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Abstract

As there is limited archeological evidence of Libyan society from Libya, assigning a social identity to an individual living in Egypt during the Third Intermediate Period (Dynasties 21 — 24, ca. 1076-723 BCE) is challenging. Comparison of textual and visual themes across a range of artifacts will allow further investigation into a connection between Libyan social identity and kinship. Case studies will cover genealogical texts, including texts on stelae and block statues, to provide insight into their function and significance to the Libyan people. In addition to investigating a living Libyan social identity, the presentation of the social identity of the dead will be examined. The combination of royal and non-royal items intentionally selected for inclusion in the funerary assemblages of the Libyan kings buried at Tanis, with emphasis on the burial of Psusennes I, will support the idea that kinship played an integral role in a Libyan social identity.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Based on archeological evidence, Juan Carlos Moreno García concludes that the people who are traditionally labeled as “Libyans” were involved in a variety of different lifestyles from trade to pastoralism and lived in a variety of different terrains in North Africa. They also were not limited to the west of Egypt (the western desert of Egypt and what we think of as the modern country of Libya). There were, in fact, Libyan groups (the most common of which were the Meshwesh and Libu) in a variety of places including in the Delta and Middle Egypt. While they had the same shared cultural foundation, the archeology of all these groups appears to document very different lifestyles.¹ It is based on this that Moreno García argues that the very term “Libyan” as a marker for people who were from west of the Nile Valley is not an accurate term, as there is too much diversity to assign all these groups a single label.² However, for the most amount of clarity and for lack of a better term, “Libyans” will be used here to refer to the semi-nomadic people who self-identified as belonging to or having been descended from one of the communities of the Libyans.

There is little physical evidence that enables a classification of the social identity of the people who modern scholars label as Libyans who lived in Egypt (Figure 1-2) during Dynasties 21-24 (1076 BCE- 723 BCE) (Figures 3-4). Previous studies have attempted to answer this question and there are two major schools of thought: those that believe it is possible to identify a Libyan identity and those who do not. Rachel Mittelman conducted a study on pottery from the Third Intermediate Period and concluded that no stylistic changes could be linked to Libyan


identity influences, indicating there was no ethnic difference between Egyptians and Libyans in this aspect. On the other hand, others, such as Jean Li in her study of women and identity in the Third Intermediate Period, have concluded that there was a decline of Egyptian identity due to a distinctly Libyan foreign ruling power. This then prompts the question, what is the evidence for a Libyan ethnic identity in Egypt? How might the Libyans have socially defined themselves within Egypt, and what presentational form did it take? Previous scholarship has debated how integrated the Libyans were in Egyptian society and how that affected their social identity. Notwithstanding that, imagery and text reveal that, in Egyptian society, it was relatively easy to cross ethnic boundaries assuming the individual adopted the correct cultural and social practices present in Egypt. It would be simple enough to consider them strictly Egyptian, as they wore Egyptian dress and appeared to adhere to Egyptian culture, yet their real identities were much more nuanced.

Ethnicity is defined by the minimum number of cultural practices required for membership to separate one group of people from another. In his book, *Wretched Kush*, Stuart Tyson Smith follows the premise that ethnic identity is created by a shared culture, language, and history, and can be self-defined and/or imposed in colonial contexts. For the purposes of this

---


6 Nash, “Core Elements of Ethnicity,” 24-25.

thesis, this definition will also be adhered to. Ethnic identities are created by individuals, shaped within their historical context, and can be identified in the archeological record by looking for situational patterns. In Smith’s research, it becomes clear that identity was a fluid and living concept. For example, it was possible for foreigners to cross ethnic boundaries and meet Egyptian norms as demonstrated by the Nubian soldier Mahirperi, a prominent member of Egyptian society, who was depicted according to the Egyptian artistic canon of an Egyptian man while exhibiting the skin tone and facial features commonly used to represent Nubians. Acceptance into Egyptian society was thus not dependent on ancestry or skin color. It was the cultural or social identity that was of import; for a culturally “foreign” person to be accepted as an “Egyptian,” one needed to behave in a way that was appropriate in the eyes of Egyptian society. Depictions of Libyans in Egyptian art prior to the Libyan Period demonstrate stereotypes meant to distance Libyans from Egyptians: skin color, clothing, tattoos, hairstyles, and one or two feathers placed into their hair. This practice of stereotyping disappears in the New Kingdom and into the Third Intermediate Period under the Libyan rulers. Nevertheless, images of Libyans do retain the ethnic marker of a feather in their hair.

The archeological record is a valuable resource, providing material that can serve as reference against the elite ancient Egyptian bias found in art and literature against ethnically different groups. It is important to note that material culture is as functional as written material

---

9 Smith, *Wretched Kush*, 22.
11 Reference Figure 5 and Figure 6.
in the “creation and assertion” of culture, however, not all material culture is related to ethnicity. For example, Smith references studies of Egyptian colonial sites in Nubia in which a gross percentage of approximately ninety percent of the archeological items were Egyptian. This begs the question, when does the interpretation of these items move from being classified as Egyptian to being associated with a different culture or vice versa? This example underlines the importance of context when trying to connect material culture to an ethnic or social group.

In an effort to identify Libyan influence in imagery and text, multiple avenues of study must be pursued. First, one must consider the presentation of the living; what form of representation are Libyans choosing to give to themselves? They are actively engaging in Egyptian social life and religious practices, so the question is how they would choose to represent themselves in private art and text which would be seen by Libyans and Egyptians alike. Second, the representations of the dead should be considered. According to ancient Egyptian religious thought, burial rituals and tombs are valuable because the Egyptians recognized the connection between death and social order in the preparations for the afterlife. Through the decoration and filling of the tomb, the public interactions with the dead, grave offerings, and funeral cults, the deceased’s wealth and social position were put on display. This created the opportunity for living individuals to redefine or negotiate their social roles, identity, and even ethnicity as the living and the dead interacted. Also, assuming the grave items were prepared in advance and the deceased directed the decorating of their tomb prior to their passing, the funerary context would reflect the identity

13 Smith, Wretched Kush, 31.
14 Smith, Wretched Kush, 35.
15 Smith, Wretched Kush, 37-38.
16 Smith, Wretched Kush, 37.
the individual wished to project, a final proclamation to the world of the living.  

Studies in other parts of the world have proven it possible to identify multiple ethnicities among groups of people. A study of a Teotihuacan enclave at Matacapan in Mexico demonstrated that different ethnicities in the same location can be identified through dress, language, and culinary practices. Similar to the rituals practiced by the Egyptians, identity is a prominent feature in funerary architecture and ritual items as the individual’s identity travels with them into the afterlife assuming that a proper burial, monument, and grave goods are provided. In the ancient Greek world, funerals, burials, as well as monuments, are valuable resources in deciphering ethnic identity as they expressed the “primordial ties” that are a part of ethnicity. Generally speaking, religion, rituals, and burials are all the material expressions of a person’s worldview. This thesis asserts that the “Libyans,” while identifying as “Egyptian,” clearly demonstrated influences from their ancestry that shaped their worldview as shown in the material culture they have left behind. They formed a self-defined social identity that was living and fluid, resulting in socially and ethnically complex imagery and funeral items.

This thesis will explore what it means to be a Libyan living in Egypt and how their social identity was expressed to determine whether it is possible to identify Libyan social markers and what they might be. When studying the degrees of assimilation of a group of people, it can be

17 Smith, Wretched Kush, 42.


easy to assume all aspects of self-identity are expressed equally. As Linda Hulin explains, it is easy to mistakenly create a definition of Libyan by requiring them to dress in Libyan clothes, eat Libyan food, use Libyan objects, and follow the Libyan religion. The above premise is incorrect because each individual is different and not all the aforementioned characteristics are necessarily equal. Not all are required for a person to identify as Libyan, nor do they all need to be expressed to the same quantity.  

This also functions on the assumption that it is possible to identify traits that are specifically un-Egyptian as there are still questions about what was the Libyan’s religion and what food they did indeed eat.  

As there is limited archeological evidence of Libyans from Libya, there is nothing that could serve as a comparison to so-called Libyan objects in Egypt.  

Assimilation can have economic and political aspects, but it also occurs in the social realm and context reveals how people of Libyan descent in Egypt navigated their personal social identity.

To explore the question of how Libyan social identity was expressed, a variety of objects from the world of the living and the dead will be analyzed. The Genealogy Stela of Pasenhor, a votive offering to the Apis Bull, links the owner Pasenhor to not only Libyan royalty but also to Libyan chiefs. Another example of a Libyan votive offering stela is that of Padiaset who not only expresses Libyan connections in the text but also visually presents himself with clear Libyan markers. The extensive genealogies typical of this period also are found on objects that

---


22 For further commentary on scholarly debates about Libyan characteristics, refer to Chapter One of this thesis, “Historiography,” 10-13.


24 Musée du Louvre IM 2846, Cat. No. 31.

25 Musée du Louvre N 413.
do not belong to specifically Libyan owners. Examples addressed in this thesis include the Memphite Priestly Stela, the statue genealogy of Basa, and the block statue of Djedkhonsuiufankh. These items will demonstrate how the genealogy genre appears to have been influenced by Libyan practices. Roberto Gozzoli does not support this idea, citing Ramesside genealogy examples and the fact that the Libyans did not appear to have a written language. However, I will argue that the opposite is true, that the evidence will show that lengthy genealogies are a Libyan characteristic that the Egyptians then adopted. In comparison to non-royal self-representation, the funerary objects of the Libyan rulers buried at Tanis will also be analyzed. The common features across the burials of Dynasty 21-24 kings will be discussed with particular emphasis on the burial assemblage of Psusennes I. Through examination, a theme of reuse becomes clear, and I will offer a possible explanation as to why non-royal items were included in a royal burial. Previous scholarship has debated how integrated the Libyans were in Egyptian society and what that means with regard to their social identity. All of the artifacts discussed in Chapter Three will demonstrate that kinship was a vital component in Libyan social understanding, which is a noticeable deviation from previous practices, as it is presented in various forms for personal expressions of identity.

26 Egyptian Museum, Berlin 23673.

27 Institute of the Study of Ancient Cultures Museum (formerly the Oriental Institute Museum), Chicago, OIM 10729.

28 Egyptian Museum, Cairo, CG 42211.


My thesis will examine what it means to be a Libyan living in Egypt by analyzing representations in imagery and text on stelae, statues, sarcophagi, and coffins. This thesis recognizes that identity is a multifaceted construct that can be difficult to understand or explain, particularly when it comes to ancient cultures. In the past, the presence of a multiplicity of identities has been unappreciated, but modern scholarship is working to rectify this. My research will demonstrate that Libyans understood and related to the world around them through a socially complex lens that included Egyptian and Libyan components.

**Historiography**

In the early twentieth century, information on the Libyans was largely limited to images in tombs, such as the Middle Kingdom tomb of Khnumhotep and Imeny, and temples, such as the temple of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu, and from Manetho’s king list.\(^3\)\(^1\) It should, moreover, be noted that Manetho’s list was written circa 400 BCE without knowledge of the political context of the Third Intermediate Period, so his listing of kings was not complete.\(^3\)\(^2\) The first scientific study of the site of the Libyan capital of Tanis occurred in 1798 when Napoleon invaded Egypt, bringing with him a variety of scholars to document and record what they found.\(^3\)\(^3\) It wasn’t until the 1860s that a scientific excavation of the city was undertaken by Françoise Auguste Mariette, focusing mainly on the Temple of Amun. Through his studies, Mariette came to believe that the city of Tanis was the lost city of Pi-Rameses, the New Kingdom capital of Ramesses II.\(^3\)\(^4\) Later, in the 1880s, Sir William Flinders Petrie continued

---


excavations at Tanis, however, he also mistakenly thought the city was Pi-Ramesses.

At the turn of the 20th century, available scholarship on the Libyans was still limited as there was little archeological information. In 1912, James Henry Breasted wrote an overview of Egyptian history and touched on the recorded Libyan rulers named in the ancient king lists. He viewed them as possessing little initiative and surmised that, in general, they “did nothing for the great of the empire.” Breasted also made the argument that the royal Libyans of Dynasty 22 (943 BCE - 746 BCE) were fully Egyptianized, meaning that they adhered to the Egyptian religion and social customs, although Breasted acknowledged that the average person of Libyan heritage may not have been so acculturated. This characterization of Libyans continued into 1982 when I. E. S Edwards claimed that Sheshonq I was Egyptian through birth and upbringing and was foreign only in regard to descent. Oric Bates wrote the first monograph on the Libyans in 1914 and his work is still influential. His map of Libyan territories, listing twelve possible Libyan peoples in the Western Desert, is still used and although it was based on conjecture, there

---


are no modern studies to discount it. His book examined various aspects of life, including race, music, weaponry, and religion. He believed the Libyans belonged to the Mediterranean Hamitic race and the size of the group was dependent upon how many times the Egyptians mentioned them. He also created a list of Libyan gods, or deities that were described as belonging to or in connection with the Libyans from Egyptian or Greek sources. However, there are some criticisms of his work. He continuously refers to aspects of Libyan life as “primitive” and his list of Libyan gods has not been corroborated by any of the works referenced in this thesis.

It wasn’t until the later twentieth century that scholarship began to consider broader ideas of identity for the Libyans. Kenneth Kitchen, an expert on the Third Intermediate Period, provided an in-depth study that detailed the chaotic struggle for power between the Egyptian and Libyan social and political forces. Robert Ritner, in a study of extensive genealogies during the Third Intermediate Period, concluded that stelae, such as Pasenhor’s Genealogy Stela, exhibiting


41 Bates defines the Hamitic race as consisting of people from North Africa, which includes peoples from Libya and Ethiopia; Oric Bates, The Eastern Libyans: An Essay (London: Macmillan, 1914), xxi-xxii, 44.


