encapsulation" of a god—the latter, in Egyptian thought, being able to perform sacral rule. The reasons for the god to find his manifestation in this very foreign ruler (keeping in mind, incidentally, the words of Darius' titulary at Hibis about his being chosen to his function

among all the beings of the mundane world, between its four cardinal points!) were perhaps pondered over but, like any god's will, could be hardly guessed with any degree of certainty.

What was the role of Udjahorresnet in formulating this concept? It would be probably too rash and too flattering for him to assign to him its authorship; however, one should not forget the word "collaborator" pronounced about him.⁵³ Insult or not, it labels well enough his position in the Egyptian party that must have more or less welcomed the coming of the Persians, perhaps preferring them over the last Saite kings;⁵⁴ if so, their coming must have been awaited and arguments to explain and excuse establishing the power of Achaemenids over Egypt had to be looked for by their partisans somewhat in advance. The concept of their "derivative sacrality" was perhaps not fully convincing, but nor was it the worst, and it was possibly the only feasible argument of the kind.

ADDENDUM

There is a statement on Darius I in Book I of the *Library of History* by Diodorus of Sicily that probably goes back to the suspected prototype of this book, the work of Hecataeus of Abdera dating to the end of the 4th century BCE:⁵⁵

A sixth man to concern himself with the laws of the Egyptians, it is said, was Darius the father of Xerxes; for he was incensed at the lawlessness which his predecessor, Cambyses, had shown in the treatment of the sanctuaries of Egypt, and aspired to live a life of virtue and of piety towards the gods. Indeed he associated with the priests of Egypt themselves, and took part with them in the study of theology and of the events recorded in their sacred books; and when he learned from these books about the greatness of soul of the ancient kings and about their goodwill towards their subjects he imitated their manner of life. For this reason he was the object of such great honour that he alone of all the kings was addressed as a god by the Egyptians in his lifetime, while at his death he was accorded equal honours with the ancient kings of Egypt who had ruled in strictest accord with the laws.⁵⁶

Luckily, the Egyptian implications of this passage as to Darius' capacity of a wise legislator have been already discussed,⁵⁷ so here it is permissible to propose an interpretation for its last phrase only, namely for its information about the lifetime worship of Darius.⁵⁸ What must have been remarkable in the concept of the Achaemenids' "derivative sacrality" in Egypt for a foreign observer of the early Persian time? Such an observer would probably have known very little or nothing at all about the standard theory of the Egyptian sacral kingship and the developments that paved the way for this concept, but he would have been quite impressed by the fact that, according to the Egyptians, their Persian ruler incarnated divinity! However, a non-Egyptian would have noticed the outward appearance of this notion and would hardly have a good knowledge of its religious and ideological nuances. A handy comparison to this might be the approach of a modern student to the notorious stela from the Fayum: at the first sight he would notice that Darius received in it godlike honors, which was in fact extraordinary for a pharaoh, and only on second thought—at best!—would he come to realize that in this scene the individuality of Darius is largely absorbed by that of god. It must have been equally (perhaps even more) natural for an ancient non-Egyptian observer to mistake an honor appropriate to the god in Darius for an honor to Darius himself as a god. As the relevant concept was the innovation of the first Persian domination, one would conclude that Darius was the first ruler of Egypt to receive godlike honors in his lifetime (the present article states that this concept appeared in the time of Cambyses, but his rule was short, left next to no monuments in Egypt, and, anyway, its memory for Egyptians and Greeks was largely formed by the stories of his atrocities, however fictitious).⁵⁹ The misunderstanding about Darius' sacrality in Egypt seems quite possible even in the perception of his contemporaries, but it was even more likely in the eventual course of tradition on his time in Egypt. Thus, it seems quite feasible that Diodorus' statement on Darius' deification in Egypt was backed by the memories of the ideological innovation of the early Persian time considered in this article.

