Egyptian history was discussed by a number of classical historians. Two extensive accounts have survived intact (those of Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus) along with the fragmentary remains of numerous other texts. Though classical historians are not usually reliable as independent sources for the history of Egypt before the Saite Period, they often provide useful information on Egyptian history in the periods contemporary with classical Greek and Roman civilization, as well as evidence of how earlier phases of Egyptian history were remembered and represented by Greek and Roman authors, and by Egyptians themselves.

The decipherment of Egyptian scripts in the nineteenth century allowed scholars to move beyond the classical Greek and Latin sources that earlier humanists had used to reconstruct and interpret the history of ancient Egypt. Among the most important of these earlier classical sources were ancient historians such as Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, whose authority underwent a thorough reevaluation in light of new Egyptian textual sources as well as the results of archaeological research in Egypt. This long process of reevaluation, over almost two centuries, has revealed the limitations of Greek and Roman knowledge of ancient Egyptian history, but with careful consideration of the historical contexts in which this knowledge was produced, the works of classical historians can provide information on various questions and topics relevant to the field of Egyptology. Though the classical historians are not usually reliable as independent sources for the history of dynastic Egypt before the Saite Period, they often
provide useful information on the periods of Egyptian history contemporary with classical Greek and Roman civilization, as well as insights into how earlier phases of Egyptian history were remembered and represented not only by Greeks and Romans but also by Egyptians.

**Herodotus and Greek Historiography ca. 525 – 332 BCE**

When Hecataeus of Miletus (c. 560 – 480 BCE) and then Herodotus of Halicarnassus (c. 490 – 415 BCE; see fig. 1) set out to investigate and record the historical past, Egypt had long had a place in Greek accounts of the legendary past. In the Homeric epics, Achilles remarked on the wealth of “hundred-gated Thebes” (*Iliad* 9.381-4); Helen and Menelaus visited Egypt and brought back oracles and marvelous gifts from their hosts (*Odyssey* 4.220-232, 351-592); and Odysseus told tall tales of Egyptian adventure (*Odyssey* 14.245-91, 17.415-444). In the works of the first Greek historians, however, Egypt played an even more significant role: the long Egyptian record of a human past provided them with a perspective from which to criticize Greek legends and genealogies, including those founded on the authority of Homer. In this respect, the encounter between Egyptian and Greek views of the past had profound consequences for Greek historiography, but the encounter also resulted in a Greek history of Egypt that was a mix of comprehension, misunderstanding, and distortion. The Greeks did gather contemporary Egyptian accounts of the past, but they also perceived and reshaped those accounts according to their own perspectives.

Only fragments of Hecataeus’s discussion of Egypt have been preserved in quotes by later authors (including Herodotus), and most of these are items of geographical or ethnographical information from his *Description of the Earth* (*FGrHist* 1 T 4, 15c, 22-1; F 300-327). The first surviving Greek account of Egyptian history is in Herodotus’s *Histories*: the entire second book (of nine) is devoted to Egypt. This “Egyptian Logos” is the longest of the ethnographic digressions in the first half of the *Histories* and it set the terms for much subsequent discussion of Egypt in classical historiography. Herodotus described the physical landscape, customs, and history of Egypt, while developing themes that would become standards of the Greek literary fascination with this alien land: unusual fauna and flora, the paradoxical flooding of the Nile, the strange practices and primordial wisdom of the Egyptians, as well as the depth of their history.

![Figure 1. Bust of Herodotus (second century CE Roman copy of Greek original) on display in the Museum of the Ancient Agora, Athens.](image-url)
traced his lineage back to a divine ancestor in the sixteenth generation. The priests were unimpressed and pointed out a succession of 345 statues, each of which was a high priest at Thebes who had succeeded to his father’s office in a line coextensive with the entire history of Egypt. Every one of the statues, they said, represented a man and not a god. Herodotus claimed that the priests at Thebes also showed him these statues (Histories 2.143-144). Though the priests could not have recited genealogies stretching 345 generations, lengthy genealogies were an important part of elite self-presentation in Late Period Egypt and they were often inscribed on statues placed in temples. Hecataeus and Herodotus therefore very likely reported (and perhaps elaborated on) a genuine encounter with the genealogies of Egyptian priests. This convincing demonstration of an immensely long human past allowed the Greek historians to push the boundary between human time and the age of the gods much further into the past than the Greeks had previously imagined, and consequently to submit their myths to a rationalizing scrutiny (Calame 1998; Moyer 2002). Egypt’s great antiquity and long recorded past also gave Egyptians considerable authority as sources of various kinds of knowledge, both for Herodotus and for his successors.

