The development of Egyptology in the 19th century, the archaeological research in Egypt (but also in university workshops or museums) were the subject of attention not only of the scientific press, but more often they started to be noticed and commented on – also in Poland - in the literary papers popularizing general knowledge, even newspapers. From Cairo there were sent the plentiful correspondence, more or less extensive descriptions of interesting places or events, information about the research proceedings which referred to different aspects of Egyptology. A rise of scientific knowledge about ancient Egypt has been changing the character of literary or paraliterary statements in connection to this subject. We can even observe the specific evolution in the ways of its construction. Before, the concepts related to the concept of ancient Egypt remained in the area of ‘unknown, secret symbols’, ‘immemorial riddle’; with the development of diligent knowledge ‘secrets’ managed to be revealed, ‘symbols’ were becoming to be understandable and ‘riddles’ solved. This process became initially visible during the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century, but it became consolidated in the second half of the 19th century. Nobody reasonable (even if this term is not adequate towards the creators of very precisely understood literary fiction, for instance poets) was asking a question: ‘What are the pyramids in fact?’ or ‘What secret meaning is hidden
from us behind the hieroglyphs?’ – and, as it happened, it was only used as deep rhetoric or visible metaphor. A Polish romantic poet – Juliusz Słowacki (1809-1846)\(^1\) was trying to introduce in a poetic form the concepts of Champollion, another poet – Cyprian Kamil Norwid (1821-1883), was scrupulously making extracts from all accessible sources.

Even more clearly one can observe this fact in relation to literary forms closer to epic, as well as fictitious (novel, short story) as documentary or paradocumentary fiction where travellers’ reports could be classified as unrelated to their literary value. Not necessarily did it influence preserving the artistic values; melancholic descriptions of ‘ruins’, philosophical deliberations over the flow of time, unrelated if the writer could be free from cliché, were giving place to the erudite presentation rooted in scientific works. It is easily observed that eruditely digressions from very beginning were inseparable elements of this type of writing. In fact, the Bible, Herodotus and Strabo were replaced by works of writers with professor titles. Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Nerval, were replaced by Champollion, Lepsius or Maspero. The material was becoming not Egypt, to say ‘as itself’, but Egypt researched and discovered by the science\(^2\). We can risk the statement that inspirations were looked for not in old legends, myths, and antique sources of writers, but in excavation reports, publications of findings, and historical and linguistic dissertations.

\(^2\) An interesting example of this kind of literature is A thousand miles up the Nile by Amelia B. Edwards (1877, Polish transl. 1880).
It is easy to justify in relation to travellers’ literature which was approaching even closer to journalist forms by characteristic features of text composition as well as more literally – by form of publication; ‘correspondence’ placed in parts in periodicals, more interesting is merging of these elements to the writers’ workspace. It was true not only in relation to Egypt. When in the 17th century the existence of Pompeii, buried by the volcanic dust, was discovered, and the next century the systematic research of this place started, the interests in the next discoveries had its impact also in literature. The peak of this fascination was the novel of Edward Bulwer Lytton *The Last Days of Pompeii* (London 1834). Lytton gained popularity also in Poland, doubtlessly in the original language version, also in translations, but quite late ones. What is interesting in this novel, there is also an Egyptian accent; one of the protagonists is *Arbaces the Egyptian*, which allowed to introduce several Egyptian motifs. Lytton’s novel is, despite being a literary fiction, in fact, an ‘archaeological reconstruction’ based on the preserved excavations of Pompeii.

The most eminent novel of more and more visible stream was Gustave Flaubert’s *Salammbô* (1862). Théophile Gautier, in a novel edited a little earlier *Le roman de la momie* (1856), turned to the ancient Egypt. In this case, the writer already declared direct cooperation with Erneste Feydeau. Today we agree about the negative assessment of realia reconstructed by Feydeau and Gautier – consultation was apparently not very tight; the specialists in literature also point out compositional weaknesses, but an important step was made.