43 Bates, Eastern Libyans, 184-190.


an emphasis on ancestry, came about as a direct result of Libyan cultural influence. Ritner’s further research into Libyan identity outlined a very complicated interpretation. He concluded that there was an active effort by Libyans, or at least the royal Libyans, to redefine their public identities to fit Egyptian expectations. Ritner proposed that there is no evidence that Libyans saw themselves as foreigners during the 21st Dynasty.

However, Ritner noted clear differences between the ruling styles of the Libyan rulers and prior pharaonic kings. Royal Libyans kept their “tribal” titles, which was unprecedented, and their conduct, according to Ritner, seemed to be based on “tribal” politics. Extensive genealogies provided justifications for the inheritance of offices and for marrying foreign powers to create kinship links, which is also an attribute seen in “tribal” cultures. Ritner also stated that the substitution of “tribal” leaders for the king in land offering scenes to the gods documented a “tribal” concept of land ownership and assigned this concept to Libyan influences.

Current studies of Libyan material culture, before Libyan settlement in Egypt, are still in the early phases. Juan Carlos Moreno García is one of the leading scholars pushing the boundary of the definition of Libyan identity and he challenges the conclusions of previous scholars such as...


Ritner. Sheldon Gosline has also contributed to recent studies in Libya, specifically examining burials. Through his research, he concluded there is evidence of monumental burials and permanent burials, which is contrary to the belief that the semi-nomadic Libyans would bury their dead “where they dropped.” He also concluded there was no prior practice of Libyans burying their dead on temple grounds which makes the burial of the royal Libyan kings at Tanis unique. This prompts questions as to the nature of these burials that will be addressed later.

Other scholars have also examined how Libyan ethnicity was expressed during the Third Intermediate Period. John Baines has argued that individuals of Libyan descent were able to manipulate their identity to their advantage, which meant there was no culturally significant difference between the Egyptians and the Libyans. He also argues that since only Libyan names were kept and there was no adoption of the Libyan language (or the writing of the Libyan language in hieroglyphic), this meant that there was a high degree of assimilation. This is in opposition to the conclusions drawn by Ritner that Libyan practices affected their methods of governance. O’Connor also disagrees with Baines. He asserts Dynasty 22 was strongly Libyan in character which largely aligns with the studies of Ritner.

---


56 Chapter 1, 19-20; Chapter 3, 38-52.


Scholarship over the last hundred years has made great strides in learning about the Libyan people. Numerous studies have been conducted elucidating the changes in coffin decoration and use of iconography in the Third Intermediate Period. Scholars such as Kitchen, Ritner, and Moreno García have conducted in-depth studies to correct the antiquated and colonialist interpretations of Breasted. Through the work of recent scholars, it is now understood how socially and politically diverse the Third Intermediate Period was and the Libyan kings themselves were a product of this diversity. This research has been further supported by advances in research on the topic of identity. Scholars such as Smith emphasize the importance of recognizing identity as a living construct, that is composed of various influences, and the expression of which varies between individuals.

---

Chapter 2: Historical Background

The Libyans were originally semi-nomadic and came into Egypt for grazing ground for their cattle, a practice possibly documented in Egypt as far back as the Early Dynastic (2900 BCE – 2590 BCE).¹ The designation “Libyan” is an umbrella term for all the smaller groups together and includes the Meshwesh (the shortened version of which is the Ma), the Libu, and the Mahasun.² Imagery of Libyans prior to the Third Intermediate Period portrayed them in a stereotypical fashion as a way to “other” them, or separate them from the Egyptians.³ They were generally shown with lighter, yellowish, tattooed skin, wearing colorful garments often made of animal hides, or penis sheaths. They wore a sidelock of hair and a feathered headdress which indicated not only their Libyan heritage and high status but the group with which they were affiliated. A vertical feather showed a connection to the Libu people while a horizontal feather designated the Meshwesh people.⁴ A combination of a vertical and a horizontal feather indicated a person who was a dual chief; or someone who identified as a chief over multiple groups of people.⁵ To accompany the stereotypical appearance, the Libyans also had stereotypical behaviors that were explicitly non-Egyptian. The Victory Stela of Piye, erected by Piye after the Nubians successfully conquered Egypt, presents the Libyans as unclean and it fell to the Nubians

¹ The Libyan Palette (Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 27434/CG 14238) dated to ca. 3,000 BC is thought to reference an encounter of the Egyptians with the Libyan peoples. Whether that contact was violent or peaceful, is entirely up to interpretation; Moreno García, “Elusive Libyans,” 156-159, 165; John Taylor, “Third Intermediate Period (1069-664 BC),” in The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt, ed. Ian Shaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 339.


⁵ Saleh, Investigating Identities, 92.
to restore Egypt. The text describes the Libyans as uncircumcised, a people who ate fish, and an abomination before those who were pure.

In imagery before the Libyan period, the depictions of Libyans on temple and tomb walls are limited to images of the Four Races of Mankind, of the Nine Bows (the traditional enemies of Egypt), and of foreigners. The Four Races represent the four basic divisions of mankind as demonstrated in the tomb of Seti I (Figure 5) represented in their stereotypical dress. This includes Asiatics (depicted with facial hair, yellow skin, and decorated kilts), Nubians (depicted with black skin, short hair, and decorated sashes), Libyans (depicted in the way characterized above), and Egyptians (depicted with red-brown skin, shoulder-length hair, and wearing a white kilt). The Nine Bows represented the inhabitants of the surrounding foreign lands that wore different clothes, worshipped different gods, and had different cultural norms. As the Egyptians believed their way of life maintained the order of the universe, others who did not live according to the Egyptian standard were agents of chaos. One way for the king to fend off the forces of chaos was to defeat foreigners in battle which is reflected in the iconography of smiting captives, therefore restoring order. The depiction of the Nine Bows shows the nine enemies of Egypt, which included Libyans, bound and captive, demonstrating Egypt’s dominance over the surrounding peoples. This motif is demonstrated on the prisoner tiles excavated from the rubbish

---


8 Smith, *Wretched Kush*, 22.


heaps from the mortuary temple of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu (Figures 6 and 7).

However, after the reign of Ramesses III, the stereotypical imagery of Libyans stops and is replaced by representing them dressed in traditional Egyptian clothes. Yet, private stelae continue to use the feather as an ethnic marker. In the imagery of the Middle Kingdom tomb of Knumhotep and Imeny, Libyans are depicted in daily life scenes in various agricultural activities. A scene from the Middle Kingdom tomb of Djehtyhotep at Deir el-Bersheh depicts men pulling a colossal statue, of which some have been identified as Libyans based on their clothes and hairstyles. This demonstrates that people with Libyan backgrounds were involved for millennia in multiple aspects of Egyptian life, from commerce to manual labor, and earned a living alongside the Egyptian people.

Imagery from Medinet Habu and the narratives of various papyri, such as the Great Harris Papyrus (BM 9999) which describes the Libyan defeat at the hands of Ramesses III and their relocation to the Delta, can give the impression that the Libyans were consistently planning attacks against the Egyptians that the king had to defeat. However, source materials, such as the letters from Payankh, a general of Ramesses III, and evidence of trade between the Egyptians and the Libyans have convinced Moreno García that the Libyans were highly involved in trade.

---

and the economy and were on relatively good terms with the Egyptians they interacted with.\textsuperscript{16} It is entirely possible, however, that the Libyan’s semi-nomadic lifestyle could have caused conflict as they went where desert resources or food and water for cattle were located. Moreno García, therefore, has proposed that these royal depictions captured and aggrandized these conflicts, but hostility was not the norm between these two groups.\textsuperscript{17} Nevertheless, incursions by Libyan Libu and Meshwesh peoples were put down by Merenptah and Ramesses III, and prisoners were placed in settlements in the Delta.\textsuperscript{18} As a result of those defeats, Libyan mercenaries made up a significant portion of the Egyptian army under the Ramesside kings.\textsuperscript{19} Later on, large numbers began settling in Egypt, possibly due to food shortages or pressures from the Sea Peoples, groups of peoples from the eastern Mediterranean that besieged Egypt at the end of the Bronze Age (ca. 1200 BCE).\textsuperscript{20}

The historical period designated by Egyptologists as the Third Intermediate Period (Dynasties 21-24, c. 1076 BCE - 723 BCE) follows the fall of the New Kingdom upon the death of Ramesses XI. The lack of civil wars or rebellions at this time indicates that the transition of rule from the Ramesside kings of Dynasty 20 to the Libyan kings of Dynasty 21 (1076 BCE – 944 BCE) proceeded smoothly.\textsuperscript{21} Due to continued involvement and interaction with the Egyptians, the Libyans of this period had also become socially complex, demonstrating characteristics of both Egyptian and Libyan identity.\textsuperscript{22} As a result of their continued involvement

\textsuperscript{16} Moreno García, “Elusive Libyans,” 160.

\textsuperscript{17} Moreno García, “Elusive Libyans,” 160-164.

\textsuperscript{19} Taylor, “Third Intermediate Period,” 334-335.

\textsuperscript{20} Taylor, “Third Intermediate Period,” 339.

\textsuperscript{21} Taylor, “Third Intermediate Period,” 331.

\textsuperscript{22} Reference Chapter 3, “Case Studies.”
in the Egyptian court and military, some Libyan chiefs gained power and influence and took advantage of the power vacuum after Ramesses XI’s death. However, during this period, Egypt was far from unified. The North fell under the control of the Libyans and the South was controlled by Egyptians in Thebes. While Dynasty 21 was shoring up its power in the North, an Egyptian named Herihor living in Thebes took the office of high priest of Amun and presented himself as the dual king of Egypt.

It was only under Sheshonq I of Dynasty 22 (945 BCE- 715 BCE) that steps were taken to curb Thebes’s power by connecting the king with the most powerful political position in the South, the high priest of Amun. Kitchen argues that an alliance between these theocratic powers and the king was initiated to prevent decentralization. Sheshonq appointed his son Iuput as the high priest in Thebes and placed other family members and supporters in important offices. However, these positions were not hereditary (in that positions were not directly passed from father to son). Rather, each successor had to be appointed by the king. Alliances with politically powerful locals were also achieved through marriages, connecting them to the royal family. Libyan rulers were able to reestablish some of the prestige held by Egypt through military expeditions into Israel, Judah, and Gaza. However, after the death of Sheshonq I, central power fragmented as significant offices became hereditary by once again passing from father to son and local princes and other Libyan chiefs gained power. Eventually, Dynasty 24 (736 BCE - 723

---

BCE) was established by Libyans in Sais. Ultimately, the Nubians pushed into Egypt establishing Dynasty 25 (722 BCE - 655 BCE).28 It is also important to note that even while Libyans held pharaonic power, there were still Libyan communities around the outskirts of Egypt that also posed a threat to the central power.29

Despite the continual battle for the centralization of power, the Libyans were active in rebuilding the economy. Fortresses were erected in Upper Egypt during Dynasty 21 to help maintain Nile traffic and facilitate trade. These forts also helped to suppress local insurrections and maintain the authority of Libyan kings.30 With regard to agriculture, it is difficult to give an opinion as to how abundant farming was as there is limited information. However, donation stelae from Dynasty 22 (943 BCE - 746 BCE) and 23 (c. 730 BCE) show that the North was able to produce enough yield to survive and had enough surplus to donate to temples.31 There was some activity in royal building projects, however, it was nowhere near as prolific as that of the kings of the New Kingdom. Under Psusennes I of Dynasty 21, the Great Temple of Amun at Tanis was constructed using building materials from nearby sites. Additions to this temple would continue in stages into the Ptolemaic Period.32

The strong central government in place during the reigns from Sheshonq I through Osorkon II also allowed them to build the Bubastite Portal at the Temple of Amun at Karnak and


the ‘Festival Hall’ at Bubastis. Outside of that time-period, Libyan kings were involved in monumental work in other ways. Statues and monuments from around Egypt, especially from nearby Pi-Ramesses, were usurped to help legitimize and strengthen the power base of the Libyan kings. Royal buildings, however, were largely limited to repairs or “minor additions.” Monumental architecture was not the only object of usurpation as royal Libyan burials included items from New Kingdom tombs. All the royal dead from Dynasties 21 and 22 were buried in reused sarcophagi or in sarcophagi carved from existing monuments. The kings and princes were buried with heirlooms or reused objects such as amulets or pottery. The royal Libyan burials that have been found are located within the grounds of the Temple of Amun at Tanis, which is different from the location of the burials of previous Egyptian kings who were buried in designated royal necropoleis. It has been suggested this was done to provide more protection and to prevent tomb robbing. Another theory is that this demonstrates a reflection of the growing personal relationship between the gods and man. Regardless of the reason, burials resembling a cache were not uncommon during this time and there is evidence of extended family members being buried together in the Theban area.

One of the most well-known structures of the city of Tanis is the Great Temple of Amun. It was not until the 1860s that the alluvial deposits were removed from around the building.

