

**FOREIGN PHARAOHS:
SELF-LEGITIMIZATION AND INDIGENOUS REACTION
IN ART AND LITERATURE**

Corey J. Chimko

Abstract

The author takes a new and integrated look at the treatment of the royal foreigner and the politics of race. Specifically examined is the inherent tension between the normally scathing view of the foreigner in Egyptian ideology and the necessity of deferring to him in times of foreign domination by the Hyksos, the Nubians and the Persians. Examined are both the image the foreign pharaohs wished to portray themselves, as well as the indigenous Egyptian reaction during and after periods of foreign domination. What emerges is a perhaps unexpected conclusion that foreigners were not hated as adamantly as is commonly held.

Keywords

foreigners, Hyksos, Nubians, Persians, Intermediate Periods, race, domination, legitimization, customs, art, literature

One of the most salient features of the depiction of foreigners in Egyptian art is the invariable subordination of the alien to the ideologically superior native Egyptian. Bestialization, feminization, infantilization and the spatial placement of foreigners on the lowest levels of stela, monuments, temples and other structures are some ways in which the god-granted dominion over foreign lands and their inhabitants by the pharaoh are conveyed to the observer. History shows, however, that this domination was only a symbolic and ideal one in terms of Egypt's real world international relations. Egypt in fact found itself under foreign domination on several occasions throughout its history; indeed, increasingly so as time wore on and contacts with other ancient civilizations increased. One wonders, then, how the art of these periods could cope with the paradoxical situation of having persons traditionally regarded as sub-human occupy the highest positions of honor in Egyptian religion and government. This study aims to examine the art of some of these periods of foreign domination to determine just that. It will also determine what reaction, if any, is discernible in the art of the periods that follow each foreign domination, in which Egypt was able to restore indigenous rule. Subsequently, a comparison will be undertaken in order to determine whether any consistency or variation occurs in the ways in which foreign dynasties have themselves depicted and the Egyptian reaction to them, and to suggest possible reasons for similarities and/or differences.¹

I will be focusing on 1) the period of Hyksos rule (XIV-XVth dynasties) during the Second Intermediate Period (2IP); 2) the period of Nubian rule (the XXVth dynasty) during the Third Intermediate Period (3IP); and 3) the first Persian dynasty (dynasty XXVII) in the Late Period.² After each of these three periods Egypt was able to restore native rule. Beginning with the second Persian occupation, Egypt was unable to do so again until modern times.

I. THE HYKSOS IN EGYPT

1) A Survey of Hyksos Royal Art

One of the problems encountered in a study of this kind is that foreign rule tends to occur in Egypt during periods of internal stress, when the indigenous government is weak, and the traditional administrative and religious infrastructure responsible for artistic production may not be at its most fertile. Coupled with the assumptions that foreign rulers would have found it more difficult to engender support, and that hate-motivated post-occupational destruction of monuments was likely a frequent occurrence, there exist less than favorable conditions for the survival of art from these periods. Nevertheless, it is surprising how much what little survives can tell us.

The Hyksos,³ being the first (and perhaps therefore the most violently hated afterwards) foreigners to claim the Egyptian throne, have left us the fewest and most fragmentary remains of any of our periods. Indeed, the number and names of the kings of the period is still a matter of considerable debate.⁴ This situation will hopefully ameliorate with the continuing excavations of M. Bietak at Tell el-Dab^{ca},⁵ but for now the gamut of Hyksos royal art may be listed and discussed without concern of taking up too much space.

Previously accepted reconstructions of the Hyksos royal dynasty⁶ have recently been overhauled by K. Ryholt, who has placed *M^c-jb-r^c* Sheshy and *Mr-wsr-r^c* Ya^ckob-har within the XIVth rather than the XVth Dynasty.⁷ Perhaps the two most important Hyksos pharaohs, *Swsr.n-r^c* Khayan and *Nb-ḥpš-r^c/ ʿ3-ḳnn-r^c/ ʿ3-wsr-r^c* Apophis remain within the 15th Dynasty, and it is they, together with Iannasi, that are the only kings to date for which we have any royal art save scarabs.⁸

Items of Khayan

Monuments:

- a. Block of granite from Gebelein⁹
- b. Usurped MK statue from Bubastis¹⁰
- c. Unprovenanced basalt lion from Baghdad¹¹

Vessels:

- d. Alabaster lid from Knossos¹²
- e. Obsidian vase fragment from Bögazköy¹³

Items of Iannasi

- f. Stela fragment from Tell el-Dab^{ca}¹⁴

Items of Apophis

Monuments:

- g. A granite architrave from Gebelein¹⁵
- h. A piece of building inscription originally from Avaris, found at Bubastis¹⁶
- i. A doorjamb of the Princess Tany and Apophis from Qantir (originally from Avaris)¹⁷
- j. Usurped statue from Tanis (originally from Avaris) of one *Mr-Mš^c* (a pharaoh of the XIIIth dynasty),¹⁸ and two other Middle Kingdom sphinxes¹⁹

Furniture:

- k. A reused XIIth dynasty offering stand with the name of the princess Tany and Apophis²⁰

l. An offering table of black granite from Avaris²¹

Tools:

m. A scribal palette from Medinet el-Fayyum²²

n. An adze blade from near Gebelein²³

o. Sword of *nḥmn* in the grave of ʿ3bd at Saqqara (**Fig. 1**)²⁴

Vessels:

p. A fragment of a stone jar with the name of Apophis and his daughter from the Tomb of Amenhotep I²⁵

q. A fragment of a large jar from Memphis²⁶

r. An alabaster vessel from Spain²⁷

What, then, can this small corpus of material actually tell us about the nature of Hyksos rule?

2) Evidence for the Hyksos Adoption of Egyptian Custom

Taking the corpus of scarabs and the inscriptionally terse monuments of Khayan, one can already draw numerous conclusions. **a)** The Hyksos sphere of influence spread far and wide. The scarab distributions of Sheshy and Yaʿkob-har run from Nubia in the south to Palestine in the north. Items *a-e* of Khayan betray the maintenance of, at the very least, extensive trade networks as far as Anatolia, Crete and Mesopotamia, if not diplomatic contacts as well.²⁸ More recently, many scholars have contributed to a rapidly expanding knowledge of the character and extent of Hyksos trade relations throughout the ancient world.²⁹ Holladay gives evidence of Egyptian trade routes in the Hyksos period proceeding from economically important sites such as Tell el Dabʿa, Tell el-Maskhuta and Tell el-Yahudiya, and running the entire length of the Transjordan, east into Babylonia, north into Hittite territory and northeast into Cyprus, Anatolia and Greece.³⁰ There is also evidence for trade with the far East, southern Arabia and inner Africa, which led Holladay to characterize the Asiatic settlements in the Delta as “a major port-of-trade probably unequaled in the Eastern Mediterranean.”³¹

b) There is at least some attempt by the Hyksos kings to cast themselves in the guise of the traditional Egyptian pharaoh. They adopt royal titulary, including the invocation of Horus (item *b*) and names with the theophoric element *Rʿ* (items *a*, *d*, and *e*). The names are written in the Egyptian language, and they use praenomens, a traditional practice of the preceding XIIIth dynasty. Redford suggests that “one might, with some reason, conclude that the Hyksos thus adopted forms they found ready to hand in Egypt, and suffered native mentors to counsel them.”³²

With Apophis, the proverbial sphere of influence can be seen throughout the whole of Egypt (Avaris, the Fayyum, Saqqara, Memphis, Gebelein, Thebes [items *l-q*]) and trade influences as far as Spain (item *r*). The gamut of revered Egyptian deities expands from Re and Horus (items *h*, *j*, *l*, *m*, *o-r*) to include the XVth Dynasty’s favored Seth (items *h*, *j*, *l*) and also Sobek (item *n*). Items *p* and *r* have special significance for diplomatic relations and have led some to speculate about Hyksos princesses in the courts of contemporary political powers.³³

As far as the royal image and administration at home was concerned, item *o* shows the king on the hunt, a typical representation for a pharaoh, and this interpretation is strengthened by the comparison of this sword with an axe of Ahmose, which shows the pharaoh in the familiar smiting scene, striking a personage with the same attributes as the one on the sword (**Fig. 1**). In the words of Daressy, “sans aucun doute c’est un personnage de même race qui est figuré dans les deux cas,

ici un chasseur, là un vaincu, et puisque selon toutes probabilités c'est un Pasteur qui est gravé sur le poignard, c'est aussi un Pasteur qui est terrassé par Aahmès."³⁴

The usurpation of Middle Kingdom statuary (item *j*) betrays an attempt by Apophis to identify himself with the kings of the XIIth dynasty, and item *k* (together with a wealth of scarabs) shows that administrators in the employ of the Hyksos pharaohs also adopted traditional administrative titles, such as 'treasurer'.³⁵

By Apophis' time, and somewhat ironically, the Hyksos kings also seem to have downplayed their foreignness by using traditional formulations that laud the pharaoh's dominance over other foreigners. Apophis has "all lands under his feet" (item *l*), his "might has reached the limits of the foreign lands – there is not a country exempt from serving him!" (item *r*), and he is even "protector of strange lands (3) who have never [even] had a glimpse of him" (item *m*). It is unlikely that this was actually the case, and far more likely that this is the same concept of the god-given dominion over all lands espoused by true Egyptian pharaohs from the earliest of times.

A growing body of evidence also suggests that Apophis' reign was in some sense one of cultural prosperity; the *Rhind Mathematical Papyrus* was recopied during his reign,³⁶ and some scholars believe we owe the survival of other important works such as the *Westcar Papyrus* and the *Admonitions of Ipuwer* to him as well.³⁷ On item *m*, Apophis is "the scribe of Re, whom Thoth himself taught, whom [] outfitted [...] to/of all things; multi-talented on the day when he reads faithfully all the difficult (passages) of the writings as (smoothly as [?]) flows the Nile", suggesting an interest in literature and the skills to pursue it. The contents of Papyrus BM EA 10475 suggests pushing back the date of the genesis of the compound genre of eulogy/narrative to the 2IP.³⁸ The *Rhind* papyrus also shows an adherence to the tradition of reckoning dates according to the regnal years of the king,³⁹ and there is a description of the dedication of a sistrum to the temple of Dendera by one *Ḳpp*, probably Apophis.⁴⁰

Looking at the corpus of art as a whole, items *a*, *n*, and *p*, as well as the mention of Hyksos military presence on the two Kamose stelae (see below), show that attempts were at least made by the Hyksos to control or influence Middle and Upper Egypt.⁴¹ Although such scanty remains cannot in themselves tell us very much about the nature of Hyksos rule in these regions, if it in fact existed to any appreciable degree, there are suggestions of heavy taxation from tax seals and scarabs⁴² as well as the words of Kamose (see below).