SUMMARY

The compilation of Cambyses' royal titulary, in which Udjahorresnet (according to his autobiography)

played a key role, might be called a starting signal for an important stage in the evolution of the Egyptian concept of kingship in the 1st millennium BCE. There are reasons to see in it a gradual decrease in the personal sacrality of a ruler. The titulary of Cambyses II and, shortly after that, the titulary of Darius I seem to reveal idea that their sacrality fully depended on a deity's will to manifest in them. This is not said in sources openly, but, if it was so, then independently of such divine will these rulers were not thought to possess inherent sacrality at all. An impetus to coin this notion was undoubtedly the situation of a firmly established foreign domination, when the Egyptian elite and especially the partisans of the Achaemenids (Udjahorresnet being one of them) needed to explain why these foreign rulers had to be accepted as sacral kings. This idea probably also backed the eventual perception of Egyptian kings in the 4th century BCE.

ABBREVIATIONS:

- Wb. Eрман, Adolf and Hermann Grapow. 1955. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, vols. I–V. Neudruck. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- PM VII Porter, Bertha and Rosalind L. B. Moss. 1951. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings*, Vol. VII: Nubia, the Deserts, and Outside Egypt. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

REFERENCES

- Agut-Labordère, Damien. 2009–2010. "Darius législateur et les sages de l'Égypte: un addendum au Livre des Ordonnances." In Juan Carlos Moreno Garcia (ed.), *Élites et pouvoir en Égypte ancienne*, 353–358. Cahiers de recherches de l'Institut de papyrologie et égyptologie de Lille 28. Lille: Université Charles de Gaulle—Lille 3.
- Beckerath, Jürgen von. 1999. *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*. 2nd edition. Münchner ägyptologische Studien 49. Munich: Zabern.
- Berlev, Oleg D. 1981. "The Eleventh Dynasty in the Dynastic History of Egypt." In Dwight W. Young (ed.), *Studies Presented to H.J. Polotsky*, 361–377. Beacon Hill, MA: Eisenbrauns.
- and Svetlana Hodjash. 1982. *Egyptian Reliefs and Stelae in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts*. Moscow: Aurora.
- Bickel, Susanne. 2002. "Aspects et fonctions de la