Herodotus says that he obtained much of his information on Egyptian history from the priests he met in Egypt. Though there has been considerable debate over the truth of this claim, there are several elements of his account—in addition to the priestly genealogies—that probably did derive from Egyptian sources, either directly or via other Greeks who traveled to, or resided in, Egypt. Herodotus mentions a papyrus roll from which the priests recited 330 royal names (2.100), a probable reference to a king-list like the Turin Canon. Of the 20 specific names that he cites, 15 are rendered accurately or in corrupt but easily identifiable forms (Lloyd 1988: 31-33; see fig. 2). The various stories of the kings from Moeris to Sethos that Herodotus says he got from Egyptian sources (2.101-141) have often been dismissed as Greek fictions, but in some cases it appears that he reported narratives of royal exploits from Egypt’s glorious past that were current among his informants and probably part of Late Period Egyptian narrative literature. Stories of the extensive conquests of Sesostris, for example, were told to provide a counterpoint to the power of the Persians (2.110; Lloyd 1988: 40). Egyptian narratives about Sesostris (a conflation of Senusret I and III) and Amenemhat III (Herodotus’s Moeris) have been discovered in Demotic Egyptian papyri (Widmer 2002), and though these manuscripts date primarily to the Roman Period, it is probable that some versions of the stories were composed earlier (Dieleman and Moyer 2010: 432-433). Even tales that do not portray kings in a favorable light could have been derived from indigenous literature. The Pheros story (2.111), for example, has a parallel in a Roman-Period Demotic papyrus (Ryholt 2006: 31-58). Herodotus’s cultural outlook and literary interests shaped the selection and presentation of the stories in various ways, but he was working with Egyptian material in several cases (Froidefond 1971: 182-187; Lloyd 1988: 41-43; Gozzoli 2006: 157-174).

Herodotus organized the chronology of his Egyptian history according to patterns that reflect his own historiographical principles as well as the Greek cultural and historical horizons within which he worked. This is evident in the three broad periods into which he divided his account of Egyptian history: the 330 kings from Min to Moeris (2.100-101), the 11 kings from Sesostris to Sethos (2.102-141), and the five kings from Psammetichus to Amasis (2.147-182). The final period, consisting of the Saitic Dynasty, is set off from the others by the digression on Hecataeus and the Theban priests, but Herodotus also remarks that for this period he was able to rely not only on Egyptian sources but also his own inquiries and observations as well as information from others, notably fellow Greeks. The availability of a wider array of sources for the Saitic Period was the result of intensified contacts between Egypt and the
eastern Mediterranean as Greek and other mercenaries served in Egypt and merchants conducted trade at sites such as Naucratis (Moyer 2011: 53-59; Vittmann 2003: 194-235). Although it still contains elements derived from literary narrative and folklore, Herodotus’s history of the Saïte Dynasty is indeed more accurate than that of the preceding periods and is a fundamental source for that era (Kienitz 1953: 2; Lloyd 1988: 38-39; 2000: 371-374). Herodotus’s pre-Saïte history is divided into the 330 kings from Min to Moeris, of whom very few are named or described, and the series of 11 subsequent kings whose deeds are described in vivid narratives. The latter period begins at an important synchronism that Herodotus made between Greek and Egyptian traditions in his attempt to establish a universal chronology: Sesostris is put in the same generation as the Greek hero Herakles (Vannicelli 2001). Herodotus apparently regarded the period before Herakles as a time during which it was difficult to achieve historical and chronological precision and therefore began his narrative account of Egyptian history with Sesostri.