It is highly probable that observation of ‘Egyptological’ flaws of the French writer made the real scientist, professor of Leipzig University and director of its Egyptology department, Georg Ebers, start writing; a kind of novel genre, already called ‘archaeological’ gained a new adjective: *Professorenroman*. Ebers was the author of many extensive works of his kind, in majority translated into Polish: *Eine ägyptische Königstochter* (1864, Polish translation in 1877)

---


Die Schwestern translated in 1883; Kleopatra translated in 1894; Serapis, translated twice: 1887 and in shortened version 1900; the most famous Uarda (1877, seven German editions) was translated only in the 20th century, but it was read in Poland before in the original. Polish critics researched the influences of Ebers; a text New streams in German literature in periodical “Ateneum” (Warsaw, 1891) brings rather criticism of the professor-writer though states that as French dramawriter took subjects from classical antique world, Ebers managed to successfully create ‘Egyptian romance’. In the works of the German scientist it is a visible characteristic element, coming probably from private literary tastes; a fascination of poetics of criminal novel, detectives, and in poor edition with anachronic catalogue of literary tricks. ‘Egyptian’ space of the novel is filled with intrigues, conspiracies, poisons, doubles, persons changed, overheard conversations and operettas’ (vaudevillian) passions.

The ideas of Ebers were transferred to the ground of Polish original novel-writing by count Wojciech Dzieduszycki (1848-1909); aristocrat, professor of philosophy at the Lvov University, a lawyer, historian, political activist, a feature writer, Shakespeare’s translator. The domain of his writing was philosophy and aesthetics, in an almost bellettristic popular manner, in non-academic forms and transferred by him into the areas which he would want to call ‘literature’. A literary legacy was surprisingly rich in genres and in subjects; from philosophical treatises through epic tales, adventure novels, and short stories to lyrics. He was also known as a popular lecturer of ancient philosophy. Without a doubt, he was a type of good-natured man, noble, kind-hearted, a scientist without a stroke of genius though with a big mind and heart. The idea of copying literary productions of Ebers was not a result of Dzieduszycki’s Egypt logical interests; an extensive novel Święty ptak (The Holy Bird, 1895, two volumes) he wrote between a boring, 3-volume novel of manners W Paryżu (In Paris) and the tragedy Książę Henryk (Prince Henry), published a year later. His general erudition helped him in work as well as the books of Gaston Maspero skimmed through and – for sure- knowledge of plentiful drawings in the kind of Ägyptische Kulturgeschichte - Altertümer - Architektur - Baukunst - Malerei – Religion etc. in popular in Poland encyclopaedias Brockhaus or Meyers Lexikon (or French colourful lithographs of Vallet from the series Egyptien,
Description de l’Égypte), uncommonly precise, except from all monuments, they presented extensively many details of architecture: columns, capitols, mouldings, pillars, ornamental motifs; different objects of daily use, clothes, headdresses, hairstyles, furniture, vehicles up to images of godheads.

A lecture of Święty ptak constantly recalls the memories of similar graphics, though without a mention of any plasticity, picturesque descriptions go too far.

We can also add his biographists’ reports: bellettristic works (of Dzieduszycki) are the mix of perfectly depicted scenes and graphomaniac lengthiness. The best one is ‘Święty ptak’, historical novel from the times of ancient Egypt (...) that was written immediately in a final version – a manuscript was at the same time a final version. He was never making notes.

A plot of Dzieduszycki’s novel can be shortly introduced as follows; the plot starts in the city Sni, built countless ages before, on the Nile a little south of the hundred-gated Thebes, in late years of the reign of Rameses I ⁶. There is a shrine in a little town; a holy falcon lives there, hooked by his leg to thin, long, golden chain, attached to the altar (I, 5). A priest of the place and local manager is Amenemha who, as well as his brother Ozortazen, regards himself as the descendant of the royal family (Amenemhat III, who built the Labyrinth⁷; I, 124), and his ancestors were the dignitaries on the court of Amenhotep IV ⁸.