36 Aston, Burial Assemblages, 397.
37 Aston, Burial Assemblages, 398-399.
38 Li, Women, Gender, and Identity, 19.
allowing proper study. Sir William Flinders Petrie drew a floor plan of the temple, copied inscriptions, and made observations on the urban organization of the surrounding town. However, he incorrectly assumed Tanis was the Ramesside capital city of Pi-Ramesses and did not realize the site could date at the earliest to the Middle Kingdom. Pierre Montet heard the rumors that Tanis was the alleged Hyksos capital of Avaris which later would become the city of Pi-Ramesses in the New Kingdom. In 1928, Montet decided he wanted to excavate there. From 1929-1940, Montet worked on the southern part of the Great Temple of Amun and the front area of the Temple of Anta. He preferred large-scale excavation and did not place much emphasis on the pottery that was found. Within the excavation areas of the Great Temple, he found foundation deposits from the Third Intermediate Period through the Ptolemaic period. In 1939, Montet outlined the outer wall and discovered the inner wall had bricks stamped with the name of Psusennes I. Montet and his team also found the tops of underground buildings made with unfired bricks alongside the external wall. Having noticed a hole in the roof of one such building, his team began digging. On February 27th, 1939, Montet entered the tomb of a king who is now


41 Coutts and Yoyotte, Gold of the Pharaohs, 15.

42 Montet was proven wrong by Labib Habachi who visited the nearby site of Tell al-Dab'a in 1942 and concluded that Tell al-Dab'a was in fact Avaris. Habachi's theory was later confirmed through excavations under the supervision of Manfred Bietak of the Austrian Archeological Institute in the 1980s; Jill Kamil, Labib Habachi: The Life and Legacy of an Egyptologist (New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2007), 76-77.

43 Coutts and Yoyotte, Gold of the Pharaohs, 16-17.
known as Osorkon II.\textsuperscript{44}

Within the building, the team found four chambers with reliefs from two of the Egyptian Netherworld Books: the Book of the Dead and the Book of Night. It was very clear that these were tombs, however, there was no evidence found of a chapel or an area of worship for the living above.\textsuperscript{45} Several kings were buried in the structure including Sheshonq III, Takeloth II, Osorkon II, and Psusennes I. Along with these kings was buried Prince Hornakht, son of Osorkon II, and General Wendjebaendjed, who was buried with all the fittings of a king.\textsuperscript{46} Pierre Montet himself describes finding the tomb of Osorkon II as the “great event” of his 11\textsuperscript{th} campaign.\textsuperscript{47} Within, he found funerary objects such as ushabtis, however, he does note that Osorkon II’s tomb showed signs of robbery.\textsuperscript{48} In the tomb of Psusennes I, Montet found an impressive and apparently undisturbed burial. The burial chamber was filled with statuettes, bronze tools, pottery, and accessories. Most impressive was the glimpse of the silver coffin of the king that Montet could see through the cracks of the inner sarcophagus. On March 20\textsuperscript{th}, 1939, in the presence of the Egyptian king, King Farouk, and the Director of the Department of Antiquities, Montet opened the inner sarcophagus finding inside a silver coffin and golden mask as well as jewelry, amulets, and a collar.


\textsuperscript{46} Coutts and Yoyotte, \textit{Gold of the Pharaohs}, 19-24.

\textsuperscript{47} Montet, \textit{Douze Années}, 107.

\textsuperscript{48} Montet, \textit{Douze Années}, 107-110.
It is the nesting sarcophagi, coffin, and other burial goods of Psusennes I that will provide interesting insights into the composition of Libyan identity and so will be an object of focus later in this thesis.
Chapter 3: Case Studies

Analysis of material culture is not limited to objects but can also be applied to architecture. During the Third Intermediate Period, Libyan kings usurped and reused statuary and architecture. Non-royal individuals also usurped and reused funerary goods and equipment.\(^1\) This phenomenon was not limited to the North. Egyptians in the South also usurped and reused funerary equipment.\(^2\) According to Caroline MacLeod, a symptom of the economic uncertainty of this period was the limited importation of materials.\(^3\) As a result, previously constructed coffins were reused by altering the designs and inscriptions to fit the needs and appearance of the new owner.\(^4\) MacLeod also argues against the idea that the reuse of goods was due to uncertainty about whether graves would be plundered. She instead argues that the reuse and redesign reflect the growing focus on painted decorations and spells rather than on coffin construction.\(^5\) The reuse of items was not limited to the royal Libyan family; nonroyal tombs from Thebes no longer focused on tomb wall art and placed the emphasis on coffin art and papyri. As a result, it can be concluded that the phenomenon of reuse is not a result of Libyan

---

\(^1\) Usurpation was a practice in which the name of a prior owner was completely obliterated so the new owner might claim an item as their own. Reuse did not take this step and the original owner’s name was left intact; Peter Brand, “Usurpation of Monuments,” *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology* 1 no. 1 (2010): 1-3.

\(^2\) Li, *Women, Gender, and Identity*, 84-85.


\(^4\) MacLeod, “Creation of Third Intermediate Period Coffin,” 74-75.

\(^5\) Macleod, “Creation of a Third Intermediate Period Coffin,” 74-75.
cultural influence as the Egyptian Theban political power also reused and usurped funerary items.⁶

In this section, a corpus of objects with connections to the Libyan people of the Third Intermediate Period will be analyzed. These objects, which were not examined first-hand, were chosen because they demonstrate a combination of Egyptian and Libyan influences. The analyses of these objects will demonstrate the variables at play in the composition of Libyan social identity. Objects to be included are: The Genealogy Stela of Pasenhor, Stela of Padiaset, the Memphite Priestly Stela, the statue genealogy of Basa, the block statue of Djedkhonsuiufankh, and the burial assemblages of the Libyan kings buried at Tanis with specific emphasis on the burial assemblage of Psusennes I.

**Apis Bull Votive Stelae**

Outside of the immediate royal family, kinship links can be documented on stelae that were commissioned by individuals who identified as belonging to one of the groups that fall under the term Libyan. Stelae are made of wood or stone and usually take a rectangular or rounded-top shape and bear writing, imagery, or a combination of both.⁷ They were introduced in Egypt in the Early Dynastic Period (2900 BCE – 2600 BCE) and were first used in a funerary context but later used in religious and political settings.⁸ Prior to the reign of the Libyan kings, ancestry and kinship was important to the working classes of ancient Egypt because land was legally distributed through the

---


generations by proving relation. For the royal family, genealogy was also important due to familial succession practices. The first known royal example of a genealogical reference is by King Djer from Dynasty 1 who named his mother in an inscription. In the Old Kingdom and the Middle Kingdom, genealogical inscriptions consisted of the nuclear family but it is difficult to follow a family past several generations. In the New Kingdom, the genealogical inscriptions become lengthier, however, most only extend two to three generations. Ramesses II of Dynasty 19 is the first king to provide detailed lists of his children and maternal grandparents. On private tombs and monuments, there are more extensive genealogies that coincide with the rise of hereditary offices, however, these usually extend only a few generations. Gozzoli believes these family lists were used to emphasize their rights and their political positions in society.

**Genealogy Stela of Pasenhor**

Genealogy records were common at the end of the New Kingdom but these records only become standard on private stelae or statuary into the Third Intermediate Period.

---


12 Bierbrier, “Genealogies,” 813.


They were used in a votive offering setting at sites of religious significance, the text recording the owner’s genealogy.\textsuperscript{17} The Serapeum Stela of Pasenhor (figure 8) was placed in the Memphite Serapeum Catacombs at Sakkara upon the death of the sacred Apis bull in the 37\textsuperscript{th} year of Sheshonq V. It was discovered by Mariette on February 26\textsuperscript{th}, 1852.\textsuperscript{18} The stela (Louvre IM 2846) is made of limestone, a stone that was easily obtainable and relatively easy to work.\textsuperscript{19} It stands 0.29 m. high, is 0.185 m. wide, and is 0.052 m. thick.

Righthand text facing Pasenhor:\textsuperscript{20}

\[
\text{ḏ(d).tn sꜣ-mrꜣf jnk ḫr mk jtꜣf Wꜣjr r nwꜣf mk wj mkꜣj jtsj Wꜣjr r nwꜣf hꜣ rmꜣ nb pꜣ.t nb.t rhy.t ḫnm.m.t nb.(t) jnk ny.t-sw.t nꜣ.t jwꜣj ḫr ns.t n.t jtsj Wꜣjr ny.t-sw.tꜣf m ḫw.t-šṣr jtt wr m ḫw.t-ḥtmt-sꜣẖꜣf sꜣẖꜣf m ḫw.t-wtꜣs.t mꜣ jrsf tn rhy.t ḫnm.m.t nb.(t) m wsḥ.t jnk ny.t-sw.t n ꜣ.t jwꜣj ḫr ns.t n.(t) jtsj Wꜣjr jnk sꜣ-mrꜣf mdꜣj ḫr jtsj Wꜣjr}\textsuperscript{21}
\]

Translation:

That which the “son-whom-he-loves” said: “I am Horus who protects his father Osiris at his critical time. Protect me as I protect my father Osiris at his critical time. Hail, all people, all patricians, all commoners, all sun-folk! Mine is the kingship of eternity. I am seated on the throne of my father Osiris, his kingship being in the Mansion of the Arrow. The Great One has taken possession of the Mansion of Sealing His Mummy, even while his mummy is in the Mansion of Elevation. See, then, all you commoners, and sunfolk, in the broad hall! Mine is the kingship of eternity. I am seated on the throne of my father Osiris. I am the

\textsuperscript{17} Ritner, \textit{Libyan Anarchy}, 17.

\textsuperscript{18} Ritner, \textit{Libyan Anarchy}, 17.

\textsuperscript{19} Nicholson, Paul T. Nicholson and Ian Shaw, \textit{Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 40, 42.

\textsuperscript{20} I would like to thank Dr. Joshua A. Roberson for his assistance with all the transliterations and translations in this thesis.

\textsuperscript{21} Transliteration after Ritner, \textit{Libyan Anarchy}, 17.
‘son-whom-he-loves.’ It is on behalf of my father that I speak.”

Lefthand text facing Apis:

\[ \text{ḏd-mdw jnk s}1=\text{f ḫr sswn n}=\text{f ḫfty.w}=\text{f sm}1\text{r} \text{r}=\text{f ḫrw}=\text{f s}1=\text{m}=\text{f ḫm-N.t jt-nṯr Pī-sn-Ḥr s}1 \text{ mr-mš} ḫm-Pṯḥ m1\text{r}-ḥrw ‘nḥḫ ṡ.t}23

Translation:

Recitation: I am his son Horus, who incinerates for him his enemies, who justifies his voice.” The son-whom-he-loves, prophet of Neith, God’s father Pasenhor, son of the general Hemptah, the justified, living forever.24

Main text

\[ Sḥn nṯr pn n jt=f Pṯḥ n ḫsb.t 12 ḫbd 4 pr.t sw 4 n ny-sw.t ḫr=Ḥpr-R’ s’1 Ṣšq dj ‘nḥḫ ms.tw=f n ḫsb.t 11 n ḫm=f ḫtp=f ḫr s.t=f m t1-ḏsr n ḫsb.t 37 ḫbd 3 ḫḥ.t sw 27 n ḫm=f ḫ

Dj=f ‘nḥḫ wḏi snb ḫw(t)-jb n s’1=mr=f ḫm-N.t jt-nṯr Pī-sn-Ḥr s’1 ḫt.ṭy-t1 Ṣm’y Ṣmr-ḥm-w-nṯr m Nnj-nj-sw.t mr-mš’ ḫm-Pṯḥ ms.n ḫm.(t)-nṯr ḫw.t-Ḥr Nb(t) ḫnn-ny-sw.t sn.t=f nb.t pr ḫrt.w-r=r=w s’1 mj-nn Pī-sn-Ḥr ms.n ḫrp ḫjy.w n ḫṛ(y)-ṣ=f ny-sw.t t1- ḫwy ḫq(?) jdb.wy Pptt-dd=s s’1 mj-nn ḫm-Pṯḥ jr.n mj-nn Ṣj-n-km.t s’1 mj-nn ḫq4 ḫw.t-Ḥr Nb(t) ḫnn-ny-sw.t nb.t pr ḫt-n.t-ṣph (s’1) 31 ḫy-sw.t mj-nn ḫmrṯḥj jr.n ḫhr ḫjy.w n ḫṛ(y)-ṣ=f ny-sw.t t1- ḫwy ḫq(?) jdb.wy ḫt-n.t-ṣph s’1 nb t1- ḫwy Wsrkn jr.n ḫq4 ḫw-Mw.t-ṣph=n s’1 ḫy-sw.t Ṣkrwṭ ḫw.t-nṯr Ṣj-ṣḥ ḫnsw s’1 ḫy-sw.t Ṣṣṇq mw.t-nṯr Kr’-m’t.(s’1) jt-nṯr wr 31 ḫmrṯḥj mw.t-nṯr ḫt-n.t-ṣph s’1 mj-nn Ṣṣṇq jr.n mw.t ny-sw.t ḫḥ(?) t1-n-wṣḥ.t s’1 mj-nn Pī-ḥṁṭy s1 mj-nn Nb- Ṣṣṇq s’1 mj-nn ḫmrṯḥj mw. ḫy-sw.t Ṣḥ ḫns wṣḥ ḫmrṯḥj mw. ḫy-sw.t sp-2 ḫmrṯḥj mw. ḫy-sw.t sp-2 ḫmrṯḥj mw. ḫy-sw.t m Pr-Ḥṛ(y)-ṣ=f ny-sw.t t1- ḫwy ḫq(?) jdb.wy m s w’ s’1 s w’ ḫn sk ḫ ḫmrṯḥj mw. ḫy-sw.t sp-2 ḫmrṯḥj mw. ḫy-sw.t sp-2 ḫmrṯḥj mw. ḫy-sw.t hnn-ny-sw.t25

---


Translation:

This God joined with his father Ptah in regnal year 12, 4th month of winter, day 4 of king Aakheppre, son of Re, Shesho(n)q (V), given life, being born in the regnal year 11 of His Majesty, and resting upon his seat in the necropolis in regnal year 37, third month of inundation, day 27 of his majesty.