- deification d'Amenhotep III." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 102: 63–90.
- Blöbaum, Anke Ilona. 2006. "Denn ich bin ein König, der Maat liebt": Herrscherlegitimation im spätzeitlichen Ägypten. *Aegyptiaca Monasteriensia* 4. Aachen: Shaker.
- Bolshakov, Andrey O. 1999. "Royal Portraiture and Horus' Name." In Christine Ziegler (ed.), *L'art de l'Ancien Empire égyptien. Actes du colloque, Musée du Louvre, les 3 et 4 avril 1998*, 311–332. Paris: Éditions du Louvre.
- Briant, Pierre. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Burchardt, Max. 1911. "Datierete Denkmäler der Berliner Sammlung aus der Achämenidenzeit." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 49: 69–80.
- Burstein, Stanley M. 1992. "Hecataeus of Abdera's History of Egypt." In Janet H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond*, 45–49. *Studies in the Ancient Oriental Civilisations* 51. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Burton, Anne. 1972. *Diodorus Siculus: Book I. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain* 29. Leiden: Brill.
- Chassinat, Émile. 1900. "Textes provenant du Sérapeum de Memphis." *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 22: 9–26.
- Cruz-Urbe, Eugene. 1988. *Hibis Temple Project, Volume I: Translations, Commentary, Discussions and Sign-List*. San Antonio: Van Siclen Books.
- Davies, Norman de G. 1953. *The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis, Part III: The Decoration*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- De Meulenaere, Hermann. 1960. "Les monuments du culte des rois Nectanébo." *Chronique d'Égypte* 35: 92–107.
- . 1991. "Le protocole royal de Philippe Arrhidée." *Cahiers de recherches de l'Institut de papyrologie et égyptologie de Lille* 13: 53–58.
- Demidchik, Arkadiy E. 2005. *Bezimyannaya piramida: Gosudarstvennaya doktrina drevneegipetskoy Gerakleopolskoy monarchii (Nameless Pyramid: The State Doctrine of the Ancient Egyptian Heracleopolitan Monarchy)*. St. Petersburg: Aleteia (in Russian).
- Felber, Helmuth. 2002. "Die Demotische Chronik." In Andreas Blasius and Bernd Ulrich Schipper (eds.), *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten*, 65–112. *Orientalia lovanensia analecta* 107. Leuven: Peeters.
- Forgeau, Annie. 2010. *Horus-fils-d'Isis: la jeunesse d'un dieu*. Bibliothèque d'étude 150. Le Caire: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Frankfort, Henri. 1978. *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as an Integration of Society and Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gardiner, Alan H. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford: Griffith Institute; Ashmolean Museum.
- Gorre, Gilles. 2009. "Nectanébo-le-faucon et la dynastie lagide." *Ancient Society* 39: 55–69.
- Gozzoli, Roberto Bruno. 2006. *The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millennium B.C. (ca. 1070–180 BC): Trends and Perspectives*. Golden House Publications Egyptology 5. London: Golden House.
- Habashi, Labib. 1969. *Features of the Deification of Ramesses II*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo 5. Glückstadt: Augustin.
- Holm-Rasmussen, Torgny. 1979. "On the Statue Cult of Nectanebos II." *Acta Orientalia* 40: 21–25.
- Jansen-Winkel, Karl. 2014. "Die Siegesstele des Amasis." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 96: 132–153.
- Jenni, Hanna. 1998. *Die Dekoration des Chnumtempels auf Elephantine durch Nektanebos II*. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 90 = Elephantine 17. Mainz: Zabern.
- Junge, Friedrich. 2005. *Late Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Ladynin, Ivan. 2006. "Ideologicheskie aspekty mezhdousobitsy Amasisa i Apriia v 570–567 gg. do n.e. (In Russian; The Ideological Aspects of the Strife between Amasis and Apries in 570–567 B.C.)." In Andrey O. Bolshakov (ed.), *Peterburgskie egiptologicheskie chteniia—2005. Tezisy dokladov (St. Petersburg Egyptological Readings—2005: Proceedings)*, 88–108. St. Petersburg: State Hermitage Publ. (in Russian)
- . 2009. "'Sokoly-Nektaneby': Skulpturnye izobrazheniia Nektaneba II pered bogom Khorom i ikh kontseptsiiia ('Nectanebos-the-Falcons': Sculpture Images of Nectanebo II before the God Horus and Their Concept)." *Vestnik drevney*