The daughter of Amenemha and a key person of the novel is beautiful Hesh-Aker. Rameses and his wife Hari-Ari, are the parents of an especially mali-

---

⁶ W. Dzieduszycki, Święty ptak, Lwów 1895, I, 1; maybe Sni was Dzieduszycki’s association with Esna (Isna), 50 km south of Thebes, but it’s modern, Arabic name; ancient Iunīt or (Tā)senet, Greek Latopolis (derivation from the name of holy fish, not falcon). See J. Baines, J. Málek, Atlas of Ancient Egypt, Oxford - New York 1980 and reprints. Another example of Dzieduszycki’s argument is “etymology” of Thebes: Egyptian name of this place was “Amu-nejna” (?) or “Ape”, a capital, with prefix “t”, t’Ape. (I, 155-156); see also Ta-ipet; Baines, Málek, 84; Esna 81.


⁸ Dzieduszycki mentions the late (!) Mr. Amenhotep IV (II, 185) in several passages; his cripplehood was the reason of religious revolution (I, 18); this religious reformation appears a plot of Israelites (!) thus introducing monotheism and dominate in Egypt (I, 65, 271); another information about family and environment of Akhenaton: Queen Tai (I, 12), Ai (I, 77), Harenhebi (I, 95), Amen-Tutankh (I, 94 and II, 29).
cious and ugly the only child, *Kerkomama*\(^9\), on whom the fate of the dynasty depends, as the pharaoh can only be the future son-in-law of Rameses. The potential candidate appears to be prince *Seti*, but he is in love with Hesh-Aker, whom he promised endless love. The practical Seti chooses a marriage with Kerkomama, planning to make Hesh-Aker his lover to lead her to the throne after the death of old Rameses. Kerkomama picks up the trail shortly before the wedding and demands her rival dead. Hesh-Aker is also loved secretly by a Hebrew *Abibaal*; the next candidate is *Amento*, poor young man from the brilliant Egyptian family. Abibaal knowing that as a representative of a foreign nation he does not have even formal chances against the remaining admirers-Egyptians, creates a treacherous plan of kidnapping Hesh-Aker. The conspiracy has also another aspect: Abibaal wants to trigger a civil war so that the Israelites may take control over Egypt. Confusion appears in the capital, a rebellion of foreign soldiers remaining in the pharaoh service adds to it, *Achai* and *Italics*, and disoriented Hesh-Aker, the reason of all this mess, that in the meantime became a nun (!) in the Theban shrine of Amon, finds shelter on...the top of a pyramid, where she dies. The holy falcon disappears from the shrine Sni, what everybody regards as a fatal sign; but it appears during the ceremonies in Thebes – and there he dies. The story ends with the statement from the reigns of Seti, who feels responsible for Hesh-Asker’s fate. The description of the future of Greek rebellions ads to the grotesque ending: *after leaving Egypt Danaus established the city of Argos and Kekropos – the city of Athens and both were wide-famous in Hellas thanks to the wisdom they gained in Egypt* (II, 292-293).

The main motif presented in a shortened version above can give an impression of narrative precision, but nothing would be more wrong. It was depicted with endless tiring descriptions and side motifs (the author seems to have an obsession of conspiracies, the heroes endlessly meet each other in different configurations, making complicated plans, in which Dzieduszycki himself is lost sometimes). The lecture of *Święty ptak* evokes astonishment mixed with cheerfulness from the first pages. His lack of Egypt logical knowledge the author replaces with his own suppositions and many realias – probably unconsciously - he replaces by taken from his own reality. A meticulous catalogue of

---

\(^9\) Dzieduszycki’s association with *Karomama-Meritmut*?; (see Schneider, *Lexikon*, p. 144).
the mistakes could be very long, but it is not necessary and pointless; *A painted little beard, similar to those that we call Spanish* (I, 3), papyruses with *calligraphic but alphabetic writing* (!), totally different from *monumental hieroglyphs* (I, 5), a Greek woman *Elpinoe* is saying to Hesh-Aker: (the god, that) you call Horus, we call Phoebus (I, 29)\(^\text{10}\).