May he give life, prosperity, health and, joy to the son whom he loves, prophet of Neith, and God's father Pasenhor, son of the mayor, overseer of upper Egypt, overseer of prophets and Heracleopolis, the general Hemptah, and born of the prophetess of Hathor, lady of Heracleopolis, his sister, the housewife Ithores, son of the like-titled Pasenhor, and born of the chief of sistrom players of Herishef, King of the Two Lands, ruler of the Two Banks, the woman Petpetdedes, son of like-titled Hemptah, and borne by the like-titled woman Tchankeme, son of the like-titled Wedjptahankhef, and borne by the prophetess of Hathor, lady of Heracleopolis, the royal daughter, the housewife Temetsepeh, (son) of the royal son, the like-titled Namlot, and born by the chief of sistrom players of Herishef, King of the Two Lands, ruler of the Two Banks, the woman Tenetsepeh, son of the Lord of the Two Lands Osorkon and born by the woman Wedjmutankhhes, son of King Takelot and the God's mother Kapes, son of King Osorkon and the God’s mother Nebeshi, son of King Sheshonq and the God's mother Karoma (son) of the God’s father, great chief Namlot and the God's mother Tenetsepeh, son of the like-titled Sheshonq, and born by the king's mother Mehetemweskhet, son of the like-titled Pahuty, son of the like-titled Nebnesi, son of the like-titled Mawasen, son of the Libyan Buyuwawa, firm! Stable! Enduring! Flourishing! In the temple of Harishef, King of the Two Lands, ruler of the Two Banks, being one man the son of one man without interruption forever! And ever! In Heracleopolis.

The Apis bull cult located in Memphis was one of the oldest cults in Egypt. The Apis Bull was considered the earthly animal incarnation of the creator god Ptah and its cult is attested in Egypt as early as Dynasty 1 (2900 BCE-2720 BCE). Upon the death

---


of the previous Apis bull, a new one was chosen that shared a specific set of markings with the previous bull.\textsuperscript{29} The deceased bull would be mummified and the king, along with the priesthood of Ptah, was responsible for its burial in the Serapeum at Northern Saqqara.\textsuperscript{30} It is in this Serapeum, built at Saqqara, that the Genealogy Stela of Pasenhor was placed. Pasenhor was not the only individual to leave a stela at this location. These objects were intended as votive offerings; they were placed in niches at the front of the complex, honoring the god and asking for his blessings upon the proselyte. As these were votive in nature; their intended use was on behalf of a private individual honoring a god in exchange for blessings or healing.\textsuperscript{31} It is in this votive capacity that Pasenhor commissioned and placed his stela at the Apis Bull Serapeum.

**Stela of Padiaset**

One thousand two-hundred votive stelae were found at the Serapeum and out of that, only one hundred and five date between Dynasty 22 and Dynasty 23.\textsuperscript{32} There are no stelae dating between Ramesses II and the beginning of Osorokon II’s reign.\textsuperscript{33} Of the one hundred and five stelae from the Libyan period, only ten contain imagery, text, or both, that distinctly identify the individual as having Libyan descent.\textsuperscript{34} While this is certainly not a large number, it does show that Libyan Egyptians were involved in

\textsuperscript{29} Marković, “Changes in Urban and Sacred Landscapes,” 196.

\textsuperscript{30} Marković, “Changes in Urban and Sacred Landscapes,” 196-197.

\textsuperscript{31} Limme, *Stèles Égyptiennes*, 6.

\textsuperscript{32} Saleh, *Investigating Identities*, 75

\textsuperscript{33} Saleh, *Investigating Identities*, 75

\textsuperscript{34} Saleh, *Investigating Identities*, 81.
Egyptian religious practices while also proclaiming their heritage, as demonstrated by the votive stela of Padiaset (Louvre N 413) from Dynasty 22 (Figure 9). Unlike Pasenhor who identifies himself as Libyan only through text, Padiaset demonstrates his Libyan connections through imagery as well. The stela depicts Padiaset followed by his sons, Paeftaoubast and Takeloth respectively, arms raised in adoration, standing before an anthropomorphic Apis with a bull-head. Resting on Padiaset’s wig is a horizontal feather, which is consistent with the representation of Libyans of the Meshwesh people. His association with the Meshwesh is further established as he is called a “Great Chief of the Ma [Meshwesh]” and his father Takeloth possessed the title before him. A choice was also made to alter the standing man holding a stick (A21 in Gardner’s sign-list) by adding a horizontal feather above the man’s head. This is an example of the modification of traditional text and imagery to signal a person’s Libyan origin.

Both stelae demonstrate the importance placed on kinship and familial connections as the patrons of these objects felt it was necessary to carefully document their genealogy. In this instance, Pasenhor shows pride in his connections to the royal family as well as to Libyan chieftains by listing both and placing this stela in an area of religious significance. Padiaset proclaims his heritage through imagery by adding a feather to his head as well as the hieroglyph of a man with a stick in addition to his Libyan title passed to him by his father. Ritner proposed that this evidence supported the argument that family ties and connections provided the justification for holding political

---

35 Saleh, *Investigating Identities*, 82.

36 Saleh, *Investigating Identities*, 82.
and social offices. Considering the broader context of other Libyan ancestral acknowledgment and the use of family members to hold control over Thebes, this evidence supports Ritner’s argument. As discussed in the Historical Background section of Chapter Two, the Theban priesthood posed a threat to Libyan authority and so it was necessary to have a familial connection bound by kinship ties to hold control over the priests. However, the point that this demonstrates a specific aspect attributed specifically to the Libyan culture would be an incorrect statement. The use of family members to hold political and/or religious control and prominently acknowledging ties to powerful societal figures is certainly nothing unique to the Libyans. This method of ruling had been utilized throughout Egyptian history by Egyptian kings, therefore it is a false assumption that this concept was driven solely by Libyan kinship practices. While the practice of genealogy is not new, the lengthy listing of family members and the praising of a non-Egyptian heritage is, however, a distinct difference from previous practices as will be discussed further below.

While the use of family members in politics is not a revolutionary concept introduced by the Libyans, it can certainly be said that this stela demonstrates an important connection to ancestry and kinship relationships by Libyans. It also demonstrates a devotion to the Apis Bull, an Egyptian god, which further emphasizes the point that by the Third Intermediate Period, people of Libyan heritage had adopted an Egyptian lifestyle. When both the stelae of Pasenhor and Padiaset are examined together, the theme of kinship becomes prominent and is expressed in a way that

---

contains both Egyptian and Libyan characteristics.

**Genealogy of the Memphite Priestly Elite (Egyptian Museum Berlin 23673)**

The priests in Lower Egypt also adopted the practice of recording lengthy genealogies. The Genealogy of the Memphite Priestly Elite also known as the Genealogy of Ankhefensekhmet (Berlin 23673) is a limestone slab with four registers of relief (figure 10). The viewer’s left side is damaged and broken although Ritner surmised a figure of a king was once there, facing the registers. Each register contains 15 men, each wears a panther skin, carries a flail, and is labeled recording his name, title, and sometimes the reign the individual served under.

**Label For King:**

\[
\text{ḏd=f (?) dmd.n.tw wr.w-ḥrp.w-ḥm.w n ny-sw.t Šš(n)q mš-ḥrw\textsuperscript{40}}
\]

**Translation:**

He said (?): “The ‘Chiefs of the Master-Craftsmen’ are united for King Sheso(n)q, the justified.”

**Label for Priests:**

\[
\text{Jt-nṯr Pḥḫ ḫm-nṯr Šḥm.t ‘nh=f-n-Šḥm.t šl n ḫm-nṯr Šḥm.t Pḫ-ḫm-nṯr šl n ḫm-nṯr Šḥm.t šl n ḫm-nṯr ḫṛy-sḥšt št wr.t Pḫ-ḫm-nṯr šl n ḫm-nṯr ‘ḥm(?) m ḫm Šṯ-Sḥḥm.t šl n ḫm-nṯr Šḥm.t Pḫ-ḥm-nṯr šl n ḫm-nṯr šl n ḫm-nṯr ḫṛy-sḥšt št wr.t jw=f-‘n-P(t)ḥ šl n ḫm-nṯr ḫṛy-sḥšt št wr.t Pḫ-ḥm-nṯr šl n ḫm-nṯr šl n ḫm-nṯr ḫṛy-sḥšt št wr.t Šḏ-(sw)-Nfr-šm n ḫm-nṯr ‘nh=f-n-Šḥm.t šl n ḫṛy-sḥšt št wr.t ḫm-nṯr (…) ṣḏ-ḥt šl ḫm-nṯr ḫḥ nr čw.t Pḫ-sḫbī-ḥt-(n)-Nṯw.t šl n wr-ḥḥp.w-ḥm.w (Ḫṛ)-sšt šl n wr.t Pḫ-sḫbī-ḥt-(n)-Nṯw.t n wr-ḥḥp.w-ḥm.w Pḫ m ḫk ny-sw.t Pḫ-sḥbī-ḥt-(n)-Nṯw.t n wr-ḥḥp.w-ḥm.w Pḫ m ḫk ny-sw.t ṣḏ-ḥḥp-R’ št n Śḥm.nhšf Pḫ n wr-ḥḥp.w
\]

\textsuperscript{38} Ritner, *Libyan Anarchy*, 21.
\textsuperscript{39} Ritner, *Libyan Anarchy*, 21.
\textsuperscript{40} Transliteration after Ritner, *Libyan Anarchy*, 22.
\textsuperscript{41} Translation after Ritner, *Libyan Anarchy*, 22.
Translation:

The God’s father of Ptah and prophet of Sekhmet, Ankhhefensakhmet (“b”), son of the prophet of Sekhmet Pahemnetcher (“d”), son of the prophet of Sekhmet Pasher(en)sakhmet, son of the prophet and master of secrets of the sanctuary, Pahemnetcher, son of the prophet of the image(?) in Letopolis, Sisakhmet, son of the prophet of Sekhmet, Pahemnetcher (“b”), son of the prophet and master of secrets of the sanctuary, Iwefaaenptah, son of the prophet and chief of secrets of the sanctuary, Pahemnetcher (“a”), son of the prophet and chief of secrets of the sanctuary, Shed(su)nefertum, son of the prophet, Ankhhefensakhmet (“A”), son of the master of secrets of the sanctuary and prophet [ . . . ], Ashachet (“B”), son of the prophet, Pepi, in the reign of King Psusennes (I), son of the chief of Master-Craftsmen, (Hor)sies (“J”), in the reign of King Psusennes (I), son of the chief of Master-Craftsmen Pepi, in the reign of Aakeppre Setepena[mon] (= Psusennes I), son of the chief of Master-Craftsmen Ashachet (“A”), in the reign of King Amonemnisut, son (continuation on missing block?) of the chief of

---

Master-Craftsmen, Ptahemachet ("b"), [ . . . , son] of the chief of Master-Craftsmen Neferenpet, and the reign of King Usima Resetpenre (= Ramesses II), son of the chief of Master-Craftsmen Ptahemachet ("a"), in the reign of King Usima Resetpenre (= Ramesses II), (son) of the chief of Master-Craftsmen, [ . . . ]neshnet (?), in the reign of King Usima Resetpenre (= Ramesses II), (son) of the God’s Father of Amon in Karnak, overseer of works of Usima Resetpenre (= Ramesses II), Ptahhotep, son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Netcherwyhotep ("b"), in the reign in the reign of King Menmaatre (= Seti I), son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Ptahemachet ("a"), in the reign of King Menmaatre (= Seti I), son of the chief of Master-Craftsmen, Tiye ("c"), in the reign of Djeserkheppre Setepenre (= Horemheb), son of the God’s Father of Amon-Re, Lord [of Kar]nak, Sokaremsaf ("a"), son of the God’s Father of Sekhmet, wab-priest of the king and God’s Father Ay, Ipu, son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Wermer, in the reign of King Nebmaatre (= Amenhotep III), son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Penpanebes, in the reign of King Nebmaatre (= Amenhotep III), (son) of the God’s Father and master of secrets of Ptah, Nehememptah, son of the setem-priest of Ptah, Tiye ("b"), son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Paimired, in the reign of King Djeserkare (= Amnenhotep I), son of the God’s Father and of Ptah, Tiye ("a"), son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Montu, in the reign of King Nebpehtyre (= Ahmose), son of the God’s Father and chief of seers of Heliopolis, Hormaakheru, in the reign of King Apophis, son of the setem-priest of Ptah, Werhotep, in the reign of King Sharek (= ? Salatis), son of the God’s Father, Horiese, son of the God’s Father, Irmer, son of the God’s Father, Kahap, son of the wab-priest and lector priest, Horemheb, [son] of the God’s Father and master of secrets of Ptah, Ptahemhat, son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Sermut (?), in the reign of King Iby, son [of . . . , son] [of . . . , son] (continuation on missing block?) of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Wehket (?), in the reign of King Khakare (= Senwosret III), son of God’s Father and prophet of Sobek, Sehetpibseneb, son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Ankhnhubkhaure, in the reign of the King Khakare (= Senwosret III), son of the Chief of Master-Craftsmen, Achkhkakare, in the reign of King Nubkhaure (= Amonemhat III), son of the Chief of Master-craftsmen, Ankhsehetwibre, in the reign of King Kheperkare (= Senwosret I), son of the God’s Father and overseer of the city and vizier, Netcherwyhotep ("a"), in the reign of King Sehetpibre (= Amonemhat I), son of the God’s Father, overseer of craftsmen, and controller of every office of the king, Sokaremheb, son of [the . . . and] prophet of Satis, Lady oh Ankh-Tawy, Nebneferu, son of the wab-priest and lector priest Minemheb, son of the God’s Father, Ptahhotep, son of the God’s Father and chief of secrets of Ptah, Nehemem, son of God’s Father and master of secrets of Ptah, Minemhat, son of the Chief of Master-craftsmen, Ptahemheb, in the reign of King Nebhepetre (= Montuhotep I), son [of . . . , son] [of . . . ] (continuation on missing block?)