- istorii* 4 (271): 3–26. (in Russian)
- Leitz, Christian (ed.). 2002. *Lexikon der ägyptischer Götter und Götterbezeichnungen*, vol. 5. *Orientalia lovanensia analecta* 114. Leuven: Peeters.
- Leprohon, Ronald. 2013. *The Great Name: Ancient Egyptian Royal Titulary*. *Writings from the Ancient World* 33. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Lippert, Sandra. 2016. “Ein saitisches-persisches Puzzlespiel. Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Dekoration des Amun-Tempels von Hibis.” In Sandra Lippert, Maren Schentuleit, and Martin Stadler (eds.), *Sapientia Felicitas. Festschrift für Günter Vittmann zum 29. Februar 2016*, 355–387. *Cahiers Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne* 14. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier 3.
- . 2017. “La codification des lois en Égypte à l’époque perse.” In Dominique Jaillard and Christophe Nihan (eds.), *Writing Laws in Antiquity: L’écriture du droit dans l’Antiquité*, 78–98. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 19. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lloyd, Alan B. 1982. “The Inscription of Udjahorresnet: a Collaborator’s Testament.” *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68: 166–180.
- Marković, Nenad. 2020 (this volume). “Udjahorresnet’s Family and His Social Background.” *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 26.
- Montet, Pierre. 1959. “Inscriptions de Basse Époque trouvées à Tanis.” *Kêmi* 15: 42–64.
- Oldfather, Charles H. (transl.). 1933. *Diodorus Siculus: Library of History*, Volume I: Books 1–2.34. Loeb Classical Library 279. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Perrot, Jean (ed.). 2010. *Le palais de Darius à Suse: une résidence royale sur la route de Persépolis à Babylon*. Paris: Presses de l’université Paris-Sorbonne.
- Posener, Georges. 1936. *La première domination perse en Égypte*. Bibliothèque d’étude 11). Le Caire: Institut français d’archéologie orientale.
- Quack, Joachim Friedrich. 2015. “‘As He Disregarded the Law, He Was Replaced during His Own Lifetime’: On Criticism of Egyptian Rulers in the So-Called Demotic Chronicle.” In Henning Börm (ed.), *Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity*, 25–43. *Studies in Ancient Monarchy* 3. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Rössler-Köhler, Ursula. 1991. *Individuelle Haltungen zum ägyptischen Königtum der Spätzeit: Private Quellen und ihre Königswertung im Spannungsfeld zwischen Erwartung und Erfahrung*. Göttinger Orientforschungen. IV. Reihe: Ägypten 21. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Serrano Delgado, José Miguel. 2001. “La titulatura real de los faraones persas.” In Josep Cervelló Autuori and Alberto J. Quevedo (eds.), *Ir a buscar leña: Estudios dedicados al Prof. Jesús López*, 175–184. *Aula Aegyptiaca Studia* 2. Barcelona: Aula Aegyptiaca.
- . 2004. “Cambyses in Sais: Political and Religious Context in Achaemenid Egypt.” *Chronique d’Égypte* 74: 31–52.
- Shonkwiler, Randy L. 2014. *The Behdetite: A Study of Horus the Behdetite from the Old Kingdom to the Conquest of Alexander*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Smith, Mark. 2017. *Following Osiris: Perspectives on the Osirian Afterlife from Four Millennia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sternberg-el Hotabi, Heike. 2009. “‘Der gute Gott, Herr der Beiden Länder, Dareios’: Bemerkungen zur Stele Berlin ÄS 7493.” In Christine Allison, Anke Joisten-Pruschke, and Antje Wendtland (eds.), *From Daēnā to Dīn: Religion, Kultur und Sprache in der iranischen Welt. Festschrift für Philip Kreyenbroek zum 60. Geburtstag*, 399–410. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Vittmann, Gunther. 2003. *Ägypten und die Fremden im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*. Mainz: Zabern.
- Wasmuth, Melanie. 2017. *Ägypto-persische Herrscher- und Herrschaftspräsentation in der Achämenidenzeit*. *Oriens et Occidens* 27. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Wilson, Penelope. 1997. *A Ptolemaic Lexicon: A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu*. *Orientalia lovanensia analecta* 78. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies.
- Yoyotte, Jean. 1974. “Les inscriptions de Darius découvertes à Suse.” *Cahiers de la Délégation archéologique française en Iran* 4: 181–183, 204–214.




NOTES

¹ Posener 1936, 6–7.

² Leprohon 2013, 9–12.