Herodotus’s account of Egypt was by far the most influential in antiquity, but two other historians of the Greek Classical Period are known to have written on Egypt. Hellanicus of Lesbos, a younger contemporary of Herodotus, wrote an Aegyptiaca (among several other works). Only a few fragments of Hellanicus’s text are preserved, and it appears that neither he nor Herodotus used the other’s work (FGrHist 608a; Fornara 1994). Hellanicus’s reference to Babys as an alternative name for Seth suggests that he had access to Egyptian sources (F 2; Derchain 1956). Aristagoras (of Miletus?) wrote an account of Egypt c. 375 – 325 BCE in which he attempted to correct Herodotus. Though too little remains to ascertain the form of the work, it discussed various Egyptian places and monuments, as well as religion, cosmology, and military groups (FGrHist 608; Fornara 1994).

The Hellenistic Period

Alexander’s conquest and the establishment of the Ptolemaic dynasty fundamentally changed the conditions under which Greeks obtained knowledge of Egypt. Greek writers on Egypt had, in principle, much more direct access to reliable information, and some Egyptians also wrote works in Greek on their own history and traditions. Evaluating the results, however, is difficult owing to the fragmentary state of every Hellenistic Greek historical work on Egypt.

Hecataeus of Abdera (c. 360 – 290 BCE) visited Egypt under Ptolemy I Soter and probably composed his Aegyptiaca at the early Ptolemaic court. Hecataeus is generally considered to be the main source for Diodorus Siculus’s account of Egypt in his Library (1.10-98), a universal history completed c. 30 BCE. There are clearly, however, interpolations by Diodorus himself (who visited Egypt c. 60 – 56 BCE) and from other sources, e.g., geographical information from Agatharchides of Cnidus (c. 215 to after 145 BCE). Since Diodorus only mentions Hecataeus by name once (1.46), it is difficult to determine where his use of Hecataeus begins and ends, and there has been debate over the extent of Diodorus’s debt to the earlier historian (Murray 1970: 144-150; Burton 1972: 1-34). If one assumes that Diodorus followed Hecataeus fairly closely, the latter began his Aegyptiaca with sections on theology and geography, before giving his version of an Egyptian history, which he followed with an account of Egyptian customs: first those pertaining to the king, and then other customs. The organization of Hecataeus’s work owes much to Herodotus, as does his account of Egyptian history, which follows a Herodotean outline, with some changes and improvements possibly based on Egyptian sources (Burstein 1992; von
Beckerath 1997: 34; see fig. 2). His idealized portrait of Egyptian kings and their daily regimen is painted with Greek ethical and philosophical strokes, and his narratives of colonization missions originating in Egypt and populating Greece and other lands promoted the prestige of the Ptolemaic kingdom through a traditional Greek narrative pattern. Nevertheless, some scholars have also proposed native Egyptian contributions to Hecataeus’s ideas of kingship and to his utopian ethnography, suggesting that, not unlike Herodotus, his work on Egypt was a product of real interaction with Egyptian civilization as well as his own intellectual and cultural preoccupations (Murray 1970; Dillery 1998). One section of Diodorus that is indisputably drawn from Hecataeus—an extensive description of the monument of Osymandyas (Usermaat/Ramesses II) at Thebes (i.e., the Ramesseum)—is clearly the result of direct observation, information from Egyptian sources, and Greek interpretation (Diodorus 1.47-49; Burton 1972: 1-34; Drews 1973: 123-131).