Supporting information is gleanable from some of the archaeological evidence, as explained by Bietak, who tells us that "it is not clear [...] whether [the royal residence found among the MB sequence at Tell el-Dab'a] had been a summer residence of an Egyptian king of the XIIIth Dynasty or the palace of a Delta ruler of Asiatic origin.⁴³ Finds from the palace suggest the latter, although the architecture seems to be Egyptian."⁴⁴ A possible candidate is one *Ḳ-zḥ-r* Nehesy, commonly held to be a member of the XIVth Dynasty,⁴⁵ who may have been a local ruler of some power before the actual Hyksos takeover. Two limestone doorpost inscriptions of this king were found in the religious sanctuary at Tell el-Dab'a,⁴⁶ in thoroughly Egyptian style even at this early time, despite being surrounded by a thoroughly Canaanite settlement.

3) Evidence for Hyksos Resistance to and Disdain for Egyptian Custom

As it is unlikely that the Hyksos would flaunt their foreign nature for fear of inciting the indigenous populace to rebellion, their royal art betrays little in the way of foreign elements.⁴⁷ Some

scarabs and seals with Canaanite depictions of Baʿal-like deities and other near-eastern gods and goddesses appear to be the only evidence. The archaeology of their capital Avaris, however, suggests that the resident foreigners maintained a strictly Levantine culture,⁴⁸ and that the religion, although once again glossed over with an Egyptian finish, centered around the worship of Seth, who was identified with the Canaanite storm god Baʿal.⁴⁹ Ironically, one interesting conclusion that can be drawn from the confusion surrounding names on scarabs is that the Hyksos kings ruled through the use of local vassals, a practice that is much more Levantine than Egyptian in character. It has been suggested that these vassals may account for the proliferation of ‘quasi-royal’ names (i.e. those with the title *hk3 h3swt*) on scarabs of the period.⁵⁰

There are also scattered finds that indicate destruction of Egyptian royal and cultic property at Avaris, and general disdain for former institutions and rulers. Bietak⁵¹ has found statues used as grinding stones and a defaced cultic plate. Middle Kingdom statuary scattered throughout western Asia is probably booty from the initial takeover.⁵² The practice of pillaging monuments was certainly not one practiced by kings ascending the throne through legitimate means, and would have had a powerfully adverse effect upon the psyche of the Egyptians.⁵³ This is also a key piece of evidence in the discussion of whether the original takeover was peaceful or hostile, a consideration in the subsequent treatment of the Hyksos’ memory, and a discussion we shall return to later when comparing our three periods.

II. REACTION TO HYKSOS RULE IN THE ART AND LITERATURE OF THE NEW KINGDOM

1) The Expulsion

Unfortunately, we have very little artistic or literary evidence relating to how the rest of contemporary Egypt regarded Hyksos rule in the Delta.⁵⁴ XVIth and early XVIIth Dynasty texts from Thebes are silent about the northern Hyksos regime, which is not surprising if one assumes that it was a source of embarrassment.⁵⁵ Legitimizing their own pretensions to kingship and avoiding the inherent shame of having to share the country (expressed so eloquently by Kamose later on), the Theban pharaohs likely saw fit to simply not mention it. Contemporary documents do, however, speak of great poverty and ruin that may have resulted from the turmoil of the 2IP and the Hyksos takeover.⁵⁶

From the period of the expulsion, the two stelae of Kamose⁵⁷ are by far the most important sources we have, chronicling as they do the Theban sentiment at the beginning of the campaign, and the results of the campaign itself. It is the results which are probably the cause of the dearth of material we now have for this period. The relevant passages for the rationalization of the revolt and the subsequent damage done (I: 2-8; II: 11-14) are well known.

The first Kamose stela seems to suggest that there were many that were happy with the situation in Egypt, with a peaceful delineation of territory and benefits for Theban bureaucrats (such as fields to graze their cattle). In II: 14 the king refers to “they who had allowed themselves to hearken to the call of the Asiatics,” presumably collaborators, suggesting again that not all Egyptians thought the Asiatics were as vile as that. Kamose seems to be motivated by a dissatisfaction with the fragmentation of Egypt, rather than any specific grievance concerning the governance of the Hyksos. This point might suggest that the foreign nature of the Hyksos may have simply been an

aspect to seize upon by the XVIIth and XVIIIth Dynasty kings to legitimize their rectification of a situation they were likely embarrassed to have let occur in the first place. Indeed, one scholar has seen the war between Kamose and Apophis as a theological one, in which foreign conquest itself is seen as a ‘sin’ or assault on Egyptian dignity that is worthy of punishment regardless of the quality of the foreign rule.⁵⁸ We will see that the hatred directed towards them in later times was not so vehement as generally thought.

If the destruction was as thorough as Kamose describes,⁵⁹ it is a small wonder that Bietak and his colleagues have uncovered no more than the foundations of buildings at Avaris and next to nothing in the way of monumental art. Some pertinent but very fragmentary art concerning the Hyksos expulsion on monuments of Ahmose has very recently been uncovered at Abydos. Stephen Harvey has published preliminary remarks on “small-scale narrative reliefs”, or fragments thereof, which “although [they] may derive from a conventional scene of victory over foreigners, it is possible that [they] represent actual battles with the Hyksos occupiers.”⁶⁰ This is also the first known depiction of what becomes traditional iconography in the New Kingdom, the horse and chariot warfare scene. Fragments of inscriptions mentioning Apophis and the Hyksos capital of Avaris have also been found, and may have been part of a larger historical narrative.⁶¹ It is interesting to note that “no cartouche surrounds [Apophis’] name, but it is written elsewhere in Egypt with this spelling, and the enemy ruler’s name may have been deemed unworthy of any special honour in the context of Ahmose’s temple.”⁶² This might in fact constitute one of the first indignities to which the memories of the *hk3 h3swt* were subjected in subsequent centuries.

2) *The Defamation Tradition in the New Kingdom and Later*

Manetho has long been the primary source for our knowledge of the Hyksos takeover, the Egyptians lamenting that “a blast of God smote us; and unexpectedly, from the regions of the East, invaders of obscure race marched in confidence of victory against our land.”⁶³ Manetho’s suggestions of burning, razing, hostility and massacring seem to be echoed in those of someone much less removed in time from the incident in question; on her temple at Speos Artemidos the female pharaoh Hatshepsut expresses similar sentiments, boasting of restoring “what was dismembered beginning from the time when Asiatics were in the midst of the Delta, (in) Avaris, with vagrants in their midst toppling what had been made”.⁶⁴

The last salient attempt to cast the Hyksos in a less than impressive light comes from *Papyrus Sallier I*, also known as the *Tale of Apophis and Seqenenre*, though in this tale the foul deeds have been attenuated to high taxation, worshiping gods inappropriately, and complaining of cacophonous hippopotami.⁶⁵

The truth of this vilification is hard to substantiate. With regard to Hatshepsut, van Seters cautions us that “it may be doubted whether the Hyksos actually destroyed Egyptian temples as she implies. They may have usurped monuments and stone from previous building for their own constructions, but this practice was common enough and does not necessarily imply any condemnation of Egyptian religion.”⁶⁶ In regards to *Papyrus Sallier I*, it should be said that high taxation and mocking behavior are not the exclusive ken of the Hyksos ruler, and we have already seen that they revered other gods than Seth.⁶⁷ Redford suggests that an influx of peaceful Asiatics into the Delta during the XVIIIth Dynasty may have resulted in attempts to define why the Hyksos were so hated.⁶⁸ Indeed, as we shall presently see, there is little actual evidence for the ‘vile’

behavior ascribed to the Hyksos; in fact, although New Kingdom royalty may textually defame the Hyksos reign, other evidence indicates that it was commemorated and identified with.

3) *The Sympathetic Tradition and Seth-Ba'al on Ramesside Stelae*

Despite the much-espoused anti-Asiatic attitudes that are indeed apparent in much of the New Kingdom literature,⁶⁹ there is an undercurrent of identification and even veneration of Asiatic traditions in the Delta region. This is particularly so under the Ramesside dynasty, which originated in the north, established their capital Pi-ramesse at the same site as Avaris, and selected the Hyksos-friendly Seth as their dynastic ancestor.⁷⁰ In the words of Leibovitch, we have “d’un côté, des textes d’une animosité traditionnelle et l’on peut dire conventionnelle à l’égard des Asiatiques et d’autre part, les rois égyptiens s’exposant volontiers en association avec des divinités d’origine phénicienne.”⁷¹ It is rather the fact that the association itself was made that is worthy of attention rather than the choice of gods, for the mythologies of Egyptian and Levantine gods have been shown to run parallel in many respects.⁷²

This is apparent most saliently on the somewhat confusing and often discussed 400-Year stela.⁷³ The stela seems to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the rule of Seth, which many scholars have identified as being reckoned from the installation of the cult of Seth at Avaris under the Hyksos.⁷⁴ There is debate as to whether the Seth referred to is a Delta-form of Seth-Ba'al or the Ombite version of the deity,⁷⁵ but whatever the case, the stela indisputably shows Ramses II worshipping a form of Seth with decidedly Canaanite attributes (**Fig. 2a**).⁷⁶ On a decorative scene at Medinet Habu, the end of the pharaoh’s chariot pole is decorated with a scene showing the king receiving a sword from what appears to be a Syrian god (**Fig. 2b**). This obviously flies in the face of the defamation tradition discussed above, indeed “whatever may have been the hatred expressed by the Thebans towards the Hyksos, in the north the Ramessides could unabashedly espouse a god associated with their memory, and even go so far as to commemorate the period inaugurated by the Hyksos as still continuing under the guise of Seth’s reign” and by so doing “unconsciously or intentionally”⁷⁷ keep alive the memory of the Hyksos.

It would seem that the northern origin of the XIXth dynasty (and hence, presumably, its proximity to Egypt’s largest settled Asiatic population) loomed large in their political and religious program, so large in fact as to run completely opposite to what we are forced to believe was established and traditional hatred toward the occupation in official circles.

Other stelae confirm that this was not an isolated phenomenon, and Bietak speaks of the type as “Seth of the Ramses” who is ꜥ3 phtj or “Great of Strength,” and whose primary Asiatic associations concern his status as a weather god.⁷⁸ Similar depictions are found on a stela from Berlin (**Fig. 2c**) and on others of Amenophis II,⁷⁹ Merneptah,⁸⁰ and Usermare-Nakhtu (**Fig. 2d**), a military official under Ramses III.⁸¹ Compared to similar depictions from Ugarit (**Fig. 2e**),⁸² and Beth Shean (**Fig. 2f**) one can hardly miss the similarity.⁸³ Evidence that the type goes back to Hyksos times is evident from similar depictions on Hyksos period scarabs. Ramses II seems to have been particularly devoted to Anat. On an obelisk from Tanis he is $mhr \text{ꜥ}n \text{tj}, k3 \text{ n } \text{š}t\text{š}$ “companion of Anat, bull of Seth”.⁸⁴ He is protected by her on a large number of works,⁸⁵ and he even gives his dog and horse names with Anat’s theophoric element.⁸⁶ When Ba'al is mentioned by name, he is given the Seth animal as a determinative.