---

The text documents sixty generations of a family of Memphite priests, tracking their paternal line from the Third Intermediate Period back to the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, possibly even earlier. This demonstrates the hereditary succession from father to son of the position of priest going back generations. While keeping a family record was not unusual in Egypt, prior to the Libyan kings the recording of lengthy family trees documenting many generations was not utilized. The listing of the priestly elite is a deviation from previous practices, and it must be considered what prompted this change. Kinship and knowing extensive family connections is a feature seen with the Libyan people as evident in their extensive genealogies and pride in their ancestry. While keeping a family record was normal on a smaller scale in Egypt, the above example is a change so one must consider the variable behind the change. A major change that occurred is the rise of the Libyan kings in Dynasty 21. Taking this change into consideration and pairing it with the examples of Libyan genealogical texts, it becomes clear that the lengthier texts listing familial connections are a Libyan practice. The adoption of these practices suggests Egyptians are accepting features of Libyan expression and incorporating them into their traditions. This concept will be further explored in the section on Genealogical Texts on Statues from Upper Egypt.

**Genealogical Texts on Statues from Upper Egypt**

The phenomenon of recording extensive genealogies is not limited to the Libyans in the North as demonstrated by the genealogy statue of Basa (OIM 10729) from Dendera in Upper Egypt (Figure 11). The block statue, measuring 41 cm high and 20.5 cm
wide, purchased by J. H. Breasted in Cairo in 1919 shows Basa seated on a platform with his legs pulled up to his chest, his arms crossed over his knees, and his body from the chest down is wrapped in a garment. Only his hands, the tips of his feet, and his head protrude out; text documents the man’s extensive genealogy of twenty-six generations, the majority of the record tracing the paternal line, covers the front and both sides of the garment, as well as the back pillar. On the front is a vignette depicting Basa on the viewer’s right, wearing a priestly leopard skin garment and worshipping a seated Osiris; he worships a standing Isis on the viewer’s left. On both the left and right shoulders is a vignette of a kneeling Basa worshipping a standing, mummified Osiris.

The record documents his family’s status and priestly involvement in the Dendrite temple from the Third Intermediate Period back to the New Kingdom.

Front Genealogical Text:

ধমন্ট্র নও ন হওতেহর নব (ত) জোন্ত ধর্মস্থটি ন নট্র নট্র নট্র জোন্ত ধর্মস্থটি ন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন নব (ত) জোন্ত যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন নট্র যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন নব (ত) জোন্ত যৌবন যৌবন যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন নট্র যৌবন 

Translation:

Third Prophet of Hathor, lady of Dendera, master of secrets of the gods and goddesses of Dendera, pure one of hands, stolist priest of this temple, temple scribe, scribe of the forecourt, scribe of investigation, scribe of the temple

---


47 Transliteration after Ritner, Libyan Anarchy, 27.
cadaster of the estate of Hathor, lady of Dendera, he who opens the doors to
heaven of all the gods and goddesses in Dendera, overseer of providing all
divine offerings in her (Hathor’s) place, he who pacifies the deities with
necessities, overseer of the great plan of the Lady of heaven, prophet and
astrologer priest\(^\text{48}\) of the third phyle, lesonis (inspector) priest, acolyte for the
first phyle and third phyle, overseer of the wab-priests of Sekhmet, overseer of
cattle, overseer of craftsmen, monthly priest for the first phyle, second phyle,
third phyle, and fourth phyle of the estate of Hathor, lady of Dendera, prophet of
Hathor, overseer of the sanctuary, prophet of Re, resident of Dendera, prophet of
Amon, resident in (text resumes on right side)\(^\text{49}\)

Right Side Genealogical Text:

\[(Jw)n.t \text{ḥm-}-(\text{nṯr}) \text{Wsjr} \text{ny-sw.t nṯr.w} \text{ḥm-nṯr Wsjr-Skr} \text{ḥm-nṯr Pḥ Sḥm.t} \text{ḥṛ(y)-}jb \text{Jwn.t} \text{ḥm-nṯr n Wsjr-Ḥmḥq} \text{ḥm-nṯr Mnw-kl-mw.t=f} \text{ḥṛ(y)-}jb \text{Jwn.t} \text{ḥm-nṯr n mdw-‘nḥ n Ḥw.t-ḤḤ Sml-Tl.wy Ḥm-nṯr n Jmḥ-m-Jp.t Ḥḥ(y)-}jb \text{Jwn.t} \text{sḥtp Ḥ}\text{mt=s jḥy sml-}jr(w) wʾb jqr jmḥḥ ḤḤ Nb.(t) \text{Jwn.t Bšs}^{1} \text{s} \text{ḥm-nṯr sḥtp} \text{ḥm.t=s Ḥm-nṯr n mdw-‘nḥ n Ḥw.t-ḤḤ mr jḥ n ṭḥ Ḥw.t-ḤḤ Nb.(t) \text{Jwn.t Ḫḏ-ḤḤ-}jw=f ‘nḥ mš-ḥrw s ṭmj-nw Bšs\text{ḥm-nṯr n Ḥm Nb.w.t Ḧnk mr ṣn jmy-}s.t-t ḤḤ s ṭmj-nw Nb.w.t Ḧnw(m) Ḫbdš(ḥbd?)-jtr wr 15-n.t mr Ḥm.w-nṯr Nb.(t) \text{Jwn.t mr snḥ}^{50} \text{(text resumes on back side)\(^\text{51}\)}

Translation:

Dendera, prophet of Osiris, king of the gods, prophet of Osiris-Sokar, prophet of
Ptah and Sekhmet, resident in Dendera, prophet of Osiris, the Bandaged One,
prophet of Min, bull of His Mother, resident in Dendera, prophet of the living
staff of Hathor and Sematawy, prophet of Amonemope, resident in Dendera,
pacifier of Her Majesty, sistrum player, he who unites the forms, excellent wab-
priest, revered one before the Lady of Dendera, Basa (IV), son of the prophet,
pacifier of Her Majesty, prophet of the living staff of Hathor, overseer of cattle
of the estate of Hathor, Lady of Dendera, Djedhorieufankh (II), the justified, son
of the similarly titled Basa (III), the justified, son of the similarly titled prophet
of the Golden One, offering priest, lesonis priest, acolyte for the third phyle
Nespakhered, the justified, son of the prophet of the Golden One, wab-priest of
the river festival, great one of the half month, overseer of the prophets of the

\(^{48}\) Term used by Ritner, \textit{Libyan Anarchy}, 28.

\(^{49}\) Translation after Ritner, \textit{Libyan Anarchy}, 28-29.

\(^{51}\) Transliteration after Ritner, \textit{Libyan Anarchy}, 27.
Lady of Dendera, overseer of the great plan (text resumes on back side)  

Back Genealogical Text:

wr Nb.t p.t ḫm-nṯr 3-nw n ḫw.t-Ḥr Nb.(t) (Jw)n.t ḫr-y-sštḥ mnḥ.(t) ḫm-nṯr ḫw.t-Ḥr ḫr y-s.t-wr.t ḫm-nṯr n Wṣjr n ṣ-w.t nṯr.w wn ⃐.wy p.t n nṯr.w jmy.(w) Jwn.t šḥtp nṯr ḫr dbḥ(n).w ḫm-nṯr P öl-Rṣ ḫr(y)-ḫj Jwn.t ḫm-nṯr Mnw-kꜣ- mw.t=f ṣṛ ṣḏ. ḫm t=s jḥy ṣmḥ jr(w) ḫmḥ ḫr Nb.(t) Jwn.t BṢḥ s m j-nw Dḏ-Ḥr-jw=f-ᢄnḥ mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw BṢḥ s mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw Nṣ-pꜣ(š)-ḥrd mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw Pnḥn mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw Nṣ-kꜣ-f(l)y)-ꜣ mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw ḫkn-m-Jp.t mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw P öl-ꜣ-n-ḥr-Mꜣ t mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw Wḏ=f-ṛ-wy mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw P öl-ꜣ-Nḥs mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw (text concludes on left side)

Translation:

Of the Lady of heaven, Third Prophet of Hathor, Lady of Dendera, master of secrets of clothing, prophet of Hathor, master of the sanctuary, prophet of Osiris, King of the Gods, he who opens the doors of heaven for the Gods who are in Dendera, he who pacifies the deity with necessities, prophet of Pre, resident of Dendera, prophet of Min, Bull of His Mother, lesonis priest, acolyte for the third phyle, pacifier of Her Majesty, sistrum player, he who unites the forms, revered one before the Lady of Dendera, Basa (II), son of the similarly titled Djedhoruirefankh (I), the justified, son of the similarly titled Basa (I), the justified, son of the similarly titled Nes-pakhered (I), the justified, son of the similarly titled Penpen, the justified, son of the similarly titled Nes-kafaya, son of the similarly titled Amonemope, the justified, son of the similarly titled Paankhermaat, the justified, son of the similarly titled Wedjaefarou, the justified, son of the similarly titled Panehsy, the justified, son of the similarly titled (text concludes on left side)

Left Side Genealogical Text:

Jmn-ꜣḏ=f ṣ mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw P öl-n-nw-Nbw.(t)-r=f mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw Sꜣ-Ḥ.wt- ḫr mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ ḫm-nṯr ḫy n ḫw.t-Ḥr Nb.(t) Jwn.t ḫ gps mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ m-j-nw ṣmꜣ- t ṣ ṣ ḫy mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ ḫm-nṯr ḫy n Jmn-Rꜣ ṣ-n-gp t nṯr.w Nb-wnn(=f) mꜣ-ḥrw s ṣ

52 Translation after Ritner, Libyan Anarchy, 29.
54 Translation after Ritner, Libyan Anarchy, 29.

39
Translation:

Amonshedef, the justified, son of the similarly titled Pennu-nebutterof, the justified, son of the similarly titled Sihathor (II), the justified, son of the First Prophet of Hathor, Lady of Dendera, Khay, the justified, son of the similarly titled Sihathor (II), the justified, son of the First Prophet of Amon-Re, King of the Gods, Nebwenn(ef), the justified, son of the First Prophet of Hathor, Lady of Dendera, overseer of cattle, overseer of fields, overseer of the granary, Sematawy (I), the justified, son of the similarly titled Sinhathor, the justified, son of the similarly titled Amonhotep, the justified, son of the similarly titled Sihathor (I), the justified, son of the similarly titled Nefer, the justified, son of the similarly titled overseer of the work center, Ded, the justified, born by the housewife, the sistrum player of Amon-Re, the servant of the Lady of Dendera, Tayesmerden, daughter of the prophet of Hathor, Lady of Dendera, the mayor of Dendera, Padinebty, son of the similarly titled Djedkhonsuiufankh, son of the similarly titled Nespaihy, the justified.

Basa’s statue clearly features a lengthy genealogy, and he takes pride in his family, however, Basa has Egyptian connections and not Libyan. Although Basa used a sculptural medium instead of a stela to record his family tree, the same theme seen on the Egyptian stelae applies; the Libyan characteristic of lengthy genealogies is incorporated into the Egyptian art style. Another example of southern (Theban) genealogical practices is the Dynasty 23 limestone block statue of Djedkhonsuiufankh, a Second Priest of Amun, found in the Karnak Cachette of Karnak Temple in Luxor and


presently in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, (CG 42211). This statue is very similar to that of Basa’s and is consistent with the block statue style. Djedkhonsiuufankh sits on a stepped platform with a thin back pillar. His legs are pulled up to his chest, his body wrapped in a garment from which his head and hands protrude. On his right side is a sunk relief depicting him wearing priestly garments, standing before the sacred bark of Sokar and on his left is another sunk relief showing him kneeling before Khonsu. On the front of his knees is a looped knot with the head of Hathor in raised relief. His body and the base are covered in writing documenting that the statue was commissioned by his son, likely posthumously, and records sixteen generations of priestly ancestors.

Ritner suggests that the use of genealogy practices seen in the South were in reaction to the Libyans in the North. The Egyptians needed a way to show their own generational authority against the Libyan dynasties. However, I would offer a different explanation. It is well-documented throughout Egyptian history that the elite classes adopted the artistic styles of the ruling class. It stands to reason that the South may have adopted this practice in reflection of the styles of the ruling class. It was an additional benefit to them, especially the priestly class, to list their temple connections and to take pride in their families as well as to have the social benefit of having a well-established family.

57 Russman, Egyptian Sculpture, 162, 220.

58 Russmann, Egyptian Sculpture, 162-163.


60 Some examples include the modeling of facial features after those of Middle Kingdom kings such as Senwosret III and Amenemhat III, and the depiction of a pronounced abdomen and narrow shoulders common in the reign of Akhenaten; Robins, Art of Ancient Egypt, 118-119, 150.
It is also noticeable that this practice stops after the Libyans lose power, as demonstrated by the block statue of Pakhraf in the collection of the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, (JE 37171), dating to Dynasty 26, or the Saite Period (664 BCE-525 BCE).\textsuperscript{61} As with the others, Pakhraf is seated on a base with his knees pulled up to his chest. His body is wrapped in a garment from which his feet and his head protrude. His hands are carved in raised relief on top of his knees and a cartouche sits on either shoulder, that on his right upper arm containing the prenomen of Psamtek I and that on the left upper arm containing the nomen of Psamtek I. On the front of his legs is the head of Hathor in high raised relief. There is a band of writing around the base and in between Pakhraf’s feet.\textsuperscript{62}

Text on the Front of the Base:

\begin{center}
ḥtp dj njsw Jmn-Re nb nswt t\.wy psḏt Wsr dj=Ṭn prt-ḥrw\textsuperscript{63} (text continues on the viewer’s right side of the base)
\end{center}

\begin{center}
Translation:

A gift the king gave and Amun-Re, Lord of Thrones and the Divine Ennead, Lord of Thebes, so that you (pl.) might give him a voice offering\textsuperscript{64} (text continues on the viewer’s right side of the base)
\end{center}

Text on the Base Right:

\begin{center}
k\.w ḫp\.w snr.w mnḥt mnḥt prj.t\textsuperscript{65} nb.t ḫr ḫdbḥt=f n ṛ’ nb n k‘ n jr(j) p‘ ḫty-
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{61} Russmann, \textit{Egyptian Sculpture}, 179, 182-83.