A characteristic tiring feature of Dzieduszycki’s writing are interjections, destroying the ‘climate’ of narration; a vehicle description that was used by one of the heroes ends with: each reader knows, at least from the pictures if not from ancient reliefs, the shape of a chariot; so he should add to the known shape a bright colour and gild that decorate the chariot, and he will have a visible image of the vehicle (I, 82) or during the fest: (…) I would bore the reader’s attention, telling gossips from thousands of years before (I, 84). Egyptians are dressed with different variants dictated by the fashion that the reader gets to know (I, 84) and inside the pyramid there are things that today’s science is laboriously discovering again (I, 244). It concerns also the people’s characteristics; (Ozortazen) it was not the mawkish and sentimental man in a modern way because such feelings were not known in the remote ancient times (I, 266). Separately, the author’s remarks should be pointed out, which are rather a sort of transposition of modern phobias; (Israel) has a lot of property, domestic trade of a country (Egypt) was almost completely in its hands (II, 52). The setting is built in a theatrical way,

\(^\text{10}\) Or *Phoebus-Apollo* (I, 52); Egyptian *Hermes, Zeus and Helios* (I, 218), *Hephaistos* (II, 62), *Pallas Athena, Arthemis* (I, 221) etc.
or rather like in a museum, which resembles the sightseeing of the exposition\textsuperscript{11}, inside and in the gardens he places pots and statues of gods in a picturesque way, from place to place separate brand statuettes (I, 84), in Thebes, here and there granite colossi were sitting in the sand, and pyramids of former kings were rising (II, 250-251). But the description of the interior of the prioress (!) room of Hatazu in Thebes is totally peculiar, completely as if taken from the Duke Dzieduszycki’s office: there is a shelf from cedar wood with the handy library, apart from this there were desks and several chairs in the room and the picture on the wall with a motif of the judgment of souls from the Book of the Dead (II, 106-107).

The above short remarks are not directed towards a mockery of the knowledge or creative talent, not to say writing competence of the author. Dzieduszycki’s book, seldom mentioned by the scholars, was absolutely criticized; it was shown that it is a perfect example of being influenced by the literary fashion and starting a subject under its influence, to which a writer is not prepared. In the commentators’ view it should even be refused the scrupulousness of creation; it was made from used novelistic clichés. Święty ptak has a considerable value. It exemplifies a real state of knowledge about the ancient Egypt, described in a model sociological depiction: of an intelligent, educated erudite of the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, not particularly interested in undertaking the subject, but reaching, most probably in a hazardous way and by chance to sources and popular studies accessible at the time, and to his own intuition, modelled by commonly held views and images about ancient Egypt.

In the context of Święty ptak a short story is worth reminding that was published several years later (1904) in a women’s magazine “Bluszcz”, Piękna na wozie różanym (Beauty on a rose chariot) by Maria Łopuszańska. This tearful short story, combining fairly motifs of Cinderella (!) and Egyptian myth about Osiris and Seth; to the pharaoh Mentesuphis an eagle brings in his claws a red sandal of a poor but exceptionally beautiful daughter of a farmer - Neitaker.