About half a century later, an Egyptian priest, Manetho of Sebennytos, wrote a history of Egypt in Greek at the early Ptolemaic court under Philadelphus or possibly Euergetes (c. 255 – 240 BCE; Moyer 2011: 85-87). His work is often compared with that of Berossos, a native of Babylon, who composed his Babylonica for the Seleucid king Antiochus I a few years earlier. Both are important examples of the new intellectual possibilities of the Hellenistic Period. Assessing Manetho’s Aegyptiaca is, however, quite difficult owing to the state of the text. The overall form of the work can only be deduced from epitomized versions that were included in chronographical works by the Christian authors Sextus Julius Africanus (c. 160/170 – 240 CE) and Eusebius (260 – 339 CE). Extracts from the epitomes in these works were, in turn, preserved by the Byzantine chronographer George Syncellus (c. 810 CE) along with other spurious works attributed to Manetho. Eusebius’s version of the epitome also survives in an Armenian translation of his Chronica. Longer passages are preserved in quotations by the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus (37/8 – c.100 CE) in his polemical treatise Against Apion. Sifting the remains of Manetho’s text from accumulations of textual corruption and interpolation is a delicate problem, but despite their complicated transmission the importance of these fragments was recognized as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century by Joseph Scaliger. Manetho’s scheme of 30 dynasties still provides a basic outline for Egyptological chronology, even if today his Aegyptiaca cannot be considered a reliable independent source for historical or chronological details (von Beckerath 1997: 35-40). The value of Manetho is not so much in the direct evidence he provides for Egyptian history, but rather as a source for Egyptian ways of preserving and representing the past, particularly in the author’s own historical and cultural milieu in early Ptolemaic Egypt (Helck 1956: 1-3). While the interest of classicists has focused on the influences of Greek historiography on Manetho’s work, Egyptologists have examined his use of Egyptian records such as king-lists and annals for their historical data and as formal or generic models. Manetho’s Aegyptiaca was, however, innovative relative to both cultural contexts in its use of a king-list framework into which narratives and other information were inserted as commentaries. This combination provided the Ptolemies and other Greek readers not only with a history based on Egyptian records, but also a sense of the meaning of Egyptian history and kingship from a Ptolemaic Egyptian perspective (Moyer 2011: 84-141). Given this orientation toward the Ptolemaic court and its particular political concerns, it is perhaps not surprising that Manetho’s work does not appear to have made a significant impact on Greek historiography outside of the later Christian chronographers who attempted to refute or explain away his long Egyptian chronology. When Diodorus wrote his account of Egyptian history toward the end of the Hellenistic Period, he did not refer to Manetho at all and chose to rely on a tradition that can be traced back to Herodotus by way of
Hecataeus of Abdera. The first book of Diodorus’s *Library* was to be the latest extended account of Pharaonic Egyptian history to survive from classical historiography.

For the history of Ptolemaic Egypt itself, the contemporary Greek historiographical sources are also fragmentary and uneven. Polybius (c. 200 – c. 118 BCE) wrote a universal history that was largely concerned with Rome’s rising dominance from 264 – 146 BCE. The first five books of Polybius’s history survive along with fragments of the remaining 35 books. At various points, he considers the history of the Ptolemaic kingdom, and though he is frequently hostile to the Ptolemies and Egypt, he provides the best source of narrative history, especially for the reigns of Philopator, Epiphanes, Philometor and Euergetes II (see Walbank 1979). The broad lines of Polybius’s account of Ptolemaic Egypt have been very influential in modern historiography (see Manning 2003: 45, 230; 2010: 76). Diodorus Siculus is important for his continuous narrative of the earliest period down to the battle of Ipsus in 301 BCE (books 18-20), for which he used the contemporary historian Hieronymus of Cardia. The fragmentary books 21-40 also record a number of events related to Ptolemaic Egypt.