\textsuperscript{63} Transliteration by author. I thank Dr. Joshua A. Roberson for consulting with me on this text.

\textsuperscript{64} Translation by author.

\textsuperscript{65} In this instance, the viper emerging is an example of the Ptolemaic spelling of \textit{prj}, however, there are examples of this spelling dating back to the New Kingdom; Dieter Kurth, \textit{A Ptolemaic Sign-List: Hieroglyphs Used in the Temples of the Graeco-Roman Period of Egypt and Their Meanings} (Hützel: Backe-Verlag, 2010) 107, #5; J. A. Roberson, \textit{Enigmatic Writing in the Egyptian New Kingdom: A Lexicon of Ancient Egyptian Cryptography of the New Kingdom}, Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde-Beihefte (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020), 108, #
Translation:

of cattle, fowl, incense, unguent, clothing, and everything that goes upon his offering table of everyday, for the ka of the hereditary noble, prince, royal sealer, and sole companion (text continues on base back)

Translation:

of the beloved one, prophet of Herishef, king of the Two Lands; commander of ships (text concludes on base left)

Translation:

of the lord of the Two Lands, king’s acquaintance, his beloved, Pa-akh-ref, true of voice, son of the great one Her-za-Aset, son of (?)

Text Between Legs and Feet:

24. I thank Dr. Joshua A. Roberson for clarifying this sign for me.

66 Transliteration by author.

67 Translation by author.

68 Transliteration by author.

69 Translation by author.

70 Transliteration by author.

71 Translation by author.
Jr(j) p' ḫty-ꜣ rḥ-nsw mꜣmr=f Pa-ah-ref\(^72\)

Translation:

hereditary noble, true king’s acquaintance, his beloved, Pa-akh-ref\(^73\)

Text on Back Pillar:

Rḥ-nsw mꜣmr=f Pa-ah- ref dj tw ḫ=f kꜣm bꜣ=tf Jmn pw nṯr njwty n jr(j)
 p' ḫty-ꜣ smr w'ty wr n (? ) ḫm nṯr Ḥrjšf sw ṭw ly (? ) ḫm nṯr Sbk (?)\(^74\)

Translation:

true king’s acquaintance, whom he loves, Pa-akh-ref; one should place behind
him before his ka in the presence of this Amun, local god of the hereditary noble,
prince, sole companion, great one of the nome (?), prophet of Herishef, king of
the Two Lands, (?), prophet of Sobek (?)\(^75\)

This is a clear deviation from the previous style of commemorative block statues of
Dynasties 21–24 which contained writing on all possible surfaces and recorded
extensive genealogies. This indicates that the artistic choice of maximizing the provided
space by the recording of family lines stopped after the end of the Libyan period.
Hussein Bassir explains that self-presentation in the Saite period (664 BCE- 525 BCE)
was focused on event commemoration rather than presenting the individual’s
biography.\(^76\) If this style was used to assert Theban authority, it is questionable as to

\(^72\) Transliteration by author.
\(^73\) Translation by author.
\(^74\) Transliteration by author.
\(^75\) Translation by author.
why this practice stops after Libyans are removed and does not return under other foreign rulers.\textsuperscript{77} An explanation is that this practice was adopted in the South because it started with the Libyan elite and was incorporated into the private sculpture and artwork produced by Egyptians in the North and the South. Therefore, as it originated with the Libyans, the practice of extensive genealogies can therefore be linked as a practice of the Libyan people; a social signifier of their identity turned into an artistic norm for the period.

In comparing the various examples examined here, there is a stronger Libyan presence on votive stelae in the North than the stelae and statues found in the South, likely due to the higher Libyan population in the Delta.\textsuperscript{78} Heidi Saleh suggests that the smaller Libyan population in the South became more assimilated to the Egyptians because they lacked a strong Libyan community. This also means it is possible individuals with Libyan connections were more hesitant to express their social identity in an environment that would not have been as accepting.\textsuperscript{79} However, the context and function of these objects should be considered when analyzing the identity of the owner. All of the examples discussed have been found in a public setting; the votive stelae in the Apis lesser vault with other votive offerings, the Memphis Priestly Genealogy and the two block statues from the Theban area would have been located in a temple setting.

\textsuperscript{77} The Kushites of Dynasty 25 did not practice lengthy genealogies and by Dynasty 26 Egyptians did not use lengthy genealogies either as shown by the block statue of Pakhruf (JE 37171). I believe this suggests a decline in usage ultimately leading to the end of the practice in Dynasty 26. For Dynasty 25 see Jeremy Pope, “Self-Presentation in the Twenty-fifth Dynasty,” in Living Forever: Self-Presentation in Ancient Egypt, ed. Hussein Bassir (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2019), 198.

\textsuperscript{78} Saleh, Investigating Identities, 94.

\textsuperscript{79} Saleh, Investigating Identities, 94.
to be seen by individuals engaging in temple activities. They would have been public in
nature, meant to express something about the nature and activities of the individuals by
or for whom they were commissioned.\textsuperscript{80} I believe this suggests that Libyan individuals
in the North were more willing to publicly depict themselves in imagery with Libyan
ethnic markers due to a larger, ethnically diverse population favoring people with
Libyan connections. This would also support the idea that lengthy genealogical texts are
an adoption of royal artistic models. Although Libyans in the South were more hesitant
to visually represent themselves as ethnically different, both Libyans and Egyptians
used lengthy genealogical texts, meaning there was not a negative connotation with the
practice. Listing familial connections was not inherently ethnically different as the
practice on a smaller scale already existed prior to the Libyan period. Therefore, the
adoption of the practice only during this period and within a public setting by people of
Libyan and Egyptian descent, suggests it was a practice inspired by Libyan practices
that happened to align with sentiments that already existed in Egypt.

\textbf{Burial Assemblage of Psusennes I}

The burial assemblage of Psusennes I is composed of several different elements that
will be described separately. The king was buried inside a silver coffin, with various
accoutrements. That coffin was placed inside two nesting sarcophagi (coffins
specifically made of stone). The innermost sarcophagus was made of black granite and
the outermost was made of pink granite. These three coffins and the king’s funerary
mask, all presently in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, will be analyzed separately.\textsuperscript{81} The

\textsuperscript{80} Saleh, \textit{Investigating Identities}, 94.

\textsuperscript{81} Aston, \textit{Burial Assemblages}, 44-47; JE 87297, JE 85911, JE85911, JE 85913, JE 87753, JE 86059.
other items in the tomb as well as the imagery on the walls of the tomb will not be examined in this thesis.

**Pink Granite Sarcophagus (JE 87297)**

The exterior pink granite sarcophagus was originally made for King Merenptah who ruled during Dynasty 19 of the New Kingdom (1292 BCE – 1191 BCE). A recumbent male figure, wearing a tripartite wig and a long, braided beard, is carved in high relief on the lid of the sarcophagus (Figures 12-13). In his hands, the figure holds a staff and a flail, both of which are common symbols for kingship (Figure 14). A belt, to which is attached a beaded apron, is on the waist; the handle of the staff rests over both the belt and the apron and a dagger is slipped inside the belt with the blade on top of the apron.  

The figure’s head is cradled by an unnamed goddess (Figure 15). Although the goddess is unnamed, it is likely it represents the goddess Isis, the mother of Horus and a great magician, or Nephthys, the sister of Isis and considered a friend to the dead in the Book of the Dead. This is a reference to Book of the Dead 151, which has roots in the Pyramid Texts, in which multiple deities come to the aid of the deceased to protect the corpse. Isis and Nephthys are among these deities, alongside the Sons of Horus Hapy, Duamutef, Imsety, and Qebehsenuef, located at the head and the foot of the body, and they provide protection to the dead so the deceased may be worthy to be among the gods.

---

82 Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennes à Tanis* (Paris, 1951), pl LXXVII.


Along both sides of the body are vertical inscriptions which reveal that the figure on the lid is the Osirian form of the dead king, which is further supported by the presence of the epithet, “Osiris-Ankhety,” meaning the Living Osiris, written on the lid. The only altering that appears to have taken place was to the cartouches in which Merenptah’s name was changed to that of Psusennes I. One cartouche was, however, missed. Merenptah’s cartouche in the middle of the figure’s belt was left unaltered, the reason for which is open to speculation. The underside of the sarcophagus lid is decorated with a high-relief figure of the sky goddess Nut, identified by the stars inscribed into her arms and dress (Figure 16). Surrounding Nut is text from Hours Two and Three from the Book of Gates, a funerary text dating from the New Kingdom describing the deceased’s journey through the underworld (Figure 17). This text is to be expected, as during the New Kingdom, it was common for royal burials to have the Book of Gates depicted on the walls of the burial chamber. The text also has no specific instruction as to where the text is to be placed, so it is not unusual to find a portion of the text on the sarcophagus itself. The text is divided into twelve hours which represent the hours of night. During the first hour, the deceased approaches the Netherworld and then must pass through the various gates and their guardians for hours two through eleven.


85 Montet, Tombeau de Psousennes, 111-112, pl LXXVI.

86 Montet, Tombeau du Psousennes, 111.

87 Montet, Tombeau du Psousennes, 119, pl LXXXI.

88 Montet, Tombeau du Psousennes, 117-119, 120-121.

The last hour describes a successful rebirth of the sun god, the defeat of the chaotic force of Apep, and the ascent of the deceased with Re.\textsuperscript{90} On both the exterior and interior sides of the lid are prayers to Nut and praises to Re.\textsuperscript{91} The exterior of the basin also has imagery from the Book of Gates, featuring fifteen gates with guardians who are ready to cut down anyone unprepared.\textsuperscript{92}

**Black Granite Sarcophagus (JE 85911)**

The innermost nesting sarcophagus is made of black granite constructed in an anthropoid shape belonging to a Ramesside official based on the style, which indicates it is from Dynasty 19 (1292 BCE-1191 BCE) or Twenty (1190 BCE-1077 BCE).\textsuperscript{93} The top of the lid has vertical and horizontal bands of text over the legs and feet, the bands mimicking the appearance of bandages. The text describes the deceased king as the “Osiris-king” and proclaims his divine connections to the gods, including Nut, the earth god Geb, Isis, and Horus (Figure 18).\textsuperscript{94} The figure is wearing a wig, a broad collar, and has a short beard (Figure 19). His arms are crossed over his chest, but he holds nothing in his closed fists. Below his crossed arms is a seated goddess, her wings outstretched. An offering table with beer and bread is above her head.\textsuperscript{95}

The exterior of the trough is decorated with text and images of various gods,

---

\textsuperscript{90} Darnell, *Writing from the Ancient World*, 251-256.

\textsuperscript{91} Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, 112-114.

\textsuperscript{92} Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, 117-119, pl LXXXII-LXXXX.

\textsuperscript{93} Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, 127.

\textsuperscript{94} Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, 127-128.

\textsuperscript{95} Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, pl XCVII.
including Thoth, the god of wisdom and writing, Anubis, the god of mummification, and the Four Sons of Horus: Hapi, Duamutef, Imsety, and Qebehsenuef, guardians of the internal organs. These gods are also a part of Book of the Dead 151, each one protecting the deceased to ensure their body stays whole. Also included on the lid is Book of the Dead 16 in which Thoth repeats four times, “Long live Re, death to the turtle, unscathed is he who rests in the sarcophagus.”

96 Behind the head is the goddess Nephthys surrounded by lines of text that state she has come for the Osiris-king.97 On the soles of the feet is an image of Isis with extended wings, framed by hieroglyphs, stating she has also come to gather up the body of her brother, the Osiris-king.98 As demonstrated with the unnamed goddess on Merenptah’s sarcophagus, this is again a reference to Book of the Dead 151 in which the goddesses Isis and Nephthys have come, among other deities, to protect the deceased.99

Compared to the outer sarcophagus, there is a noticeable lack of royal insignia associated with the male figure. There is no uraeus on the brow or a royal headdress of any kind. He also holds no crook, flail, or staff. The figure lacks the long, braided beard, a well-known indicator of divinity. Unlike the outer sarcophagus, all the cartouches have been altered so the previous owner is unknown.100 There is some slight damage to the nose, suggesting the black granite sarcophagus was slightly too big to fit within the


97 For complete text see Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes* 128.


100 Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, 126.
pink granite sarcophagus comfortably.\textsuperscript{101}

\textbf{Silver Coffin (JE 85917)}

The inner-most coffin is a solid silver anthropoid coffin, a rare find as only five silver coffins have been found, all of which were found at the Tanis tombs: the coffin of Wendjebaendjed,\textsuperscript{102} Sheshonq IIa,\textsuperscript{103} Osorkon II,\textsuperscript{104} the destroyed silver coffin of Harnakht C,\textsuperscript{105} and the one belonging to Psusennes I. The sarcophagus of Psusennes measures 2.2 m. in length, 65 cm wide, and 80 cm high.\textsuperscript{106} The lid shows a king wrapped in garments with a Rishi design and holding a staff and flail (Figure 20). Rishi refers to the design developed in Dynasty 17 (c. 1630 BCE – 1540 BCE) in which a pair of wings envelopes the body from shoulders to feet. It is called Rishi as that is the Arabic word for ‘feather.’\textsuperscript{107} A gold uraeus and headband sit atop his \textit{nemes} headdress (Figure 21). The overall style of the coffin is like that of the middle coffin of Tutankhamun of Dynasty 18 (1539 BCE – 1292 BCE) rather than the Rishi designs found on Ramesside non-royal coffins.\textsuperscript{108} The false beard is attached to the chin with two supports.\textsuperscript{109} On the chest is a large broad collar. The king’s hands are crossed across his chest, resting on the wings of
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a vulture with a *shen* sign clasped in each of its talons; the feather design of the wings is etched over the arms instead of under the arms. The same vulture design is shown above and below the arms, totaling three stacked horizontal vultures in a straight vertical line, one directly below another.