Though both Tuthmosis III and Amenophis II stylized themselves “smiter of the Hyksos who

had attacked him,”⁸⁷ even before the XIXth dynasty, we have the vessel from Amenhotep I’s tomb (item *p*), and Tutankhamun’s restoration of the temple of ‘Seth of Avaris’. The temple is renewed in the reign of Seti I, ‘he who belongs to Seth’, “in order to dedicate a new residence to the god who represented the origins of royal ideology of the XIXth Dynasty.”⁸⁸ Although they may not have conceived of it in these terms, it seems as though the pharaohs of the New Kingdom were indebted to the Hyksos for the innovations in warfare that lead to the success of the so-called ‘Egyptian Empire’.⁸⁹

The Asiatic syncretism of the period is equally well-attested in the New Kingdom literature, with characters such as El, Baʿal, and Anat showing up rather frequently, their attributes sometimes assimilated to those of native Egyptian deities.⁹⁰ Because of the now centuries-old Asiatic cultural presence in the Delta, one might expect signs of such multiculturalism in textual or epigraphic material, but the appearance of Levantine gods on the royal art of New Kingdom pharaohs, the same pharaohs that are proponents and heirs of the defamation tradition directed against the memory of the Hyksos, is an intriguing problem. This is especially so since there are a number of reasons to assume that the Ramesside form of Seth worship closely resembled that of the Hyksos period.⁹¹

Te Velde proposes an interesting cosmological solution. In the tales of Horus and Seth, Horus rules *kmt* while Seth rules *dšrt*, or the foreign places, and is associated with the *rhyt*, or non-Egyptians.⁹² Seth is revered as a ‘frontier god,’ counterpart to and cooperater with Horus during a time when the Egyptian ‘Empire’ ruled and interacted with foreign lands. He must be venerated, for “the divine foreigner makes positive forces available for the maintenance of the cosmos.”⁹³ As that rule is eroded following the reign of Ramses III, the amicable relationship with the foreign likewise erodes and with it the worship of Seth. As te Velde puts it, “the close connection of Seth with foreign countries and with the God Baʿal was not only fatal to the cult of Seth, but also to the symbolism of the reconciliation of Horus and Seth.”⁹⁴ This proposition is further supported by the fact that there are no representations of Baʿal in Egypt where he is not also Seth, and that in later periods Seth worship is confined almost exclusively to the periphery of Egypt, as the veneration of Seth-Baʿal occurred on the periphery at Avaris and Pi-ramesse.⁹⁵

If we again accept that settled Levantines in the Delta were not necessarily identified with the Hyksos kings, and therefore were not driven out as vehemently as the foreign princes themselves, then we might look upon the portrayal of an easternized Seth on Ramesside stelae as a concession in ruling a Levantine population, for “rank and wild growth of exotic religions and religious needs could be counteracted and obviated by raising up Seth to be a state god by the side of Amon, Ptah and Re.”⁹⁶ Conversely, it might also be the case that Asiatic elements had been present for so long in the Delta by this time, that they were not in fact considered non-Egyptian by the Ramesside kings; as van Seters puts it: “during the century and a half of their residence in Egypt, Hyksos cults and mythology were so firmly established that it was no longer possible for the Eighteenth Dynasty to eradicate them or even distinguish them as foreign cults.”⁹⁷ Te Velde’s explanation of the utility of the Seth cult in terms Egyptian cosmology also provides a convincing ideological approach to the problem. Whatever the reason, it is certainly the case that “les pharaons à partir du début de la XVIII^e dynastie jusqu’à Ramsès II n’ont pas méprisé [le] panthéon phénicien. Bien au contraire, ils ont tous exprimé leur vénération pour ces divinités.”⁹⁸

III. THE THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD AND THE ART OF THE NUBIAN PHARAOHS

A comment should be made here concerning the nature of the dynasties designated ‘Libyan’, i.e. the rulers of the XXIInd through XXIVth Dynasties. Whereas it is true that these rulers were of Libyan descent (apparent from their distinctive Libyan names), and whereas certain facets of their rule (such as the maintenance of the traditional Libyan titles ‘Great Chief of the Ma[shwesh]’ and ‘Great Chief of the Libu’⁹⁹) do constitute ties with their Libyan heritage, the rule of these dynasties was obtained through traditional means in the various Delta centers that were their capitals, at least insofar as their power was derived from within Egypt itself.¹⁰⁰ Most likely descendants of the Libyan prisoners of war resettled during the campaigns of the New Kingdom pharaohs, it may be said that these dynasties were for all intents and purposes fully Egyptianized. Indeed, the XXVIth, or Saïte Dynasty, which marks the return to indigenous rule after the Nubian occupation, is likely also of Libyan stock. The Libyan dynasties, therefore, do not constitute a ‘foreign’ occupation in the same way that the Hyksos, Nubian, and Persian ones do, the latter’s power being derived from abroad and having conquered Egypt through military force.

1) Traditional Artistic Production

In contrast with the Hyksos artistic repertoire, that of the Nubian pharaohs is substantially more proliferate. From the time of the institution of the cult of Amun in Nubia through the efforts of the Egyptian Empire in the New Kingdom, it seems as though a thoroughly Egyptianized religion was practiced in Nubia and the Napatan state. The chronology of Napatan rulers who had aspirations to the Egyptian throne reads as follows:

- 1) Kashta (c. 760-747)
- 2) Pi(ankh)y (747-716)
- 3) Shabako (716-702)
- 4) Shebitku (702-690)
- 5) Taharqa (690-664)
- 6) Tantamani (664-656)¹⁰¹

A complete inventory of the Nubian kings’ artistic production is too lengthy to summarize here,¹⁰² so I will be confining myself to the most important and representative works that relay most saliently the spirit of Nubian rule. Already in the reign of Kashta, who is unlikely to have penetrated into Egypt very far, we already have the adoption of royal titulary and a respect for native Egyptian deities.¹⁰³ An aegis of Mut wearing the double crown, of unknown provenance but very Nubian in style, also bears his name, suggesting the adoption of pharaonic ceremony at the Nubian court.¹⁰⁴

The most important document for this period is the Victory Stela of Kashta’s successor Pi(ankh)y,¹⁰⁵ which is written in Classical, not Late, Egyptian. On it, a mutilated Pi(ankh)y, who is “king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Piye beloved-of-Amun, ever living”¹⁰⁶ receives the homage of the conquered Egyptian rulers, backed by Amun and Mut. The stela narrates Pi(ankh)y’s triumphant campaign into Egypt, and his observance of cult as he progresses steadily northward towards Memphis. Yet even before setting out, Pi(ankh)y expresses a wish to celebrate traditional

observances, then pays homage to the local deities of the towns he overtakes.¹⁰⁷ He continues to be hailed by the fallen princes as an incarnation of Horus and as son of Nut, he sacrifices to Sokar, and finally, after he succeeds in capturing Memphis, he is legitimized by Ptah.¹⁰⁸ These are certainly the actions of a pious Egyptian king; indeed it is interesting to note that the Libyan rulers whom Pi(ankh)y supplanted are cast as foreigners and are treated (on the top of the stela) in such a way as to suggest that he is a more legitimate successor to the throne than they.

We have seen that the Nubian pharaohs were well versed in Egyptian custom prior to the takeover, and they seem to have taken genuine pride in fulfilling traditional obligations. The stela is complemented by a pair of blocks from the temple of Mut in Karnak, one showing Pi(ankh)y's fleet returning from a successful foreign trading mission, and the other part of a religious scene in a Theban temple.¹⁰⁹ Perhaps more significantly, Pi(ankh)y's stay at Memphis is probably behind the inauguration of the custom at El-Kurru of burying the Nubian pharaohs under pyramids.¹¹⁰ This hearkening back to ancient and revered forms in religion and art is a trademark that the Nubians will employ over and over, interestingly enough most often in Nubia itself.¹¹¹ Pi(ankh)y returned to Napata after his Egyptian victories and added a temple wall, columned halls and forecourts, and an entrance pylon to the Amun temple at Gebel Barkal.¹¹² Again, it seems as though Egypt prospered under this rule and that deviations from traditional custom did not occur, but were followed and even enhanced.

The prosperity and piety of Egypt under Nubian rule is epitomized by Pi(ankh)y's successor Shabako, who is the first Nubian ruler to be named in Manetho's XXVth Dynasty, and who adopted a very archaizing titulary according to Old and Middle Kingdom style by using the praenomen 'Neferkare', known from the IIIrd(?), VIth, VIIth, VIIIth, IXth and Xth dynasties.¹¹³ He not only followed custom but added significantly to the building programmes at Karnak,¹¹⁴ Luxor,¹¹⁵ and Medinet Habu.¹¹⁶ Shabako is also the first Nubian pharaoh for which we have established portraiture, in statuary from Karnak, Memphis and El Kurru.¹¹⁷ On his reliefs, as on his stelae,¹¹⁸ Shabako is shown performing cult offering to various Egyptian deities, most notably Amun, Mut, and Osiris. He seems to have had a special relationship to Memphis, where he erected a chapel and naos stela. His reverence for Memphis is also apparent in his decision to have the *Memphite Theology* recopied onto a granite stela, the 'Shabako Stone', as a result of its deteriorated state on papyrus.¹¹⁹ This is only one instance of the overall archaizing tendency already mentioned for this period, the Nubian rulers seeing fit to copy art, worship, and titulary from Old and Middle Kingdom models. Although "none of these were vast works, [...] they heralded a new era of royal building both within Thebes and throughout Egypt."¹²⁰ It might seem as though such activity might be an attempt at self-legitimization more than a genuine love for Egyptian culture, but other evidence of Nubian rule as well as the later celebration of Shabako's memory argue otherwise.¹²¹

This trend continues under the reign of Shebitku, who added to the temple of Osiris-Hekadjet and a chapel of Amun to the Karnak precinct,¹²² as well as scenes at Luxor,¹²³ where he offers to Amon and Hathor. A stela dedicated to his cult has also survived.¹²⁴ Shebitku, however, decided to revert to a more imperial-style titulary, akin to the pharaohs of the New Kingdom. This is possibly because of his military initiatives in Palestine versus the Assyrians, defending Egypt through the use of his general Taharqa, who would succeed him as pharaoh.