*Egypt in the Historiography of the Roman Period*

When Diodorus Siculus visited Egypt, the Ptolemaic kingdom was already coming under the power of Rome, and in just a few years Cleopatra VII would come to the throne. Julius Caesar composed his own account of the *Alexandrian War*, and Octavian’s conflict with M. Antonius and Cleopatra occasioned hostile caricatures of Egypt and her queen in various literary genres. Despite these, Plutarch would later compose a relatively sympathetic portrait of the last Ptolemaic monarch in his historical biography of Antonius (written c. 110 – 115 CE). After Diodorus Siculus, however, no surviving Greek or Latin authors treated the history of Egypt at any length. Among the fragments of lost historical works on Egypt, some were quoted because they were used in inter-ethnic and inter-religious debates over origins and antiquity between Egyptians, Jews and (somewhat later) Christians. Josephus, in his treatise *Against Apion*, criticizes tendentious versions of the Exodus narrative written by the first century CE Egyptian authors Apion and Chaeremon (*FGHist* 616 and 618). The immediate historical context of these hostile exchanges was the anti-Jewish violence in Alexandria of the late 30s and early 40s CE, and these texts, along with excerpts from Manetho and Hecataeus of Abdera, have been used as sources for exploring the origins of ancient anti-Semitism. Egyptological interpretations of this network of Exodus narratives have examined the use of traditional Egyptian discourses of the polluted foreigner, and possible memories of religious trauma in the Amarna Period (Redford 1986: 257-293; Assmann 1997: 1-54). Over a dozen other writers are known to have written works on Egypt, as well as another three dozen or so who wrote works on Alexandria, other Egyptian cities, or other topics relevant to Egypt and its history (see *FGHist* 611-664). This large number of lost works is a salutary reminder that modern historians who wish to reconstruct the state of classical historiography on Egypt must bear in mind the historical processes of selection and preservation by which the classics have survived.

In the surviving works of the major Roman historians there are brief digressions on particular aspects of Egyptian history. Tacitus, for example, discusses the introduction of the cult of Sarapis in the context of describing Vespasian’s sojourn in Egypt (*Histories* 4.81-84), and Ammianus Marcellinus gives a brief description of Egypt when the discovery of an Apis bull is reported to the emperor Julian (22.15-16). The latter also quotes Hermapiou’s Greek translation of the hieroglyphs on an obelisk that Augustus brought to the Circus Maximus at Rome (17.4.17-23). Works such as Strabo’s *Geography* (esp. book 17.1-2) and Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History* contain numerous references to Egypt and at times include...
The lists of Egyptian kings in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herodotus</th>
<th>Diodorus</th>
<th>Historical Pharaohs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Menes</td>
<td>Menes / Ahm (Dyn. I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 kings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastiris I</td>
<td>7 kings</td>
<td>Nefertari Saptah Neithicerry? (Dyn. VIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(329 kings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including Nineteis</td>
<td>(some number of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 10 Ethiopians)</td>
<td>kings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osymandius</td>
<td>Usermastra - Ramesses II (Dyn. XIX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 kings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choroues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aegyptus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11 kings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td>Njumata - Amenemhat III (Dyn. XII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 generations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sesostris</td>
<td>Sesostris I / III (Dyn. XII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sesostris II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(several kings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoc I</td>
<td>Ahmose (Dyn. XVIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mendes / Marrus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(no kings for 5 generations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proto II</td>
<td>Cetes / Procus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhampsirinuus</td>
<td>Rameses III? (Dyn. XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 kings, including Nileus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheops</td>
<td>Khafra (Dyn. IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chephren</td>
<td>Khafra (Dyn. IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycerinus</td>
<td>Mentuhotep (Dyn. IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asypris</td>
<td>Shoshenq I (Dyn. XXII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a king or kings (perhaps Saisypris)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taphnechbias</td>
<td>Tefnakhte (Dyn. XXIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boechoris</td>
<td>Bakentencf (Dyn. XXIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(some period of time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anysis</td>
<td>Sabacum (Dyn. XXV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sabaecos</td>
<td>Shabako (Dyn. XXV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sethos</td>
<td>(amercy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dodecarchis</td>
<td>(12 kings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psammet口味</td>
<td>Psammetechous 1 (Dyn. XXVIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Necho</td>
<td>Necho II (Dyn. XXVII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psammetechous</td>
<td>Psammetechous II (Dyn. XXVI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apries</td>
<td>Apries (Dyn. XXVI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amasis</td>
<td>Amasis / Ahmose II (Dyn. XXVII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psammetechous</td>
<td>Psammetechous III (Dyn. XXVII)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The lists of Egyptian kings in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus.
historical information. Nothing, however, survives that can be compared to the extensive accounts of Egyptian history preserved in Herodotus and Diodorus. This paucity of historical writing on Egypt is all the more remarkable given the large number of texts in both Greek and Latin that testify to considerable interest in Egyptian religion in the Roman Empire (e.g., Plutarch On Isis and Osiris, Apuleius Metamorphosis, Iamblichus On the Mysteries). In so far as the surviving texts are a guide, the mythical past of Egypt was of greater interest than the historical past to Greek and Latin writers of the Roman Empire.