\textsuperscript{11} Expositions of artifacts (not only Egyptian) in the 19th century museums were of a special manner: a kind of “composition of objects”, more “aesthetic” than “essential” (provenance, chronology, etc.); anyway, aspects of the reception were closed to visiting in curious “property-room”; T.J. Mitchell, Colonising Egypt, Berkeley 1991; Egyptology in the Age of Maspero and Ahmad Kamal [in:] D.M. Reid, Whose Pharaohs? Archaeology, Museums, and Egyptian National Identity from Napoleon to World War I, Cairo 2002, 172-212.
Mentesuphis orders to find the owner of the shoe, which soon results in a triumphant entry to the city of Memphis on the rose chariot and then a wedding. A marital bliss is interrupted by a jealous desire of a power of prince Seti who secretly murders Mentesuphis. The widow thinks of a vendetta plan: as a result not only Seti dies, but also his supporters. Neitaker, fulfilling his revenge, commits suicide and people transferred these events into myth. Although introducing a motif of Cinderella seems grotesque, figures and main motif proof certain ‘Egyptologist’ orientation. They correspond, in general outline, to Herodotus’ and Manetho’s tradition about the events from the end of sixth Dynasty; Mentesuphis should be a husband (or brother) of Nitocris\(^{12}\), who avenged him, after him being murdered, then she commits suicide. In agreement with the sub-title of the short story – and current knowledge, it is a legend, not finding its confirmation in archaeological proofs. The short story distorts an important detail of Herodotus work, namely, that Mentesuphis was supposed to be murdered... as a bad ruler by Egyptian people (!), and also equating Nitocris-Neitaker with harlot Rhodopis, but the trace can be information about her pyramid ending the story. This ‘didactic’ composition was a fragment of a series published in ‘Bluszcz’, *Obrazy z przeszłości niewiast* (*Pictures from the past of women*), its thesis being that of showing the examples of brave and full of wisdom women in different times and cultural circles.

The topics of ‘country’, ‘society’, their reciprocal relations, complicated mechanisms of the functioning of a man placed in these abstract pieces of existence, so much determining his fate, were the area of constant reflection of Bolesław Prus (pen-name of Aleksander Głowacki, 1847-1912). Maybe Prus’ intention was to write a book being some sort of an allegory of Polish history, projection of the currently existing country as a mechanism, maybe a political, historical and philosophical parabola, undertaking questions about examples of a common existence, possibilities of getting to know and understanding it. But he created an exceptionally entertaining, timeless historical novel about ancient Egypt. In Polish common conscience the *Pharaoh* (1895)\(^{13}\) is perhaps

---


\(^{13}\) *Pharaoh*, transl. by M. de Mankowski (digest), New York 1900; *The Pharaoh and the Priest*, transl. by J. Curtin, Boston 1902; *Pharaoh*, Warsaw, Polestar Publications, and New York,
the only one and for sure the most important piece of literature where the heritage of the ancient Egypt is commemorated.

Prus had never been to Egypt. Egyptology was not his passion. It was being stated that the most difficult issue to understand is the fact he wrote this novel. *Pharaoh* is such an outstanding novel that to find the answer they started to investigate right after its publication. The author was known from his negative relation towards historical writing, he did not consider it as the most proper convention of the epoch. For some critics it was *strange and they wiped their eyes* (!) surprised at the ‘Egyptian’ change of Prus. Therefore, almost all analyses assumed the use of an ‘Egyptian costume’ as a secondary or even unimportant aspect of the work. It has been claimed that in this consciously accidental costume he conveyed a message and ideas referring to his closest reality, impossible to articulate directly for different reasons, for instance political. Prus broke the ‘Anti – historical’ convention before – by using exactly Egyptian staffage. In the short story *Z legend dawnego Egiptu (From the legends of Ancient Egypt, 1888)*\(^{14}\) the message is to reveal contrast between hope and man’s desires and the irrationality of human fate. But at the same time it was a visible description of a historical episode from the end of 1887, the turning point of conflict of the aged Prussian emperor Wilhelm I and his follower, Frederick, with the important role of a third influential politician, Bismarck. The conflict between ‘good’ *Horus* and ‘bad’ *Rameses* is, in fact, a political commentary of Prus, vividly interested in German politics. The author by using the trick of ‘Egyptianizing’ of the motif, and giving an assurance title (*From legends…*), at the same time gained the right to add a political punchline (death of *Horus*), and a historical and philosophical generalization. Maybe then Prus noticed that abstract ancient Egypt is not the worst idea for allegorisation of the present, or wider, many different aspects of modern history. A simple allegoric interpretation was rejected very quickly. It is possible that an emotional indifference of Prus towards Egypt is the confirmation of this trick, intuition said that not necessarily it was about the stories of the rulers from the Nile. The next step would be to search for an impulse to Egyptian idea of the *Pharaoh* in the event from