Taharqa surpasses all Nubian pharaohs in the extent of his piety, having built extensively all over Egypt and Nubia.¹²⁵ Some of the more interesting of his works come from the reliefs and

painted scenes on the temple at Kawa, which show Taharqa trampling foreign enemies in a style copied directly from the tombs of the Vth and VIth dynasty kings at Abusir and Saqqara. Likewise, five Kawa stelae record his pious activities and the success he was granted as king because of them, and are good sources for unmutated iconography.¹²⁶ Even on these stelae, lying in the heart of Nubia, the king talks of events in Egypt, of being crowned with the double uraeus, and of being one whose father is “Amon-Re of Karnak”.¹²⁷ The colonnades he added to the temple of Amon-Re still stand. Indeed, many reliefs and buildings were dedicated co-jointly with the ‘God’s Wives’ at Thebes, the institution re-inaugurated in the Libyan period on New Kingdom models and followed by the Nubian pharaohs. He seems to have had a hand in emphasizing the worship of Osiris as well, dedicating the temples of Osiris Lord-of Life and Osiris Lord-of-Eternity with Shepenwepet II, daughter of Pi(ankh)y. Also important was the sanctuary near the sacred lake, the cult center of the king and “a propaganda instrument of the highest order” where an elaborate ritual of regeneration took place that “endowed the king with the religious legitimization to exercise rule on earth as successor to the gods.”¹²⁸ Taharqa was crowned and ruled in Memphis, apparent from the Serapeum Stelae in his name and the huge ashlar found bearing the inscription “Taharqa, beloved of Ptah”.¹²⁹ An interesting problem that bears witness to the Nubian pharaohs’ adeptness at copying traditional forms is the frequent misattribution of monuments to the Middle Kingdom and vice versa.¹³⁰ Trade also flourished under Taharqa, objects bearing his name having been found near Mosul, at Nimrud, Assur and Palmyra.¹³¹ His ambitions to be a great imperial pharaoh were to be his undoing, however. Despite victories over the Libyans, Taharqa was less successful against the Assyrians. Esarhaddon got to Memphis and Assurbanipal conquered Thebes, driving Taharqa into Napata for good. But the Assyrians left, allowing one last Nubian incursion into Egypt.

The last Nubian pharaoh, Tantamani, was not content to relinquish the Egyptian throne. His ‘Dream Stela’ reads like a typical *Königsnovelle*,¹³² revealing his attempt to assert his legitimacy through the traditional granting of an oracle, which

“was interpreted for him in the following way: ‘Upper Egypt already belongs to you: conquer Lower Egypt, and you will wear the Double Crown, for you will be given the Land in its length and width, without anyone else sharing it with you.’”¹³³

Tantamani decides that it is best not to ignore the oracle, and gathers his people for invasion. Besides following a well-established literary tradition for self-legitimization, Tantamani built in traditional style at Thebes, El-Kurru and Gebel Barkal.

2) *Non-Egyptian Elements in the Art of the XXVth Dynasty*

In light of the long-standing practice of Egyptian religion and reverence for ancient tradition in Nubia, it is not surprising that we find little in the way of deviation from traditional forms in the art of the XXVth Dynasty. One way in which the kings of the XXVth Dynasty do stand out, however, is in their personal iconography. Most conspicuous are the ‘kushite cap’, the tight-fitting skull-cap headdress worn by the Nubian kings, and its decoration, the double uraeus, which stands in contrast to the usual single uraeus of Egyptian pharaohs (**Fig. 3**). There has been much discussion regarding both traits. The cap has been seen as simply a representation of closely cropped hair, but it now seems as though it is attested marginally before the Nubian dynasty as an element in the worship of

Ptah. The double uraeus is also a pre-Nubian attribute of high-priestesses and goddesses, but never of a pharaoh. It would seem logical to conclude that this iconography has been adopted to symbolize the Nubian rulership over the ‘Two Lands’ of Nubia and Egypt.¹³⁴ The uraei themselves often wear the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt. This interpretation is also strengthened by the fact that the uraei fall prey to post-occupational iconoclasts (see below).

The modeling of the Nubian body is likewise an innovation that inaugurates a period of increased realism in Egyptian art. Chiseled musculature and fleshier ‘Nubian’ faces are the salient features of this new modeling. Other than this, however, very little seems to have been deviated from; indeed, it has even been suggested that Kushite religious theology prepared Egypt for the reality to be achieved under the Saïtes.¹³⁵

IV. THE SAÏTE REACTION TO NUBIAN RULE

1) Psamtik I and the Nitocris Adoption Stela

The Saïte or XXVIth Dynasty has been determined to constitute somewhat of an archaistic revival, continuing perhaps the trend observed by the XXVth Dynasty, although there is a scarcity of material due to the “comprehensive plundering of the country at the time of the Persian invasion.”¹³⁶ Nevertheless, what does survive enables us to draw several conclusions which are both unexpected and pertinent to this study.

One very important document is the Nitocris Adoption Stela of Psamtik I, founder of the XXVIth dynasty.¹³⁷ It records the installment of the king’s daughter Nitocris into the college of priestesses at Karnak, under the tutelage of Taharqa’s daughter Amonirdis, who herself is in the care of Shepenwepet, Taharqa’s sister, the latter being the acting ‘God’s Wife of Amun’. On it, Psamtik states that as a lover of truth he will not expel an heir from his seat, but rather will give his daughter to Amonirdis in honor of pre-existing custom, as Amonirdis was given to Shepenwepet.¹³⁸ There is no indication of any animosity or desire to mar the memory of the Nubian pharaohs; quite the contrary: Psamtik is making sure we know what a pious man he is by respecting the succession of the Theban priestesses descended from them. In fact, the reverence for archaism exhibited by the Nubian pharaohs is also policy under the Saïtes.

Several other monuments show at least a respect for, if not an affinity with, the Nubian pharaohs on the part of Psamtik I: blocks from the temple of Mut at Karnak record his name alongside the celebrated Saïte general Somtutefnakht; a scene from the Wadi Gasous shows Psamtik I offering to Min in the presence of Nitocris and Shepenwepet, who is unashamedly labeled “daughter of king Pi(ankh)y, justified”; the funerary monuments of Shepenwepet II, which were modified by Nitocris for herself and her mother, maintain the designation of Amonirdis I as “daughter of king Kashta” and Shepenwepet II as “daughter of king Piankhy”; Shepenwepet II is also mentioned as “daughter of king Pi(ankh)y” in the tomb of Pabes, an attendant of Nitocris and on an offering table from the tomb of Montuemhat; and lastly, an Apis stela from Psamtik I’s twentieth year records the Apis’ birth in year twenty-six of Taharqa, a date that could easily have been reckoned in terms of the years of Psamtik’s father Necho I if there had been any reason to defame the memory of the Nubian ruler.¹³⁹

Psamtik himself would seem to have had no reason to hate the Nubian dynasty; it was not him, after all, but rather the Assyrians who were responsible for ousting the Nubians, and Psamtik

I therefore had no military prerogative against them. Psamtik II, however, is another story.

2) *The Mutilation of XXVth Dynasty Monuments by Psamtik II*

The Nubian campaign of Psamtik II has been convincingly pinpointed by Yoyotte as the source for the mutilation of the cartouches and uraei of the Nubian rulers, which is apparent on the majority of their monuments.¹⁴⁰ It had been previously believed that this mutilation occurred during the reign of Psamtik I following the expulsion of Tantamani,¹⁴¹ but is now believed to be a politically motivated occurrence intended to de-legitimize subsequent Nubian pretensions to the Egyptian throne.¹⁴² The Nubian campaign is well-known as the only significant occurrence in Psamtik II's reign, and the geographical distribution of the mutilations¹⁴³ is consistent with the path such an army would take, as well as the places in which they would have been stationed. Additionally, a number of monuments show traces of Nubian cartouches that were replaced by Psamtik II's,¹⁴⁴ and others that were completely mutilated and replaced.¹⁴⁵ There are indications that "loin de constituer une opération sans importance, [les événements militaires de l'an III] représentent très probablement une phase critique des conflits qui, depuis le milieu du VIII^e siècle, opposait la monarchie de Napata à celle de Saïs."¹⁴⁶ This is hinted at on a stela from Tanis which states that "le Pays des Nubiens (2) [...] médite de (?) combattre avec [toi(?)]," suggesting a possible pre-meditated attack.¹⁴⁷ If this was the case, and the Nubians were intent on retaking Egypt, we can see Psamtik's Nubian campaign and the accompanying mutilations as an effort to not only defend the frontier, but also to demolish, in the process, iconographic representations of Nubian rulers that might have boosted support for them or legitimized their pretensions. The Nubians are now relegated to the status of the 'other', in the same way as any hostile foreign force against which a true Egyptian pharaoh might wage war; in the words of Yoyotte:

"les rois de la XXV^e dynastie, considérées jusqu'alors comme légitimes, furent traités comme les usurpateurs et comme les individus coupables du crime de lèse-majesté. En effaçant leur souvenir [...] le Saïte dénonçait du même coup les droits que les princes de Kouch avaient acquis sur le trône d'Égypte et détruisait les manifestations extérieures qui pouvaient rappeler ces droits à leurs partisans"; [Psamtik's desire was to] "détruire le caractère proprement Nubien de ces effigies et de supprimer du même coup un symbole manifeste des prétentions du Kouchite à la double royauté sur l'Égypte et l'Éthiopie."¹⁴⁸

Whether or not a Nubian attack was imminent, we can see that Psamtik's motivation for both the campaign and the mutilations was strictly political and not ideological. He destroyed their monuments because they were a political threat to the Saïte dynasty, not because they were foreign, or practiced a different religion (as we have seen, they did not!). This is further evident through his choice to install his own daughter in Thebes, supplanting the office of God's Wife, unlike his more reverent predecessor of the same name, and his usurpation of their monuments.¹⁴⁹

Despite Psamtik II's efforts, however, some of the virtuous deeds and piety of the Nubian rulers was to survive. This is especially so for the memory of Shabako, who had a street named after him in Late Period Memphis, and whose inscriptions were restored in the Ptolemaic period. Even the Greek historians speak of him highly.¹⁵⁰ If there were any other attempts at defaming the memory of the Nubian pharaohs during the XXVIth Dynasty, they have not survived. It might be said

that the Saïtes had bigger problems to deal with, such as the Persian threat looming on the horizon.

V. THE PERSIANS IN EGYPT

1) Traditional Egyptian Art of the XXVIIth Dynasty

The Persians were certainly not as familiar with Egyptian religion and art as were the Nubians. Their takeover of the Egyptian throne might therefore be seen as ostensibly more illegitimate, and there is indeed a defamation tradition applied to the Persian rulers that shows up in Herodotus¹⁵¹ and other classical sources.¹⁵² The first Persian dynasty consisted of:

1. Cambyses (II) (530-522) [Egypt after 526]
2. Darius I (522-486)
3. Xerxes (486-465)
4. Artaxerxes I (465-424/3)
5. Darius II (423-405)
6. Artaxerxes II (405-359 [Egypt until c.399])¹⁵³

The traditional take is that the Persians were considerably harder-handed towards the native populace than their conquering predecessors. On this point one must navigate the evidence with a certain degree of caution, however, for much of the written evidence for this view was put forth by parties having a vested interest in the posthumous vilification of the Persian dynasties. Artifactual evidence in fact paints a much rosier picture of Persian rule in Egypt, at least at first, although it is the extent to which the surviving contemporary indigenous art reflects the opinion of the masses versus what the ruling elite would have us believe that requires further examination.¹⁵⁴ What we do have indicates that the early Persian rulers were as eager to adopt Egyptian custom as were the Hyksos and the Nubians.¹⁵⁵

From the reign of Cambyses we have two pieces of official art, the epitaph and sarcophagus of the Apis buried in the sixth year of his reign (524). On both, Cambyses is depicted no differently from any Egyptian pharaoh that has come before him. Similarly, the inscriptions sing the praises of indigenous custom; the epitaph records Cambyses' funeral offering to Apis as King of Upper and Lower Egypt, while the sarcophagus places Cambyses squarely in the divine hierarchy as son of Re and of Apis-Osiris, exalted and receptive of the gifts of eternal life, prosperity, health and happiness.¹⁵⁶ There is nothing artistically or textually 'un-Egyptian' here.