**Bibliographic Notes**

There is a substantial bibliography on Herodotus’s account of Egypt, and a long-running debate over his accuracy and the nature of his sources. See, e.g., Wiedermann (1890); Spiegelberg (1927); Heidel (1935); Armayor (1978, 1980, 1985); Lloyd (1988); and Fehling (1989: 77-84). An important aspect of this research is the question of whether the Egypt of Herodotus (and other Greek historians) was a mirage or a portrait of the “other” created out of Greek intellectual and cultural interests and practices of representation. Significant works in this vein are: Froidefond (1971: 115-207), Hartog (1986; English translation: Hartog 2001: 41-77), Vasunia (2001: 75-135). Responses to the studies of Egyptian alterity in Greek texts include Moyer (2002; 2011: 42-83) and Gruen (2011: 76-114). A fundamental resource for particular details of Herodotus’s account is Lloyd’s commentary on the second book of *Histories* (Lloyd 1975 – 1988), a revised version of which is now included in Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella (2007). For the fragments of Hecataeus of Mileus, see below.

The most recent commentary on the account of Egypt in Diodorus Siculus’s *Library* is Burton (1972; this includes a discussion of the sources: pp. 1-34). For studies of Hecataeus of Abdera on Egypt, see Murray (1970, 1972); Burstein (1992); and Dillery (1998). On the textual transmission of Manetho, Laqueur (1928) is still fundamental. A brief outline of the transmission is also given by Waddell (1940: xv-xx). For the chronography of George Syncellus (in which important parts of Manetho’s text are preserved), see Adler and Tuffin (2002). On the fragments of Manetho in the context of polemics between Greeks, Jews, and Egyptians, see Yoyotte (1963); Aziza (1987); Denis (1987); Mendels (1990); and Schäfer (1997). Studies of Manetho that emphasize Greek models include Fraser (1972: 505-510); Murray (1972); Sterling (1992: 117-134); and Dillery (1999, 2007). Studies that emphasize Egyptian sources and models include Helck (1956); Redford (1986: 203-230); and Moyer (2011: 84-141). For the published text of the fragments of Hecataeus of Abdera and Manetho, see below. On the relationship between Berossus and Manetho, see Murray (1972: 209); Fraser (1972: 1.105); Dillery (2007); and Moyer (2013). Egypt in Polybius is discussed by Walbank (1979); the latter’s commentary on Polybius is also fundamental (Walbank 1957 – 1979). For an overview of the historical works that can be used as sources for the Hellenistic age (including Ptolemaic Egypt), see Walbank (1984: 1-10). The best commentary on Strabo’s description of Egypt is Yoyotte, Charvet, and Gompertz (1997). Discussion of various Greek accounts of Egyptian history can be found in Drews (1973) and Gozzoli (2006).

The fragments of lost Greek historical works were collected by Jacoby (1923 – 1958). A revised version of this collection, together with English translations and commentaries, is being produced under the general editorship of Ian Worthington and published on line as sections are completed (Worthington and Jacoby 2007-present). In these works, abbreviated *FGrHist* and *BNJ* respectively, each author is assigned a number, as are his fragments (F) and testimonia (T). The author numbers are the same in both versions. Important for Egypt are the following: Hecataeus of Mileus (1), Hellanicus of Lesbos (608a); Aristagoras (608); Hecataeus of Abdera (264); and Manetho (609); in
addition, there are a number of lost writers on Egypt and Egyptian topics, assigned nos. 608-665. These range in date from the fifth century BCE to the sixth century CE.
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