---

1887 that could draw his attention to ancient Egypt. According to this logic, Prus could a ‘combine’ novel with two layers: a historical and philosophical message, and a costume, which choice was influenced in 1894 by the memory of an idea checked seven years before, but, without doubt, Prus undertook thorough Egyptian studies already in the 90ties for the needs of the Pharaoh.

The basic plot of the the Pharaoh is very simple; the Egyptian ruler, old Rameses XII, is infirm and his power is only an illusion. The real power is in the hands of priests, represented by a crafty politician, Herhor. The successor to the throne, young Rameses XIII spots this and knows he will have to fight with the priest caste or accept a fiction of his own rule. He is not drawn by the simple desire to have power; he is rather an idealist having a vision of bringing Egypt back to the economic and military power, and justice to the people. He makes mistakes caused by his lack of political experience and lack of ability to find allies, though there are are many who are ready to support him among the priests. Herhor undertakes a cynical game with Rameses, taking advantage of the knowledge of the upcoming solar eclipse. He is improvising the gods’ anger towards the people and the intrigue of the archpriest Mefres leads to a physical annihilation of a young pharaoh. He is murdered by a professional murderer but, in some way, he wins because of the necessity of reformulating the concept of power and relations inside the state. There are two versions of the novel ending: an Epilogue skipped in the first edition changes the ending suspended in ambiguity, but not in a fictional pattern. The wise man, Menes, articulates the historic and philosophic conception relativizing the fate of Ramesses and Herhor, inscribed into the system of general unchangeable rules.

Let us come back to the ‘Egyptian’ problems of the Pharaoh. Prus’ general interest in Egypt might be stirred by different reasons. What then became a decisive element in choosing this civilization centre and not for instance Assyria, Carthage or even antique Rome? If these are the inspirations of ‘archaeological novels’ the choice of Egypt was not determined but assuming Prus knew the most important, and the most skilful techniques of Salammbô by Flaubert, he may have been discouraged from choosing Carthage because of the potential accusation of imitation. Perhaps Gautier or Ebers? Or Dzieduszycki? A rhetorical question about Uarda and Święty ptak was asked by commentators contemporary to Prus. It is possible that the Egyptian dispenser was used because
the Roman one was used almost parallel – a little earlier - by a literary rival, Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846-1916, in his famous novel *Quo vadis*, 1895/96). It cannot be excluded that Prus chose an unexploited Egyptian costume (without any doubt he knew that Ebers’ novels are literary poor and his work will stand out against the competition) cautiously, he wanted to prevent troublesome comparisons. During a promotion of the English translation of the Pharaoh in the USA, an advertised advantage of Prus’ novel was an implication of similarities to *Quo Vadis* - already known there; on the title page under the name of the translator it was emphasised that he also translated the work of Sienkiewicz. The author of the *Pharaoh* was surely not thrilled. It should be reminded that Prus had the idea of writing about ancient Babylon, unfortunately not realized. We can add one more rather humoristic hypothesis: we cannot exclude that first the title appeared by associating the name of a popular card game with the main plot of the novel. The game was named *pharaoh* by accident – after a clumsy motif of an “Egyptian” figure on the back side of the pack of cards imported from France. The main idea was betting and drawing the cards. Victory was a result of thorough strategy as well as coincidence or good luck. As every gambling game it had an element of emotions and desires. In a philosophical dimension ‘the game over the state’ is, in fact, the concept that Prus wanted to describe. Like in the *pharaoh* card game. It is hard to believe in such easy solutions but a similar suggestion of explaining the genesis of ‘Egyptian idea’ of this novel cannot be logically denied.