Similarly, we learn that his governance was equally adoptive of indigenous custom from the statue of one Udjhorresnet.¹⁵⁷ Udjhorresnet originally served as a naval general under Amasis and Psamtik III of the XXVIth Dynasty. After the conquest, Cambyses appointed him courtier, chief priest of Neith and chief physician, very noteworthy positions. Udjhorresnet seems to have held considerable sway with the foreign king. His statue is constructed in an entirely Egyptian style, with no hint of foreign artistic elements. In it he tells us of the invasion of Cambyses, calling the latter "Great Ruler of Egypt," "Great Chief of All Foreign Lands" and "His Majesty," and composing his royal titulary in his name of "King of Upper and Lower Egypt Mesitu-Re."¹⁵⁸ He tells also of the invasions of foreigners who had settled in the temple of Neith, and how he made supplication to Cambyses to have them expelled, and how Cambyses complied with his request. Cambyses then,

in traditional pharaonic form, has the temple purified, restored, and made offerings to the gods in Sais.¹⁵⁹

What seems clear from the inscription is that despite the fact that Cambyses was foreign and did in fact conquer Egypt, that it was not he that was responsible for the desecration of the temple of Neith, indeed, quite the contrary. He seems to have heeded the pleas of his chief physician and expelled what were likely his own men from the sanctuary.¹⁶⁰ He even performed the sacrifices in the tradition of the pharaohs before him. Much has been made of the so-called ‘collaboration’ of indigenous officials, especially Egyptian officials, with the conquering Persians. What has always been considered conspicuous in such cases is the Egyptian acceptance of foreign domination with very little opposition. We have seen, however, that also in the cases of the Hyksos and the Nubians, the Egyptian conception of foreignness was not based on one’s origins or skin color but on one’s conduct. As long as the conquering king was Egyptian in deed, that was good enough. And this is the impression that Udjahorresnet gives us. He does not fail to mention the chaos that resulted from Cambyses’ invasion, but also takes pride in being able to advise the pharaoh on Egyptian custom and from having won him over. Indeed, Udjahorresnet is even charged with the composition of Cambyses’ official titulary. In the inscription itself, one can see that Cambyses’ characterization changes from being a ‘ruler of foreigners’ to being a ‘ruler of Egypt’. In the passage describing the calamities that befell Egypt as a result of the Persian conquest, Cambyses is ‘Great King of All Foreign Lands’, (*wr ʕ3 ḥ3swt*) but upon his conquest becomes both ‘Great Ruler of Egypt’ (*ḥk3 ʕ3 n kmt*) and ‘Great Chief of all Foreign Lands’. The deeds he performs as pharaoh are performed entirely by ‘His Majesty’, with no mention thereafter of his foreignness. Udjahorresnet’s collaboration seems to be contingent on the acceptance by Cambyses of Egyptian custom.

Imitating his predecessor, Darius I’s Apis Epitaph and its inscription, from the fourth year of his reign, are close to identical with that of Cambyses, except that the cartouche his *nsw-bjty* name was supposed to go in was left empty.¹⁶¹ Similarly, several other existing artworks, such as a pair of wooden naos shrines, a stela from the Fayyum, and the worship scenes from of the temple of Amun at Hibis, also show Darius as a quintessentially Egyptian pharaoh.¹⁶² There is also evidence that Darius undertook construction at El-Kab,¹⁶³ Edfu, Abusir and Memphis, as well as a recodification of Egyptian law modeled on that of Amasis (i.e. in traditional Egyptian fashion).¹⁶⁴ Yet certain signs of deviation and indignation seem to be creeping into Darius’ Egyptian art. At Hibis he is ‘universal high priest’, not pharaoh,¹⁶⁵ and as his reign wore on, Darius saw fit to have himself portrayed more and more as a foreign ruler, or at least to allow “official” depictions of him in and around Egypt to reflect his Persian background.

2) *Non-Egyptian Elements in the Art of the XXVIIth Dynasty*

The stelae Darius erected along his Suez canal,¹⁶⁶ as well as the statue of him found at Susa (see below) both probably date to the last third of his reign, based on the spelling of his name, and on the list of conquered peoples inscribed on them.¹⁶⁷ The first and most striking non-Egyptian trait of the Canal stelae is the fact that they are quadrilingual, i.e. they contain, in addition to the Egyptian hieroglyphs, translations in Old Persian, Babylonian and Elamite cuneiform. The inscription contains Persian place-names in cartouches, with Persia occupying the number one position in the list of twenty-four countries. Notably, the Egyptian inscription contains a verbatim translation of traditional Achaemenid titulary instead of Egyptian, and goes on to state:

(7) Saith Darius the King: I am a Persian; from Persia I seized Egypt; I ordered this canal (9) to dig, from the river by name Nile, which flows in Egypt, to (10) the sea which goes from Persia. afterwards this canal was dug (11) thus as I commanded, and ships went from Egypt (12) through this canal to Persia thus as was my desire.”¹⁶⁸

Darius still stands on the *šm3* sign of unification, which in this case might stand for both his role as ruler of Upper and Lower Egypt and for the unification of disparate lands brought about by the construction of the canal. He also still stands under a thoroughly Egyptian winged disc, but he is in Achaemenid costume. One might argue that these modifications should be considered in light of the fact that the canal was constructed to facilitate trade, and that the stelae were decorated to facilitate comprehension by as many people as possible who might be using the canal. This is certainly plausible, however the fact remains that the canal lay in essentially Egyptian territory, and that blatant glorification of Darius’ Achaemenid origins could not have been conducive to his acceptance as a thoroughly Egyptian king.

Similarly executed with mixed motifs is the statue of Darius discovered in context at Susa in 1972.¹⁶⁹ It is made of Egyptian granite with Egyptian techniques, and Darius stands in a typically Egyptian pose, the left leg forward, holding an Egyptian emblematic staff. His dress, however, is thoroughly Achaemenid with his flowing robe and strapless boots. In the hieroglyphic inscription, Atum of Heliopolis is Darius’ patron deity, and it has been established that the statue, or at least a copy of it, once stood in the temple of Atum at Heliopolis. In the hieroglyphs, it asserts that it was erected

“so that there should be a durable monument of Darius and so that he be remembered before his father Atum, Heliopolitan Lord of the Two Lands, Re-Herakhti, for the whole extent of eternity,”¹⁷⁰

whereas in the same place in the cuneiform, we have an explicit statement that the statue was made *in Egypt* for the purpose of showing that a Persian had taken Egypt:

“[Dariu]s, may he live for ever! The exalted, the greatest of the great, the chief of [the whole...] land, [son of the god’s] father, Hystaspes, the Achaemenid, who has appeared as king of Upper and Lower Egypt on the Horus throne like Re, the first of the gods, forever.”¹⁷¹

Like the canal stelae, this piece of official art is certainly outside the oft-cited policy of appeasement supposedly practiced by the Persian pharaohs. To set up so blatantly a foreign depiction of the pharaoh would be anathema to local religious zealots, especially if Darius deigned to set it up in the temple of Atum itself. Even if native Egyptians could only read the softened hieroglyphic inscription and not the cuneiform, they could at least have recognized the script as foreign and therefore as having no place in an Egyptian temple.

One final piece of official art that probably dates to the latter years of Darius’ reign is the famous statue of Ptahhotep now in the Brooklyn Museum.¹⁷² Unfortunately, the inscription contains no biographical details or historical facts, but it is the statue’s appearance and Ptahhotep’s accoutrements that identify it as exhibiting Persian influence.¹⁷³ Another inscription exists in Paris

of one Ptahhotep that dates to the thirty-fourth year of Darius' reign, suggesting that they might refer to one and the same person. If this is true, we might see Ptahhotep's willingness to have himself portrayed in Achaemenid style as a reflection of Darius' equal willingness to do so during the latter years of his reign. Ptahhotep wears a garment not unlike that of the Darius statue, and certainly reminiscent of Persian dress. Most strikingly, however, is the ibex-headed torque that he wears around his neck (**Fig. 4**),¹⁷⁴ a piece of art thoroughly Iranian in both form and decoration. As Cooney points out, this torque could not possibly have served any religious function in terms of Egyptian belief, and so its inclusion is extremely conspicuous. Cooney postulates that perhaps it was given to him as a gift from Darius, and that Ptahhotep was sufficiently proud of such a bestowal that he chose to have this symbol of divine favor portrayed in his funerary statue.¹⁷⁵

Ptahhotep does not fit into the same collaborative framework as Udjahorresnet. Rather than attempting to fit himself and his ruler into an Egyptian framework, he chooses instead to celebrate his closeness to the foreign ruler and to do so by exhibiting foreign elements in his funerary statue. Such a radical departure from what has come before might suggest the existence of other collaborators that were so in a much truer sense of the word. Furthermore, political conditions may have somehow changed during the latter stages of Darius' reign, making the blatant exhibition of such foreign loyalty less dangerous, if not less conspicuous. These changes may be reflected in the statues of Darius and Ptahhotep, but the scarcity of any other such depictions might very well be a result of the opposition that did exist towards them. Indeed, the Ptahhotep statue is heavily damaged, and many other statues of the same style may very well have been destroyed completely.

VI. THE REACTION TO PERSIAN RULE

The last indigenous pharaohs of Egypt were forced by the circumstances of history to assert themselves to a greater degree than their predecessors into the winds of contemporary world politics. Political intrigue was the order of the day, and it seems as though the pharaohs busied themselves primarily with forging alliances to keep stronger powers outside Egypt's borders. Some of the pharaohs of Dynasty XXX built extensively, but their monuments seem to have focused on their own legitimization rather than the defamation of preceding monarchs. We have already mentioned the defamation tradition that shows up in Herodotus concerning Cambyses, and although not historic in a specific sense, it certainly conveys the post-occupational sentiment and disdain with which the Persians were remembered.