³ Notably, A.B. Lloyd took the sentence about Udjahorresnet’s compiling Cambyses’ titulary for a subordinate clause of time-condition pertaining to the preceding description of his elevation at Cambyses’ court: “... His Majesty

- handing over to me the office of Chief Physician, having caused to me to be beside him as a Companion and Controller of the Palace, when I had made his royal titulary in his name of King of Upper and Lower Egypt Mesuti-rē” (Lloyd 1982, 169). This interpretation is not necessarily true, but the embedding of this phrase in the general description of the dignitary’s proximity to the Persian king is significant.
- ⁴ Posener 1936, 31 (no. 3: the Apis stela), 35–36 (no. 4: the sarcophagus of Apis).
- ⁵ Posener 1936, 12, comm. “r.”
- ⁶ *Wb.* II 151.10–14.
- ⁷ Blöbaum 2006, 392 (“Abkömmling des Re”); Leprohon 2013, 168 (“the offspring of Re”); J. von Beckerath (1999, 220) left this name, like all the other ones in his compendium, untranslated.
- ⁸ See NOTE 1.
- ⁹ Posener 1936, 31.
- ¹⁰ Posener 1936, 32.
- ¹¹ Posener 1936, 35.
- ¹² For the use of group-writing in such cases, see: Gardiner 1957, 52 (§ 60), 304 (§ 387.2), 322 (§ 409). The only case that might contradict this theory is the writing of the name on the unknown naophorous statue, the texts of which were copied by I. Rosellini:  (Posener 1936, 28). It seems possible, however, that the sign Gardiner M17 () also accentuates here the phoneme t, according to the principles of group-writing (Junge 2005, 42).
- ¹³ Cf. *Wb.* II. 141.14; Wilson 1997, 460.
- ¹⁴ Serrano Delgado 2004, 37; cf. Serrano Delgado 2001, 175–184.
- ¹⁵ Yoyotte 1974, 213; Perrot 2010, 279; Wasmuth 2017, 111. Serrano Delgado (2004, 38) translated this epithet as “offspring of Atum, living image of Re,” thus refraining from attributing to its first part the meaning “image,” which he suspected for Cambyses’ title (cf. Blöbaum 2006, 184, 187). This is not necessarily true: the epithet in the text of Darius’ statue is written , i.e., with the determinative Gardiner A53 () definitely denoting the meaning of “image, likeness” (symptomatically, it is repeated in the writing of *twt* in this text slightly later).
- ¹⁶ Yoyotte 1974, 213; Perrot 2010, 279; Wasmuth 2017, 118.
- ¹⁷ Serrano Delgado 2004, 38.
- ¹⁸ On a specific “solar” nature of Egyptian kings, see: Berlev 1981, 362–365; see also important remarks about the meaning of the Horus’ name: Bolshakov 1999, 314–318.
- ¹⁹ Blöbaum 2006, 394 (Thronname, II–VIII); Lippert 2016, 356ff.
- ²⁰ Beckerath 1999, 62–63.
- ²¹ Beckerath 1999, 184–185.
- ²² Blöbaum 2006, 421; about the reading of the Argeads solar prenomina, see: De Meulenaere 1991, 53–58.
- ²³ PM VII, 289.149–152; Davies 1953, pl. 48–49; translation: Cruz-Urbe 1988, 154–155. Unfortunately, recent research into the decoration of the temple of Hibis that gave special attention to the titularies of the Persian king left this case without discussion: Lippert 2016, 356, 371.
- ²⁴ According to A. I. Blöbaum, the Two Ladies name in this titulary of Darius I finds analogies in the names of Ramesses III and of the Dynasty XXI king Siamun (Blöbaum 2006, 393, Herrinnenname, B); however, these analogies are limited to the epithet “son of Amun” (a part of the Horus name for Ramesses III and a personal name of Siamun), while the rest of this Darius’ title is unique.
- ²⁵ *Wb.* I.71.3. According to Cruz-Urbe, the epithet he translated as “choicest one of Re within their four sides” should allude to a group of four deities (Cruz-Urbe 1988, 154, n. 989; incidentally, the reference to *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* I, p. 71, he gave to that effect is incorrect). Even if so, the connection to the cardinal points is likely, as they are mentioned explicitly in the words of the goddess.
- ²⁶ Cruz-Urbe 1988, 154.
- ²⁷ Cruz-Urbe 1988, 155.
- ²⁸ Blöbaum 2006, 92, 214.
- ²⁹ Blöbaum 2006, 384: Glanz des Re; *Wb.* IV. 331.
- ³⁰ *Wb.* IV. 335.
- ³¹ *Wb.* IV. 331.16.
- ³³ Burchardt 1911, 71–72, Taf. VIII.1; Vittmann 2003,