Was the *Pharaoh* a ‘Professorenroman’ at all? Prus not only overcame literary cliché, but also kept some elements. Surely, he gave Egypt a more serious character than just exotic decoration for the twists and turns of the heroes’ love life, as it was in the works of his predecessors, the *Pharaoh* really lacks a love affair. Love is a marginal motif, an episode not influencing the plot, in the life of a young ruler. Resignation from this motif would not be painful. The ideological assumption was totally different, at the same time Prus was freeing himself from critical remarks of his reviewers. Another cliché remained: the motif of criminal romance with typical persons. Intrigues of Mefres and Lykon, although justified by the plot, are the most artificially constructed elements of this piece of work. The majority of ‘archaeological novels’ were in fact love-sensational vaudevilles, dressed in ancient costumes. Prus treated
Egypt as a terrain on which not a superficial costume novel takes place, but a great political conflict, a struggle for power in the state. Moreover, a careful reader spots that unlike many of such literary kinds, the materials for local flavour are not boring lengthy erudite descriptions of Egyptian details. The author of the *Pharaoh* agreed for such a solution despite the fact that professional Egyptologists were among his ancestors. Perhaps as a first one. When Ebers decided to place real historical figures on the margin of a romance plot as a kind of authentication of decoration, but in reality he questions ‘archeologization’ of his text. Prus makes his heroes the central characters of Egyptian state, Herhor and Rameses XIII whose existence was denied by modern Egyptology (in times of Prus it was a questionable issue), but, in fact, this figure correctly concentrates accents of the rule of the last Ramessides.\(^{15}\)

The knowledge about Egypt that Prus skilfully took advantage of was probably coming from a small amount of sources. He did not use German works because of his poor knowledge of that language, French literature was rich enough, also the translation of ancient Egyptian texts. A careful lecture of *Les Contes populaires de l’Égypte ancienne*... (1882) by Gaston Maspero allowed for correct movement in the word of old Egyptian realia,\(^{16}\) Maspero himself treated his work as complimentary to his *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l’Orient* (1875), where he sends readers for chronological data. Extensive, almost 500-page *Lectures historiques; Historie ancienne* (1890), also containing part of Assyrie; half of the content was devoted to Egypt. The next chapters seem to be a course book for an author intending to create a novel placed in Egypt: *Thebes et la vie populaire – Le marché et les boutiques* - *Pharaon – Amon, le grand dieu de Thebes – Le recrutement de l’armée – La vie de château – La maladie et la mort – Les funérailles et le tombeau – En voyage – La bataille*. An interesting trick of Prus was also a skilful ‘Egyptologist’ adaptation of some concepts taken from historical books, well-known at that

---


\(^{16}\) Some convergences are evident: Eunana (Prus) and Matchminu (Maspero); description of Rameses’ funeral and Maspero’s chapter *Les funérailles et le tombeau*, as just as full particulars of the Temple of Amun; *Pentuer* (Prus) and *Pentaur* (Ebers, *Uarda*); see also E.de Rougé, *Le poème de Pen-ta-our: Extrait d’un mémoire sur les campagnes de Ramses II (Sesostris) dans la séance publique annuelle des cinq académies, le 14 août 1856*, Paris.
time, for instance from Draper and Buckle\textsuperscript{17}. The figure of Julian Ochorowicz, Prus’ friend, is important; Ochorowicz (1850-1917)\textsuperscript{18} gave a lecture in 1893 *O wiedzy tajemnej kapłanów egipskich* (The Secret knowledge of Egyptian priests), edited as a separate book already after the *Pharaoh* had been written, referring by the words of Preface to the author of the Prus’ novel. The main point of Secret knowledge are ponderations over the psychology of creating religious doctrines and using the techniques of persuasion by Egyptian priests, combining magic with technique etc. The similarities between Ochorowicz’s concepts and the key-moments of the *Pharaoh* are visible. Many times the practice of taking advantage of ignorance, creating recognized natural phenomena or technological achievements are shown as divine activities, pointing out to the priests, the only mediators and executors of the will of god. The title *Wiedza tajemna* - Secret knowledge was perverse; the knowledge monopoly was his secret tool of absolute power.