The scarcity of surviving Persian material speaks of the reaction more loudly than any renunciation. Nevertheless, I would like to examine two final monuments, which span the transition from the XXXth Dynasty to the second Persian occupation, and whose manner of dealing with it can perhaps shed some light on the anti-Persian sentiment at the time.

The first item is the Naples stela of one Somtutefnakht, another so-called 'collaborator'.¹⁷⁶ Note that this stela is devoid of any foreign influence. Somtutefnakht's involvement in the wars against Alexander on the Persian side have been inferred from historical references in the inscription; he is thought to have begun his career in the XXXth dynasty under a 'Great King', presumably of Egyptian origin and probably Nectanebo II. In contrast to Udjahorresnet's inscription, the new Persian overlord is never referred to as ruler of Egypt, only king of Asia:

You (Harsaphes) gave me access to the palace,
 The heart of the Good God¹⁷⁷ was pleased by my speech.
 You distinguished me before millions,
 When you turned your back on Egypt.¹⁷⁸
 You put love of me in the heart of Asia's ruler (*Hšryš*)¹⁷⁹
 (...) You protected me in the combat of the Greeks,
 When you repulsed those of Asia.¹⁸⁰

I have mentioned before that Persian sensitivity to indigenous custom began deteriorating after the reign of Darius,¹⁸¹ and the harshness of the Persian kings of the second occupation is well documented and generally accepted. Somtutefnakht's reluctance to follow Udjahorresnet's usage, and his use of determinatives, are likely responses to the almost universally established hatred for the Persians by this time. Here, then, is a negative quantification of the hypothesis that acceptance of foreign rule was contingent on the foreigner's willingness to adopt indigenous custom.

The second official monument whose life spanned the period of the second domination is the tomb of Petosiris, high-priest of Thoth at Hermopolis, and his family. Its construction and decoration are thought to span the end of the fourth and beginning of the third centuries BC, Petosiris' grandfather having served under the kings of the XXXth Dynasty, and Petosiris and his brother having lived through the second Persian domination and the establishment of Macedonian rule.¹⁸² A similar sentiment to that of Somtutefnakht is alluded to in Petosiris' biographical inscription (No. 81) from the tomb:

“I spent seven years as controller for this god (Khmun),
 Administering his endowment without fault being found,
 While the Ruler-of-foreign-lands (*hkꜣ n ḥꜣswt m ndty-ḥr Kmt*)¹⁸³ was Protector in Egypt,
 And nothing was in its former place,
 Since fighting had started (30) inside Egypt,
 The South being in turmoil, the North in revolt;
 The people walked with ‘head turned back’,
 All temples were without their servants,
 The priests fled, not knowing what was happening.”¹⁸⁴

Here, Petosiris describes the rule in Egypt of a ‘Ruler of Foreigners’, likely a Persian ruler of the second occupation. Later in the text, after having become $\lambda\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu\eta\sigma$ of Thoth, and after the temple is restored, his successes are ascribed to a ‘Ruler of Egypt’ (81, 88), likely one of the Macedonian liberators, perhaps Alexander himself or Ptolemy Soter. By contrast, his brother Djethotefankh, who let the temple crumble during the second Persian domination, “a laissé faire pour éviter, peut-être, des désordres plus grands mais, à l’arrivée des Macédoniens, il fut vraisemblablement associé aux méfaits perpétrés dans le temple de Thot,” and “a sans doute été condamné à mort, dès l’arrivée des troupes d’Alexandre, pour son manque de prévision et d’autorité au moment des troubles, peut-être aussi pour son comportement de ‘collaborateur.’”¹⁸⁵

Both inscriptions associate leaders of foreign lands with a chaotic state of invasion, and subsequently, when that state has been rectified through the observance of traditional Egyptian

policy, the rulers are adopted as fully indigenous, and are associated with order. And, as with the works of Udjahorresnet and Somtutefnakht, the foreign influence seen in the Petosiris tomb is almost exclusively Greek, the only hint of Persian influence being the depictions of metalsmiths producing decorative arts of Iranian design.¹⁸⁶

The overall impression one gets from examining the official art of the Persian occupation in Egypt is that the foreign pharaohs make a concerted effort to appear as indigenous as possible during the initial stages of the occupation. As time goes by, however, it seems as though that effort wanes, and that beginning about the time that the Achaemenid empire reaches its apogee in about the middle of the reign of Darius I, the Persian rulers hold fewer qualms about asserting their foreign nature. Perhaps this was simply a function of arrogance on the part of Darius; when one looks at the list of impressive achievements that occur around the time of the execution of those artworks that exalt him as Achaemenid, one can see how he might have deemed appeasement no longer necessary in an empire of such vast power.

Perhaps it is precisely such arrogance that initiates the cascade of anti-Persian sentiment that seems to plague the Persian occupants of Egypt to a much greater degree from this time forward. Rebellion becomes endemic following the Persian defeat at Marathon in 490, and we have seen from both artistic and textual evidence that the Egyptian opinion of the Persian rulers erodes around this time as well.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

1) Depictions: Relative Consistency

We can now answer several of our initially posed questions. In regards to whether any variation occurs in how foreign rulers have themselves depicted in Egyptian art over time, it would seem that for the most part official policy was unanimously to adopt indigenous customs. When one was not familiar with indigenous custom, one let Egyptian officials compose one's titulary or suggest appropriate actions (as in the case of the early Persian rulers). This is the most salient consistency. As for variation, the most conspicuous deviance from this norm is the physical modeling and accoutrements of the Nubian pharaohs, but this can be put down to simple physiognomic differences in the first case, and in the second we saw that the accoutrements had been used in Egypt before, although they may here have adopted a customized symbolism. As for the deviance that occurs in the late reign of Darius and the later Persian pharaohs, might I suggest that whereas the Hyksos and Nubians conquered (at least supposedly) primarily for the purpose of settling and/or governing in Egypt with little or no other expansionist pretensions, the Persians at the time of the conquest were already in the midst of attempting to rule a 'world empire', and their attentions were therefore of necessity divided. Perhaps if the Persian pharaohs had been content with the extent of their expansion at the time of the takeover of Egypt, and had expended more energy and time in Egypt, they too might have come to respect its art and religion to the same degree as, say, the Nubians did.

2) Reactions: The 'Hostile Takeover' Criterion and its Implications

It has been suggested by some that a criterion of the means by which power over the country was seized can be used to predict the native reaction to the conquering dynasty; Redford, for

example, believes that

“the procedure adopted by the collective historical memory seems clear: an acclimatized foreigner who adopts the culture of the natives and tries to become one of them is accepted, and his origin forgotten. A foreign war-lord who reduces the country through war and rules it, not on the strength of traditional practice, but on the strength of his army, is never accepted as native, but forever after remembered as an alien.”¹⁸⁷

Redford is here discussing the Hyksos (and presuming that their takeover was military), but he himself admits that the evidence for this attitude is scarce, offering the suggestion that “there was no need to curse the Asiatic; everyone knew and agreed that he was evil.”¹⁸⁸

In my opinion, there is compelling evidence to suggest that foreign dynasts, even those who conquered through military force, were not subjected to any greater degree of hatred, slander, or post-occupational defamation than any other pharaoh against whom a predecessor had cause to revile. Yes, foreigners are characterized as vile and are the subjects of ridicule and disgust, but this characterization pertains to the ‘otherness’ displayed by those groups *in their native foreign lands*. It does not apply, according to the evidence, to foreign rulers who were either already Egyptianized or became so upon their ascension to the throne.

In every case of post-occupational derision, the derision can consistently be put down to political concerns rather than racial or ideological ones. In fact, we have seen that ideologically the foreign pharaohs were not only accepted but revered. In the case of the Hyksos, we have Ahmose’s council members’ conciliatory gestures, and, if we accept the dating of the 400-Year stela that argues for the commemoration of the beginnings of the Seth cult under the Hyksos, we have a clear instance of reverence for an institution inaugurated by the ‘hated’ foreign princes. In the defaming case of Hatshepsut, we might see a political motivation for a female pharaoh who had a greater need for legitimization than most, and then we have the Ramessides invoking the protection of Asiatic deities. In the case of the Nubian rulers, we have evidence of Psamtik I’s cooperation with Nubian priestesses at Thebes in the accession of his daughter to the office of God’s Wife, and the consensus that Psamtik II’s mutilations were entirely politically motivated. In the case of the Persians, we have the positive testaments of Udjahorresnet and Ptahhotep, and a defamation tradition that can be put down to late and post-Darius political and administrative neglect. In sum, there is not a shred of evidence to suggest that any of the foreign rulers were hated specifically for their foreign nature while on the Egyptian throne.

The foreign pharaohs of Egypt recognized the benefits of ruling by traditional means, and many actually believed in their own legitimacy. So, apparently, did the Egyptians themselves. Under close scrutiny, the art and literature that these men have left us, as well as the reactions to it, reveal that this is true.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Albright, W. F. 1954. “Northwest—Semitic Names in a List of Egyptian Slaves from the Eighteenth Century BC,” *JAOS* 74: 222-33.

_____. 1965. “Further Light on the History of Middle-Bronze Byblos,” *BASOR* 179 (October): 38-43.

- Allen, J. 2002. "The Speos Artemidos Inscription of Hatshepsut," *BES* 16: 1-19.
- Assmann, J. (ed.). 1999. *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten*. Cairo: IFAO.
- Atkinson, K. M. T. 1956. "The Legitimacy of Cambyses and Darius as Kings of Egypt," *JAOS* 76: 167-77.
- Ayad, M. 2001. "Some Thoughts on the Disappearance of the Office of the God's Wife of Amun," *JSSEA* 28: 1-14.
- Badawi, A. 1943. "Die neue historische Stele Amenophis II," *ASAE* 42: 21.
- Baines, 1989. "Ancient Egyptian Concepts and Uses of the Past: 3rd to 2nd Millennium Evidence," in R. Layton (ed.), *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. London: U. Hyman, 131-149.
- Bareš, L. 1996. "Foundation deposits in the Tomb of Udjahorresnet at Abusir," *ZÄS* 123: 1-9.
- _____. 1999. *The Shaft Tomb of Udjahorresnet at Abusir*. Prague: Karolinum Press.
- Benson, M. & J. Gourlay. 1899. *The Temple of Mut in Asher*. London: Murray.
- Betancourt, P. 1997. "Relations between the Aegean and the Hyksos at the End of the Middle Bronze Age," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University Museum, 429-432.
- Bietak, M. 1975. *Tell el-Dab'a II. Der Fundort im Rahmen einer archäologisch-geographischen Untersuchung über das ägyptische Ostdelta*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- _____. 1979. *Avaris and Piramesse: Archaeological Exploration in the Eastern Nile Delta*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1981. "Eine Stele des ältesten Königssohnes des Hyksos Chajan," *MDAIK* 37: 63-71.
- _____. 1984. "Eine Palastanlage aus der Zeit des späten Mittleren Reichs und andere Forschungsergebnisse aus dem östlichen Nildelta (Tell el-Dab'a 1979-1984)," *Anzeiger der Phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien* 121: Nr. 14, 313-349.
- _____. 1987. "Canaanites in the Eastern Nile Delta," in A. F. Rainey, (ed.), *Egypt, Israel, Sinai: Archaeological and historical relationships in the biblical period*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 41-56.
- _____. 1990. "Zur Herkunft des Seth von Avaris," *Ägypten und Levante* I: 9-16.
- _____. 1991. "Egypt and Canaan during the Middle Bronze Age," *BASOR* 281: 27-72.
- _____. 1997a. "The Center of Hyksos Rule: Avaris (Tell el-Dab'a)," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University Museum, 87-139.
- _____. 1997b. "Avaris, Capital of the Hyksos Kingdom: New Results from Excavations," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University Museum, 87-140.
- Briant, P. 1987. "Pouvoir central et polycentrisme culturel dans l'empire Achéménide," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg & A. Kuhrt, (eds.), *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures, and Synthesis*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut, 1-33.
- _____. 1989. "Histoire et idéologie. Les grecs et la 'décadence perse'," *Mélanges P. Lévêque* 2. Paris: Besançon, 33-47.
- Brink, E. C. M. 1982. *Tombs and Burial Customs at Tell el-Dab'a and their Cultural Relationship*