- ³² In fact, the participle of the verb *stwt* with this meaning can be found in the text on the pedestal of Darius' statue from Susa: *twt stwt r ntr nfr nb t3wy* "the image made similar to the good god, the lord of Two Lands" (DSeg3, col. 1–2; Yoyotte 1974, 213; Perrot 2010, 279; Wasmuth 2009, 84).
139–140; Sternberg-el Hotabi 2009, 399–410 (the scholar suspected that the name of the person might be read Pa-di-Wsir-Pe "Given by the Osiris [of] Pe"); Wasmuth 2017, 245–247, fig. 53.
- ³⁴ E.g., Berlev and Hodjash 1982, 24, n. "e"; Smith 2017, 56, 74–75, 88–89, 94–95, et al.
- ³⁵ An anonymous reviewer of this article proposed the following translation of line 1 of the stela: "This is the face (i.e., not 'This Horus') of the great god giving life (to) Pashep son of ..."; he/she also commented: "Here, Darius has the appearance—litt. the face—of Horus. Darius is embodied in the Horus represented on the stela, which goes very, very well with the demonstration proposed by the author." I am very grateful for this proposal, which is enlightening, if true; however, I am not sure if it should be taken unreservedly. At the start of line 1 one finds the writing , but a phonetic writing for the name of Horus is not unknown (see *Wb.* III. 122, bottom, right; Leitz 2002, 230, although here examples of a similar phonetic writing show also determinatives). At the same time, a doubtless writing of the god's name ( ) is found in a similar context ("this Horus, giving life...") at the start of line 2 of the stela. I question the possibility that the writings at the start of line 1 and 2 should really correspond to different words.
- ³⁶ Rössler-Köhler 1991, 275–276 (Nr. 80).
- ³⁷ For all that is known, he was really the first of the Persian masters of Egypt disinclined to accept a status of pharaoh (mind the absence of royal titulary in any expanded versions for him and his successors: Blöbaum 2006, 397; cf. Herodotus VII.7; see, however, a discussion: Briant 2002, 545–547).
- ³⁸ Sternberg-el Hotabi 2009, 401–402.
- ³⁹ See a list of these monuments: Jenni 1998, 88, 90, 92–94; research on them and on their priesthood: De Meulenaere 1960, 92–107; Holm-
- Rasmussen 1979, 21–25; Gorre 2009, 55–69.
- ⁴⁰ Montet 1959, 59–60; Jenni 1998, 90, n. 585.
- ⁴¹ Ladynin 2009, 3–26.
- ⁴² See, incidentally, about a frequent loss of royal power (probably, together with sacrality) by the unjust kings or their direct progeny in the *Demotic Chronicle*: Papyrus Demotic Bibliothèque nationale 215, recto III.18–19, 20–21, IV.6–7, 9–10, 12; Felber 2002, 81–83; Quack 2015, 36–37. A plausible explanation of such situations within the contemporary concept of kingship is the cessation of god's embodiment in such kings following their mischief.
- ⁴³ E.g., Smith 2017, 95–96, 496, 539.
- ⁴⁴ A feasible explanation might be his receiving a subsidy for building a tomb from the Persian king or his authorities, or receiving from them as a gift some parts of the tomb's apparel, perhaps a coffin.
- ⁴⁵ See now: Shonkwiler 2014.
- ⁴⁶ See a virtually unstalling view: Frankfort 1978, 3–6 and ff.; see also in the Russian research depending on the experience of the St. Petersburg Egyptological school: Demidchik 2005, 14–27.
- ⁴⁷ See NOTE 18, above.
- ⁴⁸ Cf. on the cult of the royal statues thought to incorporate divine capacities of kings somehow connected to them but detached from their mundane personalities, so that kings themselves could be agents of that cult: Habashi 1969; Bickel 2002, 63–90.
- ⁴⁹ A detailed discussion of this point based on the Elephantine Stela of Amasis is given in my Russian publication (Ladynin 2006, 88–108), which, however, appeared earlier than the consideration of this text by K. Jansen-Winkeln (Jansen-Winkeln 2014, 132–153).
- ⁵⁰ One might be inclined to think otherwise, as there exist the "falcon statues" of the New Kingdom rulers: however, a better look at them shows they represent kings not covered with feathers but, rather, wearing feathered cloaks, probably connected with the Sed-festival ritual: Bolkshakov 1999, 319.
- ⁵¹ This function of Horus, son of Osiris, is registered in fact since the time of the Pyramid