The influence of one more source of inspiration is also possible; *Historia Egiptu* (The History of Egypt) by Ignacy Żagiell (1826-1891)\textsuperscript{19}. Żagiell, contemporary critics were wrote, *woke up in Prus an interest in Egypt at all and exceptional respect for this country*; moreover, it was suggested that facts mentioned in *Historia* concerning the end of the Ramesside dynasty constitute the frames of the *Pharaoh* subject. In fact, Maspero, opposite to Żagiell, carefully described the succession of Rameses XII, not mentioning Rameses XIII at all\textsuperscript{20}. A historian of literature, F. Ziejka, undertook the polemics point-


\textsuperscript{18} Ochorowicz was a very interesting and characteristic person of the 19th century; investigator of psychology, physiology of brain, researcher of electricity phenomena, electromagnetism, parapsychology, hypnotism and esoteric knowledge.

\textsuperscript{19} *Historia starożytne Egiptu* (History of Ancient Egypt, 2 vols.; Vilna 1880); an unusual and large book, but one should keep one’s distance. Żagiell was a dreamer and deceiver more than researcher, and his work is undoubtedly a compilation, much as he should like to be seen individually.

\textsuperscript{20} *Histoire ancienne des Peuples de l’Orient par...*, Paris 1893, 288-289. *Nota bene* in another book the same time (1893), *Ancient Egypt* by Waleria Jędrzejewiczowa, we can find information about Herhor as direct successor of Ramses XII. Polish *Wielka Encyklopedia Powszechna Ilustrowana* (The Great Universal Illustrated Encyclopedia) based on Campollion’s *Monuments*, Rosellini’s *Monumenti*, Lepsius’ *Denkmäler* and some works of Mariette; the article *Egypt* (1896) comprise the list of Ramessides I-XIII, after Carl Richard Lepsius.
ing out the vast disproportion. The growth of several Żagiell’s sentences into a big novel really appears to be a risky thesis. On the other hand, Ziejka stresses, potentially very possible, the influence of further French sources, not only Maspero, but also the book of Léon Ménard\textsuperscript{21}, having an almost identical titles or scientific works of August Mariette\textsuperscript{22}. Moreover, he draws the attention to historical works not referring to the history of ancient Egypt and specifically similar with the depiction of Prus’ historical processes\textsuperscript{23}.

Egyptologists also paid attention the work of Prus. T. Andrzejewski\textsuperscript{24}, analyzing sources referring to the late Ramesside Period, pointed out the surprising correctness of many of Prus’ accounts, who managed to avoid didactic erudite showing off. Z. Žaba\textsuperscript{25}, S. Morenz\textsuperscript{26}, I. Katznelson\textsuperscript{27} and A. Niwiński\textsuperscript{28} also made notes and remarks on the novel.

\textsuperscript{21} Historie des anciens peuples de l’Orient, Paris 1883; his name is not included in Who Was Who in Egyptology.
\textsuperscript{22} Aperçu de l’histoire ancienne d’Égypte, 1864.
\textsuperscript{23} Mainly T. Korzon, Wewnętrzne dzieje Polski za czasów Stanisława Augusta […] , (Domestic History of Poland during the Reign of Stanislaw August, 4 vols.); Pharaoh is a kind of transposition of Polish situation at the end of 18th century, and some parallels are between Ramses XIII and Prince Joseph Poniatowski.
\textsuperscript{24} „Meander” 1953-1954 (in Polish).
\textsuperscript{25} Czech edition of Pharaoh, Praha 1950.
\textsuperscript{26} Die Begegnung Europas mit Ägypten, Zurich 1968, 187.
\textsuperscript{27} In Russian translation of Pharaoh, Moskva 1972.