- to Syria-Palestine during the Second Intermediate Period. (Beiträge zur Ägyptologie, Band 4). Vienna: Afro Pub.
- Caminos, R. 1964. "The Nitocris Adoption Stela," *JEA* 50: 71-101.
- Capart, J. 1914. *Les monuments dits Hycsos*. Bruxelles: Vromant & Co.
- _____. 1946. "Contribution à l'iconographie du dieu Seth," *CdE* 21: 29-31.
- Carter, H. 1916. "Report on the Tomb of Zeser-ka-ra Amenhetep I, Discovered by the Earl of Carnarvon in 1914," *JEA* 3: 147-54.
- Chace, A. B. 1979. *The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus*. Reston: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Clarke, S. 1922. "El-Kâb and its Temples," *JEA* 8: 16-40.
- Clédat, J. 1919. "Notes sur l'Isthme de Suez," *BIFAO* 16: 201-228.
- Clère, J. J. 1982. "La stèle de Sânhkptah, chambellan du roi Râhotep," *JEA* 68: 60-8.
- Cooney, J. D. 1954a. "The Portrait of an Egyptian Collaborator," *Brooklyn Museum Bulletin* 15/2: 1-16.
- _____. 1954b. "The Lions of Leontopolis," *Brooklyn Museum Bulletin* 15/2: 17-25.
- Cruz-Uribe, E. 1986. "The Hibis Temple Project 1984-85 Field Season, Preliminary Report," *JARCE* 23: 157-66.
- _____. 1992-3. "The Writing of the Name of King Darius," *Enchoria* 19/20: 5-5-10.
- _____. 2003. "The Invasion of Egypt by Cambyses," *Transeuphratène* 25: 9-60.
- Daressy, G. 1893. "Remarques et notes," *RecTrav* 14: 20-38.
- _____. 1899. "Un poignard du temps des rois pasteurs," *ASAE* 7: 115-20.
- Davies, B. G. 1997. *Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Davies, W. V. & L. Schofield, (eds.), 1995. *Egypt, the Aegean and the Levant: Interconnections in the Second Millennium BC*. London: British Museum Press.
- de Meulenaere, H. 1968. "La Famille du Roi Amasis," *JEA* 54: 183-7.
- de Moor, J. C. 1971. *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba 'lu*. (AOAT 16). Neukirchener-Verlag: Neukirchener Verlag.
- der Manuelian, P. 1983. "Prolegomena zur Untersuchung Saitischer Kopien," *SAK* 10: 221-45.
- _____. 1994. *Living in the Past: Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-sixth Dynasty*. New York: Kegan Paul.
- Devauchelle, D. 1986. "Présentation des stèles nouvellement découvertes au Serapeum," *BSFE* 106: 31-44.
- _____. 1994a. "Notes et documents pour servir à l'histoire du Serapeum de Memphis (I-V)," *RdÉ* 45: 75-86.
- _____. 1994b. "Les stèles du Serapeum de Memphis conservées au musée du Louvre," in E. Bresciani, (ed.), *Acta Demotica*. (EVO 17). Pisa: Giardini Editori e Stampatori, 95-113.
- _____. 1995. "Le sentiment anti-perses chez les anciens Égyptiens," *Transeuphratène* 9: 67-80.
- _____. 2000. "Notes et documents pour servir à l'histoire du Serapeum de Memphis (VI-X)," *RdÉ* 51: 21-31 + pls.
- Diodorus Siculus. (1963). *Bibliotheca Historica*. (tr. C.H. Oldfather). London: Harvard University Press.
- Dunham, D. 1950. *El Kurru*. Cambridge: Museum of Fine Arts by Harvard University Press . The

- Royal Cemeteries of Kush, Volume I.
- _____. 1970. *The Barkal Temples*. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts.
- Erman, A. 1901. "Eine Weihung des Hyksos Apophis," *ZÄS* 39: 86-87.
- Evers, H. 1929. *Staat aus dem Stein : Denkmäler, Geschichte und Bedeutung der ägyptischen Plastik während des Mittleren Reichs*. Munich: Bruckmann.
- Fajardo, F. M. & J. P. Parcerisa. 1984. *Nuevos Materiales Procedentes de la Necropolis del Cerro de San Cristobal*. Almunecar/Grenada: Empúries 45-6: 284-93.
- Faulkner, R. O. 1973-8. *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts (3 Vols)*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Fazzini, R. 1988. *Egypt Dynasty XXII – XXV*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. (Iconography of Religions XVI).
- Gamer-Wallert, I. 1978. *Ägyptische und ägyptisierende Funde von der Iberischen Halbinsel*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert Verlag.
- Gardiner, A. H. 1933. "Tanis and Pi-Racmesse : a retractation," *JEA* 19: 122-128.
- _____. 1959. *The Royal Canon of Turin*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- _____, 1968 [1947]. *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica Vol. I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardiner, A.H. & B. Gunn. 1918. "New Renderings on Egyptian Texts II: The Expulsion of the Hyksos," *JEA* 5: 36-56.
- Garstang, J. 1928. "An Ivory Sphinx from Abydos," *JEA* 14: 46-7.
- Gauthier, M. 1916. *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte (IV)*. Cairo: IFAO.
- Gibson, J. C. 1984. "The Theology of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle," *Or* 53: 202-19.
- Goedicke, H. 1981. "The 400-Year Stela Reconsidered," *BES* 3: 25-42.
- Golenischeff, V. 1893. "Amenemha III et les sphinx de 'Sân'," *RecTrav* 15: 131-136.
- Griffith, F. Ll. 1938. "A Stela of Tirhaqa from Kawa, Dongola Province, Sudan," in *Mélanges Maspero* I: 423-30.
- Griffiths, J. G. 1960. *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Grimal, N.-C. 1981a. *Quatre Stèles Napatéennes au Musée du Caire*. Cairo: IFAO.
- _____. 1981b. *La Stèle Triomphale de Pi(ankh)y au Musée de Caire*. Cairo: IFAO.
- Gyles, M. F. 1959. *Pharaonic Policies and Administration, 663-323 BC*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Habachi, L. 1954. "Khatâna-Qantîr: Importance," *ASAE*. 52: 443-559.
- _____. 1974. "Sethos I's Devotion to Seth and Avaris," *ZÄS* 100: 95-102.
- Hall, H. R. 1914. *Hieroglyphic texts from Egyptian stelae, &c., in the British Museum V*. London: The British Museum.
- Haran, A. 1998. "Nationalism and the Sin of Conquest in the Texts of Kamose (*k3-ms*). Carnarvon Tablet No. 1, Stela No. I and Stela No. II," in I. Sirun-Grumach (ed.), *Jerusalem Studies in Egyptology*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 265-269.
- Harvey, S. 1988. *The Cults of King Ahmose at Abydos*. (PhD Dissertation). UMI Press.
- _____. 1994. "Monuments of Ahmose at Abydos" *BEES* 4: 3-5.
- Hayes, W. C. 1955. *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum [Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446]*. Brooklyn: Brooklyn Museum.
- Hein, I. & H. Satzinger. 1993. *Stelen des Mittleren Reiches II, einschliesslich der I. und II. Zwischenzeit*. (CAA 7). Mainz/Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Helck, H. W. 1962. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend V. Chr.* (Äg. Abh. 5). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- _____. 1975. *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Herodotus. 1997. *Historiae*. (tr. A.D. Godley). London: Harvard University Press.
- Holladay, J. S. 1997. "The Eastern Nile Delta during the Hyksos and Pre-Hyksos Periods: Toward a Systemic/Socioeconomic Understanding," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Museum, 183-252.
- _____. 2001. "Toward a New Paradigmatic Understanding of Long-Distance Trade in the Ancient Near-East: From the Middle Bronze II to Early Iron II – A Sketch" in M. Daviau, et al., (eds.), *The World of the Aramaeans II: Studies in History and Archaeology in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion*. Scheffeld: Scheffeld Academic Press, 136-198.
- Hutchinson, R. W. 1962. *Prehistoric Crete*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jacquet-Gordon, H. K. 1960. "The Inscriptions on the Philadelphia-Cairo Stature of Osorkon II," *JEA* 46: 12-23.
- James, T. G. H. 1961. "A Group of Inscribed Egyptian Tools," *BMQ* 24: 36-43.
- Johnson, J. H. 1999. "Ethnic Consideration in Persian Period Egypt," in E. Teeter & J. Larson, (eds.), *Gold of Praise: Studies on Ancient Egypt in Honor of Edward F. Wente*. (SAOC 58). Chicago: Oriental Institute, 211-222.
- Josephson, J. A. 1997a. "Archaism" in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*. Vol. I: 109-113.
- _____. 1997b. "Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period Revisited," *JARCE* 34: 1-20.
- _____. 1997c. *Royal Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period, 400 – 246 BC*. Mainz/Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Kamal, A. B. 1909. *Tables d'offrandes vol. I. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*. Cairo: IFAO.
- Kent, R. G. 1942. "Old Persian Texts," *JNES* 1: 415-23.
- Kevran, M., D Stronach, F. Vallat, & J. Yoyotte. 1972. "Une statue de Darius découvert à Suse," *JA* 260: 235-66.
- Kitchen, K. A. 1986. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Kraus, R. 1999. "Wie Jung ist die Memphitische Philosophie auf dem Sabaqo-Stein?" in E. Teeter & J. Larson, (eds.), *Gold of Praise: Studies on Ancient Egypt in Honor of Edward F. Wente*. (SAOC 58). Chicago: Oriental Institute, 239-246.
- Kuhrt, A. 1995. *The Ancient Near East c. 3000-330 BC (Vol. II)*. New York: Routledge.
- Labib, P. 1936. *Die Herrschaft der Hyksos in Ägypten und ihr Sturz*. Glückstadt: Augustin.
- Leahy, A. 1994. "Kushite Monuments at Abydos," in C. Eyre, et al., (eds), *The Unbroken Reed. Studies Shore*. London: EES, 171-192.
- Leclant, J. 1963. "Kashta, Pharaon, en Egypte," *ZÄS* 90: 74-81.
- _____. 1965. *Recherches sur Les monuments thébains de la XXVe dynastie dite éthiopéene*. Cairo: IFAO.
- Lefebvre, .G. 1923-4. *Le tombeau de Petosiris I-III*. Cairo: IFAO.
- Leibovitch, J. 1953. "Le problème des Hyksos et celui de l'Exode," *IEJ* 3: 99-112.
- Lemaire, A. 1991. "Recherches d'épigraphie araméenne en Asie Mineure et en Égypte et le problème de l'acculturation," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg & A. Kuhrt, (eds.), *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut, 199-206.