Texts, where he (in equation with a living king) is the main agent in the resurrection rituals provided for the deceased king equated with Osiris. For the functions of Horus, son of Isis, providing for the afterlife of kings and individuals in later periods, see: Forgeau 2010, 267–304.

⁵² See allusions to the image of Horus, son of Osiris and Isis, in the royal texts of the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties: Blöbaum 2006, 196–197; significantly, the phrase *is hm.f m sh3.f mi irt.n Hrw n it.f* (“really, His Majesty was in remembering him (Apis) like Horus has done for his father”) appears at the Serapeum stela of Year 4 of Darius I (Posener 1936, 37–38), being a repetition from a similar monument of Amasis (Chassinat 1900, 20).

⁵³ E.g., Lloyd 1982.

⁵⁴ See in the present volume the important contribution by Nenad Marcovic on Udjahorresnet’s prominence in the Saite priestly milieu; based on this, it seems likely that he and his surrounding would have opposed the military parvenu Amasis.

⁵⁵ Burstein 1992, 45–49; Gozzoli 2006, 193–194.

⁵⁶ Oldfather 1933, 325; Diod. I. 95.4–5: ἕκτον δὲ λέγεται τὸν Ξέρξου πατέρα Δαρεῖον τοῖς

νόμοις ἐπιστῆναι τοῖς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων· μισήσαντα γὰρ τὴν παρανομίαν τὴν εἰς τὰ κατ’ Αἴγυπτον ἱερὰ γενομένην ὑπὸ Καμβύσου τοῦ προβασιλεύσαντος ζηλῶσαι βίον ἐπιεικῆ καὶ φιλόθεον. ὁμιλῆσαι μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῖς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ μεταλαβεῖν αὐτὸν τῆς τε θεολογίας καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἀναγεγραμμένων πράξεων· ἐκ δὲ τούτων ἱστορήσαντα τὴν τε μεγαλοψυχίαν τῶν ἀρχαίων βασιλέων καὶ τὴν εἰς τοὺς ἀρχομένους εὐνοίαν μιμήσασθαι τὸν ἐκείνων βίον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τηλικαύτης τυχεῖν τιμῆς ὥσθ’ ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ζῶντα μὲν θεὸν προσαγορεύεσθαι μόνον τῶν ἀπάντων βασιλέων, τελευτήσαντα δὲ τιμῶν τυχεῖν ἴσων τοῖς τὸ παλαιὸν νομιμώτατα βασιλεύσασιν κατ’ Αἴγυπτον.

⁵⁷ Agut-Labordère 2009–2010, 353–358; Lippert 2017, 78–98.

⁵⁸ Notably, it is unnoticed in the fundamental commentary to Diodorus’ Book I: Burton 1972, 274–275. M. Wasmuth (2017, 249) connected this Diodorus fragment with Darius’ identification to Egyptian gods but did not go further than to state that.

⁵⁹ About this topos, see: Briant 2002, 55–57.