Over the legs is a geometric line pattern with a band of text going down the center within which are repeated prayers to Nut translated by Montet:

> Said by Osiris, master of the two lands Akheperre Psusennes. He said, “Oh, my mother Nut, spread your wings over me. Make me like the indestructible and tireless.”[^10]

On the feet, to the left and right of the center band of text, are Isis and Nephthys seated in a mourning position, with text identifying them.[^11] On the underside of the lid is a standing figure of a winged Nut, with a uraeus, who stands on the sign for gold, *nbw*. To the viewer’s left are the words of the goddess and to the viewer’s right is a listing of the names and titles of the dead king (Figure 22).[^12]

On the viewer’s left is a recitation by the goddess:

> Said by Nut, the great, who begot the gods, he of Ra, in the West, who gives the funeral meal, everything good and pure, everything good and sweet.  
[^13]

Underneath Nut, Isis and Nephthys kneel in a mourning position, the forward hand raised to the forehead and the other grasping a *sekhem* scepter.[^14] The image of a kneeling woman with her hand to her head is the hieroglyphic pose used in the

[^14]: Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, pl CIII.
determinative for mourning woman.\textsuperscript{115} It is not unusual for Nephthys and Isis to be depicted in the mourning pose on a coffin. They are mourning the death of Osiris and the deceased symbolically becomes Osiris in death.\textsuperscript{116} The \textit{sekhem} scepter signifies power and has connections to Osiris and by extension, Anubis.\textsuperscript{117} In the case of the silver coffin, the scepter is in reference to Anubis, which is verified by his name written next to the emblem.\textsuperscript{118} Around the edge of the basin runs a band of text which bears two symmetrical inscriptions:

To the viewer’s right of Nut:

Said by Nut, Osiris-king Akheperre Psusennes, “Oh for you, I am protection for you, I extend over you. I remove all your evils. I purify you. I deify your body. I cause you to join the Ennead of the gods.”\textsuperscript{119}

To the viewer’s left of Nut:

Said by the Osiris-king Akheperre Psusennes: “Oh gods who are in the necropolis, Ennead of the Sacred Land, very great who are before Tjaour, peace in the circle, while navigating, in Khentamentit, the great god, sovereign of eternity, may this Osiris-king Psusennes be triumphant in your wake...eternally.”\textsuperscript{120}

**Mummy of Psusennes I**

Based on the sarcophagi, ornaments, and burial goods deposited with him,

Psusennes I was likely mummiﬁed following the mummiﬁcation standard of the Third


\textsuperscript{116} Wilkinson, \textit{Reading Egyptian Art}, 35.

\textsuperscript{117} Wilkinson, \textit{Reading Egyptian Art}, 65, 183.

\textsuperscript{118} Montet, \textit{Tombeau du Psousennes}, pl CIII.

\textsuperscript{119} Translation from Montet, \textit{Tombeau du Psousennes}, 131.

\textsuperscript{120} Translation from Montet, \textit{Tombeau du Psousennes}, 131-132.
Intermediate Period as it would not make sense for all the other rituals to have been observed but not the mummification process. However, no conclusions can be reached as to the mummification method specifically as the body was destroyed. All that was left by the 1900s was the king’s skeleton due to the wet environmental conditions of the Delta.

He had, however, also been equipped with a solid gold mask (JE 85913) and with gold leaf mummy bands\textsuperscript{121} on the body, arranged to look like bandages and decorated with bands of text. The mask was made of two pieces of beaten gold that connected together covering the head and chest. The face has a serene appearance, with inlaid eyes and eyebrows and a gold false beard (Figure 23).\textsuperscript{122} The mask is reminiscent of the one belonging to King Tutankhamun from Dynasty 18 (Figure 24). The masks are physical representations of Book of the Dead\textsuperscript{151a}; which is also the spell that is inscribed on the back of Tutankhamun's mask. In the spell, parts of the face are associated with various divine beings so that the wearer may become a god.\textsuperscript{123} The mask of Psusennes, while not as ornate and not inscribed like that of Tutankhamun, fulfills the same purpose and is as effective as the mask of the boy king. On his mummy was a variety of jewelry and amulets, all of which served to mark his importance in Egyptian society and to help him successfully navigate the afterlife.\textsuperscript{124} No copy of the Book of the Dead was found with him, although that does not mean there was not one in antiquity. Since various wooden

\textsuperscript{121} Aston, \textit{Burial Assemblages}, 44.

\textsuperscript{122} Montet, \textit{Tombeau du Psousennes}, 131-132.

\textsuperscript{123} Quirke, \textit{Going out into Daylight}, 373.

\textsuperscript{124} Montet, \textit{Tombeau du Psousennes}, 132-158.
objects in the tomb were deteriorated as well as the body of Psusennes, any degradable materials likely were not preserved.\textsuperscript{125}

**Burial Assemblages of Royals and Elites Buried at Tanis**

The tombs located at Tanis also held burials of elite individuals from this time period. In comparison to Psusennes, the remaining objects in the tombs contain much of the same items as those in the tomb of Psusennes, including shabtis, jewelry, ceramics, and amulets. Like Psusennes, three others with confirmed Libyan ancestry were also buried in usurped sarcophagi. King Takeloth I (887 BCE-874 BCE) was buried in a usurped quartzite sarcophagus from Ameny, the Overseer of the Seal.\textsuperscript{126} Harnakht C, son of Osorkon II, was buried in a usurped granite sarcophagus (Figure 25), however, any indication as to when the sarcophagus is from or who it previously belonged to has been destroyed.\textsuperscript{127} Osorkon II (872 BCE - 842 BCE) was buried inside a usurped Ramesside sarcophagus (Figure 26), but as there is no imagery or text, there is no indication of who the previous owner was.\textsuperscript{128} Three other individuals were also buried with gold masks. Wendjebaendjed, a general, was buried wearing a gold mask (Figure 27),\textsuperscript{129} as was King Sheshonq II (Figure 28),\textsuperscript{130} and King Amenemope (Figure 29).\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{125} Montet, *Tombeau du Psousennes*, 132-133.

\textsuperscript{126} Aston, *Burial Assemblages*, 54.

\textsuperscript{127} Aston, *Burial Assemblages*, 55.

\textsuperscript{128} Aston, *Burial Assemblages*, 58.

\textsuperscript{129} Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 87753

\textsuperscript{130} Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 72163 A-D

\textsuperscript{131} Egyptian Museum, Cairo, JE 86059
King Takeloth I likely had a gold mask as well based on the fragments found inside his sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{132} The masks of the other men buried at the Tanis tombs are significant because they demonstrate a clear connection to the Egyptian religion and practices. Although they vary in style and appearance, they all function to be a physical representation of Book of the Dead 151a. It is clear the Libyan kings, in addition to the general buried with them, adhered to the Egyptian religious thought. As a result, this makes the differences from previous burial practices all the more valuable in understanding the identity of the Libyans.

\textbf{Analysis}

The varied coffins of Psusennes I offer insight into the king’s worldview and how he understood his identity. The exterior pink granite sarcophagus links Psusennes to the New Kingdom kings and by extension contributes to his legitimacy as an Egyptian king. The solid silver coffin and the gold mask and gold leaf mummy bands demonstrate the power and importance he held as well as the continuation of the superior craftsmanship skills of the New Kingdom and the extraordinary metal-working skills of Libyan craftsmen. Both of these funerary objects conform to typical Egyptian decorative programs expected of a royal burial. The figure on the exterior sarcophagus holds a crook and flail and wears a false beard, typical features indicating a royal individual. Various scenes from the Book of the Dead are inscribed into the stone sarcophagi and the goddess Nut is carved into the underside of the middle sarcophagus, embracing the deceased, providing protection and comfort. On the silver anthropoid coffin, the deceased also wears a false beard and holds a crook and flail. He is also wearing a gold

\textsuperscript{132} Aston, \textit{Burial Assemblages}, 54.
uraeus on the *nemes* headdress signifying kingship. In both instances, Psusennes is embracing Egyptian religion and religious practices. He calls upon Egyptian gods for protection and uses the artistic canon to demonstrate his status as a king.

Of the three, the black granite sarcophagus is of special note. The appearance of the figure matches the typical artistic canon of a non-royal figure. The non-royal status of the sarcophagus can be verified by comparing it to other examples belonging to non-royal individuals from the New Kingdom. Located at the British Museum is the granodiorite inner sarcophagus of Merymose (EA1001), who was a viceroy of Kush who served under Amenhotep III of Dynasty 18 (Figure 30).133 The design of this official’s sarcophagus is very similar to that of Psusennes’ usurped sarcophagus. The anthropoid figure has a short beard and wears a wig. He has a large collar with a figure of a kneeling, winged Nut beneath his arms. At the top of the head is a kneeling Nephthys and on the soles of his feet is Isis standing atop a *djed* sign. On the lower half are horizontal and vertical bands of text mimicking bandages and figures of gods are featured along the exterior of the trough (Figure 19).134 The similarities of the sarcophagus of Merymose to the sarcophagus of Psusennes verify that the black granite coffin of Psuennes is likely from the New Kingdom and belonged to a non-royal, but high-ranking person. It is the lack of royal regalia: the false beard, the *nemes* headdress, the crook and flail, however, that makes the choice of this coffin interesting. The use of a non-royal sarcophagus in a royal setting is a clear deviation from previous practices.

---


In addition, other kings buried at Tanis were also buried in usurped sarcophagi as well as with items that were made specifically for them. The importance of the choice to reuse this sarcophagus therefore cannot be understated and can help explain the theme of reuse present in the Libyan kings’ burials.

The coffins of Psusennes I are intriguing in that they demonstrate respect for Egyptian traditions combined with Libyan expressions. The use of the sarcophagi, the depiction of funeral deities, and excerpts from funerary texts such as Book of the Dead 151, are all expected to be seen in the context of a royal Egyptian burial. Reusing the coffin of Merenptah allowed Psusennes to reach back to the Ramesside Period and claim some of the legitimacy and prestige of the previous period for himself. This then creates the question of what the purpose of the second nesting sarcophagus is, which belonged to a Ramesside official, who was likely not a member of the royal family. To understand why Psusennes chose to include a non-royal coffin in his burial assemblage, the sarcophagus must be analyzed through the lens of kinship from the Libyan perspective.

Kinship does not exclusively refer to direct, blood-familial connections. Instead, family, or kinship, is defined in broad terms, referring not only to blood connections but to social connections as well. Sometimes these connections can be engineered, as in this case in which a kinship link was created with the kings of the Ramesside period in an effort to obtain legitimacy. The nonroyal sarcophagus serves as a kinship connection to the New Kingdom because the importance is placed upon connections instead of the royal status of the previous owner. To legitimize himself as king, Psusennes used the items to create a kinship connection to the New Kingdom, the most recent period of

---

great Egyptian power. It is important to note that this method of political legitimization does not indicate changes within his personal identity. As discussed earlier in Chapter Two, Libyans had been living in Egypt since the Middle Kingdom and I would argue that they saw themselves as ethnically Egyptian with Libyan heritage. Psusennes’s method of expression is noteworthy as it is unusual in comparison to previous kings. He easily was able to legitimize himself by using the sarcophagus of Merenptah and clearly had the ability to obtain royal funerary items from previous dynasties. He obtained a royal sarcophagus from the Valley of the Kings in Thebes, which indicates he had resources, manpower, and a transportation network with the South. If there were systems in place in which he could obtain a royal sarcophagus, it brings to question as to why another royal sarcophagus or coffin was not taken. Instead, a choice was made to take a nonroyal coffin, also from Thebes.136

It can be argued that the objects were obtained by robbery committed by the Libyans, however, the context of the period and the nature of tomb robbery do not support this conclusion. Nigel Strudwick has investigated the nature of tomb robbery in ancient Egypt and concluded there were phases of robbery. For this thesis, three of those phrases are relevant: the opportunistic robberies taking place in Dynasty 18, the systematic robberies of minor tombs in Dynasty 20, and the systematic robberies of royal tombs in the late New Kingdom.137 A collection of papyri called the Tomb Robbery Papyri (among which are Papyrus Abbott, BM EA10221, and Papyrus Mayer

136 I would like to thank Lorelei H. Corcoran for this observation.
B, National Museums Liverpool, M11186) detail not only priests inspecting tombs for robbery but also documenting the identities of those who were caught stealing.\textsuperscript{138} The individuals involved ranged from skilled craftsmen to low-ranking priests to people from Deir el-Medina who were responsible for burying the elite in the Valley of the Kings and the Valley of the Queens.\textsuperscript{139} By comparing the items left in lightly-robbed tombs to the range of objects left in an allegedly intact tomb such as that of Tutankhamun, it becomes clear that robbers preferred items that were easily portable and easy to hide.\textsuperscript{140} Strudwick also says there is evidence of favoring reusable resources such as linens and wooden coffins. Strudwick suggests that the sarcophagus of Merenptah was taken as a part of these robberies committed by the locals. If this is the case, it would have been possible to transport it northward as there would have been a familial connection between the rulers in Tanis and Thebes, meaning there was not an absolute break of contact between the two regions.\textsuperscript{141} However, if this is the case for the coffin of Merenptah, it does not answer the question as to why a nonroyal coffin was chosen instead.

Instead of finding another coffin or sarcophagus from another royal burial, the choice was made to use a nonroyal item in a royal context and there was no apparent


\textsuperscript{139} Margaret, “Mechanisms of Tomb Robbery.”

\textsuperscript{140} Margaret, “Mechanisms of Tomb Robbery.”

\textsuperscript{141} Hulin, “Libyans,” 501.
effort to add royal signifiers.\textsuperscript{142} This might indicate that the royal status assigned to the object was not as important as the kinship connections, whether direct or indirect, to the Ramesside kings. As a result, it can be concluded that Libyans understood and related to the world around them through a socially complex lens that included Egyptian and Libyan components. As Egyptians, they held to the traditions and religious practices of the period. At the same time, they placed great value on kinship, both literal, blood relations as can be seen with the Genealogy Stela of Pasenhor, but also to manufactured ties of kinship as the Sarcophagi of Psusennes I prove. Willeke Wendrich explains that the concept of personhood was present in ancient times; people likely defined their identities based on the people they associated with.\textsuperscript{143} The Libyan kings did create their identities based on their genealogy and kinship connections, both literal and created, tying them to individuals belonging to both Libyan and Egyptian identities. As a result, the social identity of the Libyan kings was affected by multiple influences, containing both Libyan and Egyptian components. However, the expression and the degrees to which their individual identity was expressed and represented varied, creating a unique, individually dependent, social identity composed of Egyptian and Libyan characteristics.

\textsuperscript{142} The prime example of adding royal signifiers to nonroyal funerary imagery is the nonroyal tomb of Horemheb at Saqqara. Horemheb was a military official who came to the throne after Ay in the New Kingdom. His nonroyal tomb became a cultic site after he claimed the throne and uraei can be seen scratched into the relief at his forehead. This was done by his cult priesthood to signify his royal status within his non-royal tomb; Geoffrey T. Martin, \textit{The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb Commander-In-Chief of Tutankhamun: The Reliefs, Inscriptions, and Commentary} (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1989).

Chapter 4: Conclusion

Due to the nature of this topic and limited surviving evidence from the Libyan people outside of Egypt, only limited conclusions can be drawn and can only specifically be applied to the royal or noble classes. While royal and nonroyal Libyans might have shared a social foundation, their lived social experiences would have varied greatly. Nevertheless, general comments about Libyan identity can be made. It is clear from the Stela of Pasenhor and the Stela of Padiaset that people with Libyan connections took great efforts to record lengthy family histories. This trait does not appear until the end of the New Kingdom into the Third Intermediate Period which coincides with rising Libyan influence, ultimately culminating in the Libyan Dynasties. During the reigns of Dynasty 21–24 kings, Egyptians with no apparent Libyan connections also start to adopt lengthy genealogical texts such as those that appear on the Memphite Priestly Elite Stela. However, this influence was not limited to the North. Lengthy texts were also found in the South around Thebes, characterized by the block statues of Basa. This practice then ends in Dynasty 25 during the Kushite Period as the focus of the texts became more about an individual event than the recording of prolonged family history and survives in a much-abbreviated form in Dynasty 26 as was seen with the block statue of Djedkhonsuiufankh. As the practice first begins as Libyans become more prominent in society, is practiced by the Libyans, and ends after the Libyans lose control of Egypt, a conclusion can be reached that unusually long genealogical texts that emphasize kinship are a result of Libyan influences.

Genealogy and knowing their ancestry contributed to the Libyans’ understanding of their social identity. As shown with Padiaset and Pasenhor, they
proudly and publicly proclaimed their kinship connections to Libyan kings and chiefs. An examination of the burials of the Libyan kings and elite at Tanis also reveals clues about their social identities. The burial assemblage Psusennes I provides a valuable case study as his coffins are composed of royal and nonroyal components. His outermost and innermost sarcophagi both adhere to an Egyptian artistic canon for royals, the outermost having once belonged to King Merenptah of the New Kingdom. The middle sarcophagus, usurped from a Ramesside noble’s burial, lacks any royal signifiers. The unusual combination of royal and nonroyal funerary items gives insight into the identity of Psusennes I. Kinship, in a broad sense, was important to the Libyans as shown through the genealogy stelae and references to their ancestral connections. In the case of Psusennes I, he used his understanding of kinship and applied it to political legitimization. By reusing objects from the Ramesside period, regardless of royal status, he is establishing kinship connections to the last great age of Egyptian kings. Whereas the objects are of Egyptian manufacture, their reuse shows clear influences of Libyan identity. As a result, these personal expressions of cultural identity construct a Libyan worldview based on the premise of kinship. This phenomenon is not limited to Psusennes as other Libyan kings interred at Tanis were buried inside reused sarcophagi, some of which can be confirmed as non-royal, such as the sarcophagi of Takeloth I. While the majority of the comments in this thesis are directed towards the burial of Psusennes I, the argument might be applied to the burials of these other individuals. They are attempting to create a kinship connection with the past. In this practice, the legitimate kinship status of these individuals does not matter, rather what matters is the constructed social connection to a past great time period.
In my research for this thesis, I have encountered no arguments for a possible explanation for the inclusion of a non-royal item in a royal context. The reasons for this choice can only be speculated, however, this does prompt the question of how much scholars really know about the Libyans. I would suggest this abnormality in a royal burial demonstrates a very clear cultural difference between the Libyan rulers and previous kings of the pharaonic era. Psusennes I chose to link himself to his Egyptian heritage by using Egyptian rituals and art yet his connection to the New Kingdom goes beyond his desire to be connected to the Ramesside kings. Through more research and archeological excavations, hopefully, a more complete picture of the culture of the Libyans can be achieved so that a clearer understanding may be gained of this culturally complex people.
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Table (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyn. 19</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I Nébhaître</td>
<td>1292–1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sety I Memn’atré</td>
<td>1292–1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II Userma’atré setepenrê</td>
<td>1290–1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merneptah Baast</td>
<td>1279–1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sety II Userkheprurê</td>
<td>1213–1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenmessës Memnire</td>
<td>1203–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siptah Akahe</td>
<td>1197–1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towsre Sîtë meritamun</td>
<td>1192–1191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyn. 20</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sethnakhte Userk’atré</td>
<td>1190–1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses III Userma’atré meriamun</td>
<td>1187–1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses IV Heqana’atré setepenamun</td>
<td>1156–1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses V Userma’atré Sekheperenrê</td>
<td>1149–1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses VI Nebma’atré meryamun</td>
<td>1145–1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses VII Userma’atré setepenrê meryamun</td>
<td>1138–1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses VIII Userma’atré akhmonamun</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses IX Nerkarë setepenrê</td>
<td>ca. 1129–1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses X Khöpëma’atré setepenrê</td>
<td>ca. 1110–1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses XI Memn’atré setepenpaah</td>
<td>ca. 1106–1077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Intermediate Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca.</td>
<td>1076–723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyn. 21</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smendes Hedjheprerrê setepenrê</td>
<td>ca. 1076–1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psuennës I Aḥhèperër setepenamun</td>
<td>ca. 1051–1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemniusité Nëforkáë</td>
<td>ca. 1005–1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemnëps Usërmà’atré setepenamun</td>
<td>ca. 1002–993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon Aḥhèperër setepenrê</td>
<td>992–987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siamun Nëjërkeprër setepenamun</td>
<td>986–ca. 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psuennës II Tëkheprër</td>
<td>967–944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyn. 22</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq I Hedjhepré rë setepenrê</td>
<td>943–923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I Sekem锛ìhèprêrë setepenrê</td>
<td>922–ca. 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takelot I Usermà’atré setepenamun</td>
<td>ca. 887–874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq II Hebëkhepré rë setepenrê</td>
<td>ca. 873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II Usermà’atré setepenamun</td>
<td>872–842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq III Usermà’atré setepenrê / amun</td>
<td>841–803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IIIa. Hedjhepré rë</td>
<td>7–790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)

Figure 3
Table (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyn. 23 (UE) and Rival Kings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takelo II</td>
<td></td>
<td>845–821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iput I</td>
<td></td>
<td>820–809–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon III, Takelot III</td>
<td>ca. 780 ± 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petubaste I</td>
<td></td>
<td>834–812–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IV, Rudamun, Iny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyn. 23 (LE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petubaste II (?), Osorkon IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyn. 24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 736–723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tefnakhte Shesherre</td>
<td>ca. 736–729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocchoris Wahare</td>
<td>728–723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 722–332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piye/Pharaoh</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 722–ca. 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabaka Neferare</td>
<td>ca. 753–723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shebitqua Djaathare</td>
<td>ca. 722–707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taharqa Neferkare</td>
<td>ca. 706–690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantamani Bakare</td>
<td>690–664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>664–ca. 655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyn. 26</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>664–525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psammetichus I Wahibre</td>
<td>664–610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necho II Wtemibre</td>
<td>610–595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psammetichus II Neferibre</td>
<td>595–589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apries Heteibre</td>
<td>589–570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasis Khemibre</td>
<td>570–526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psammetichus III Ankhkare</td>
<td>526–525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyn. 27 (Persian)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>525–404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambyses</td>
<td>525–522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius I</td>
<td>521–486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerxes</td>
<td>486–466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes I</td>
<td>465–424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius II</td>
<td>424–404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyn. 28</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>404–399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyraios</td>
<td>404–399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyn. 29</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>399–380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrites Bahre merenre</td>
<td>399–393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psammetichus Userre setepenphu</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakois Khemmuatre</td>
<td>393–380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrites II</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 4
Chronology of Third Intermediate Period Kings,
Figure 5: Relief of the Four Races of Man from the Tomb of Seti I, Valley of the Kings, Thebes, Dynasty 19.
Image from https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Races2.jpg
Figure 6
Relief of Libyan Prisoner From the Temple of Ramses III, Medinet Habu, Thebes. On exhibit at the Ramses the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs Exhibition at the Houston Museum of Natural Science.
Photo Credit: Elizabeth Heldman, May 11, 2022.
Figure 7
Relief of the captive enemies from the Temple of Ramses III, Medinet Habu, Thebes (Cairo, JE 36457 A, B, D, H)
On exhibit at the *Ramses the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs* Exhibition at the Houston Museum of Natural Science
Photo Credit: Elizabeth Heldman, May 11, 2022.
Figure 8
Serapeum Stela of Pasenhor from Serapeum of Saqqara, Dynasty 22 (S. Louvre IM 2846, CAT. NO. 31),
Image from
Figure 9
Serapeum Stela of Padiaset from Serapeum of Saqqara, Dynasty 22 (Louvre IM 3749, CAT NO. 21).
Image from https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010020344.
Figure 10
Genealogy of the Memphis Priestly Elite from Memphis, Dynasty 22 (Berlin 23673),
Image from
Figure 11
Block Statue with Genealogy of Basa, from Dendara, Third Intermediate Period (OIM 10729),
Image from
https://isac-idb.uchicago.edu/id/6f6102d9-3a51-46eb-ae7f-ceba4f157abd.
Figure 12
Drawing of the Exterior of Pink Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I
Drawing from Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennes à Tanis* (Paris, 1951), plate LXXVI.
Figure 13
Face Detail of Pink Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I (Cairo, JE 87297).
*On exhibit at the Ramses the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs* Exhibition at the Houston Museum of Natural Science.
Photo Credit: Elizabeth Heldman, May 11, 2022.
Figure 14
Chest Detail of Pink Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I (Cairo, JE 87297).
*On exhibit at the Ramses the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs* Exhibition at the Houston Museum of Natural Science.
Photo Credit: Elizabeth Heldman, May 11, 2022.
Figure 15
Head Detail of Pink Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I (Cairo, JE 87297). On exhibit at the Ramses the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs Exhibition, Houston Museum of Natural Science.
Photo taken by Elizabeth Heldman, May 11, 2022.
Figure 16
Underside Detail of Pink Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I, (Cairo, JE 87297).
On exhibit at the Ramses the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs Exhibition at the Houston Museum of Natural Science.
Photo Credit: Elizabeth Heldman, May 11, 2022.
Figure 17

Drawing of Underside of Pink Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I

Drawing from Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennes a Tanis* (Paris, 1951), plate LXXIX.
Figure 18
Drawing of Exterior of Black Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I
Drawing from Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennes à Tanis* (Paris, 1951), plate XCVI.
Figure 19

Face Detail of Black Granite Sarcophagus Lid of Psusennes I (Cairo, JE 85911),

Image from

Figure 20
Drawing of Exterior of Silver Coffin Lid of Psusennes I
Drawing from Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennes à Tanis* (Paris, 1951), plate CI.
Figure 21
Silver Coffin of Psusennes I (Cairo, JE 85917).
Image from https://english.ahram.org.eg/NewsContentMulti/476903/Multimedia.aspx.
Figure 22
Drawing of Interior of Basin of Silver Coffin of Psusennes I,
Drawing from Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennes à Tanis* (Paris, 1951), plate CIII.
Figure 23
Mummy Mask of Psusennes I (Cairo, JE 85913),
Image from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psusennes_I.
Figure 24
Funerary Mask of Tutankhamun (Cairo, JE 60672).
Figure 25
Usurped Sarcophagus of Harnakht,
Photo from Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau d’Osorkon à Tanis* (Paris, 1951), plate XLVIII.
Figure 26
Usurped Sarcophagus of Osorkon II
Plan Drawing from Pierre Montet, Les Constructions et le Tombeau d’Osorkon à Tanis (Paris, 1951), plate XLVII.
Figure 27
Mask of Wedjaebaendjed (Cairo, JE 87753),
Figure 28
Mask of Sheshonq II,
Image from Pierre Montet, *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennes à Tanis* (Paris, 1951), plate XXII.
Figure 29
Mask of Amenemope (JE 86059),
Figure 30
Sarcophagus of Merymose (British Museum, EA 1001), Image from https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/image/33229001.