- Lichtheim, M. 1980. *Ancient Egyptian Literature, Vol. III: The Late Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lloyd, A. B. 1982. "The Inscription of Udjahorresnet: A Collaborator's Testament," *JEA* 68: 166-80.
- Loprieno, A. 1996. "The King's Novel," in A. Loprieno, (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 275-95.
- Lorton, D. 1973. "The So-called "Vile Enemies of the King of Egypt (in the Middle Kingdom and Dyn. XVIII)," *JARCE* 10: 65-70.
- Macadam, M. F. 1949. *The Temples of Kawa I*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Manetho. *Aegyptica*. (tr. W.G. Waddell). London: Harvard University Press.
- McGovern, P. & G. Harbottle. 1997. "'Hyksos' Trade Connections Between Tell el-Dab'a (Avaris) and the Levant: A Neutron Activation Study of the Canaanite Jar," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia, University Museum: 141-158.
- Menu, B. 1994. "Le tombeau de Pétoisiris: Nouvel examen," *BIFAO* 94: 311-327.
- _____. 1995a. "Les carrières des Égyptiens à l'étranger sous les dominations perses: les critères de justification, leur évolution et leurs limites," *Transeuphratène* 9: 81-90.
- _____. 1995b. "Le tombeau de Pétoisiris (2). Maât, Thot et le droit," *BIFAO* 95: 281-295.
- _____. 1996. "Le tombeau de Pétoisiris (3). Culpabilité et responsabilité," *BIFAO* 96: 343-357.
- _____. 1998. "Le tombeau de Pétoisiris (4). Le souverain de l'Égypte" *BIFAO* 98: 247-262.
- _____. 1999. "Alexandre le Grand, *hq3 N Kmt*," *BIFAO* 99: 353-356.
- Mettinger, T. N. D. 2001. *The Riddle of Resurrection: 'Dying and Rising Gods' in the Ancient Near East*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Meyers, E. (ed.) 1997. "Hyksos," *Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*. New York: Oxford University Press, 133-6.
- Möller, G. 1909. *Hieratische Paläographie : die ägyptische Buchschrift in ihrer Entwicklung von der fünften Dynastie bis zur römischen Kaiserzeit I*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Montet, P. 1930. "Tanis, Avaris et Pi-Ramses," *RB* 39: 5-28.
- _____. 1947. *Tanis I, Les constructions et le tombeau d'Osorkon II à Tanis*. Paris. La nécropole royale de Tanis. Tome premier.
- Morkot, R. G. 2000. *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers*. London: Rubicon Press.
- Myśliwiec, K. 1988. *Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI-XXX*. Mainz/Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- _____. 2000. *The Twilight of Ancient Egypt: First Millennium BCE*. (tr. D. Lorton). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Newberry, P. 1906. *Egyptian antiquities : scarabs ; an introduction to the study of Egyptian seals and signet rings*. University of Liverpool, Institute of Archaeology. London: Constable.
- O'Connor, D. 1983. "The New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period 1552-664 BC," in B. Trigger, et al. (eds.), *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 183-278.
- _____. 1997. "The Hyksos Period in Egypt," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Museum, 45-67.
- Oren, E. D. 1997a. "The Hyksos Enigma – Introductory Overview," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos:*

- New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Museum, xix-xxvi.
- Parkinson, R. B. 1999. "Two New 'Literary' Texts on a Second Intermediate Period Papyrus? A Preliminary Account of P. BM EA 10475," in J. Assmann, (ed.), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten*. Cairo: IFAO, 177-196.
- Petrie, W. M. F. 1885. *Tanis*. London: Trübner, 1885-1888.
- Pharaonen und Fremde. Dynastien im Dunkel*, 1994. Vienna: Eigenverlag der Museen der Stadt Wien.
- Pleyte, W. 1863. *Lettre à Monsieur Théodule Devéria sur quelques monuments relatifs au dieu Set*. Leiden: Hooiberg.
- Posener, G. 1936. *La première domination Perse en Egypte*. Cairo: IFAO.
- Porter, B. & Moss, R. L. B. 1927-51. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*, 7 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Prisse d'Avennes, É. 1847. *Monuments égyptiens : bas-reliefs, peintures, inscriptions, etc., d'après les dessins exécutés sur les lieux ; pour faire suite aux Monuments de l'Égypte et de la Nubie de Champollion-le-Jeune*. Paris: Didot.
- Pritchard, J. B. 1955. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (2nd Ed.)*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Redford, D. B. 1970. "The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition," *Orientalia* 39: 1-51.
- _____. 1986. *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books*. Mississauga: Benben.
- _____. 1992. *Egypt, Canaan and Israel in Ancient Times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1997. "Textual Sources for the Hyksos Period," in E. Oren, (ed.), *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Museum, 1-44.
- Redmount, C. A. 1995. "The Wadi Tumilat and the 'Canal of the Pharaohs'," *JNES* 54: 127-135.
- Reisner, G. A. 1923. *Excavations at Kerma (Pts. I-III)*. (Harvard African Studies V). Cambridge: Peabody Museum.
- Roes, A. 1952. "Achaemenid Influence upon Egyptian and Nomad Art," *Artibus Asiae* 15: 17-30.
- Root, M. C. 1979. *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut.
- _____. 1991. "From the Heart: Powerful Persianisms in the Art of the Western Empire," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg & A. Kuhrt, (eds.), *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut, 1-29.
- Russman, E. R. 1974. *The Representation of the King in the XXVth Dynasty*. Brussels-Brooklyn: Fondation Reine Elisabeth & Brooklyn Museum.
- Ryholt, K. 1997. *The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period*. (CNI 20). Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Sauneron, S. & J. Yoyotte. 1952. "La campagne nubienne de Psammétique et sa signification historique," *BIFAO* 50: 158-207.
- Schaeffer, C. 1931. "Les fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra : rapport sommaire," *Syria* 12: 1-14 (2. campagne).
- Schmidt, W. 1963. "Baals Tod und Ausferstehung," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 15: 1-13.
- Sethe, K. 1910. "Neue Spuren der Hyksos in Inschriften der 18. Dynastie," *ZÄS* 47: 73-86.

- Shaw, I. 2001. "Egyptians, Hyksos and Military Technology: Causes, Effects or catalysts?" in A. Shortland, (ed.), *The Social Context of Technological Change. Egypt and the Near east, 1650 - 1550 BC*. Oxford: Oxbow, 59-71.
- Simpson, W. K. 1959. "The Hyksos Princess Tany," *CdÉ* 34: 233-9.
- Spiegelberg, W. 1990. *The Credibility of Herodotus' Account of Egypt in Light of the Egyptian Monuments*. (tr. A.M. Blackman). New York: ECA Associates.
- Steindorff, G. & K. Seele. 1957. *When Egypt Ruled the East (2nd ed.)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sternberg-el Hotabi, H. 2000. "Politische und sozio-ökonomische Strukturen im perserzeitlichen Ägypten: neue Perspektiven," *ZÄS* 127: 153-167.
- Stock, H. 1955. *Studien zur Geschichte und Archäologie der 13. bis 17. Dynastie Ägyptens*. Glückstadt: Augustin.
- _____. 1963. "Der Hyksos Chian in Bogazköy," *MDOG* 94, 73-80.
- Te Velde, H. 1967. *Seth, God of Confusion*. Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Tresson, P. 1930. "La Stèle de Naples," *BIFAO* 30: 369-91.
- Tuplin, C. 1991. "Darius' Suez Canal and Persian Imperialism," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg & A. Kuhrt, (eds.), *Achaemenid History IV: Centre and Periphery*. (ed.). Leiden: Nederlands Instituut, 237-83.
- Vandier, J. 1958. *Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne III: Les grandes époques, la statuaire*. Paris: Editions J. & A. Picard & Cie.
- _____. 1969. "Le dieu Seth au Nouvel Empire. A propos d'une récente acquisition du Louvre," *MDAIK* 25: 188-197.
- Van Seters, J. 1966. *The Hyksos: A New Investigation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Vercoutter, J. 1962. *Textes biographiques du Sérapéum de Memphis*. Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Von Beckerath, J. 1965. *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten*. (Äg. For. 23). Glückstadt: Augustin.
- _____. 1966. "The Nile Level Records at Karnak and their Importance for the History of the Libyan Period (Dynasties XXII and XXIII)," *JARCE* 5: 43-55.
- _____. 1993. "Nochmals die "Vierhundertjahrstele," *Orientalia* 62: 400-403.
- _____. 1999. *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*. (MÄS49). Mainz/Rhein: Philipp von Zabern Verlag.
- Von Bissing, F. W. 1930. "Totenstele eines persischen Großen aus Memphis," *ZMLG* 84: 226-39.
- Von Bothmer, B. 1960. "The Philadelphia Cairo Statue of Osorkon II," *JEA* 46: 3-11.
- Watuston, A. 1989. "Death and Resurrection in the A.B. Cycle," *UF* 21: 425-34.
- Weill, R. 1935. "The Problem of the Site of Avaris," *JEA* 21: 10-25.
- Weinstein, J. 1974. "A Statuette of the Princess Sobeknefru at Tell Gezer," *BASOR* 213: 49-57.
- _____. 1975. "Egyptian Relations with Palestine in the Middle Kingdom," *BASOR* 217: 1-16.
- Winlock, H. 1924. "The Tombs of the Kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty at Thebes" *JEA* 10: 217-77.
- _____. 1941. *The Temple of Hibis in El-Khargeh Oasis (3 Vols.)*. New York: Metropolitan Museum.
- _____. 1947. *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes*. New York: MacMillan.

- Wolf, W. 1929. "Der Stand der Hyksos Frage," *ZDMG* 83: 67-79.
- Wreszinski, W. 1923. *Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Yoyotte, J. 1951. "Le Martelage des Noms Royaux Éthiopiens par Psammétique II," *RdE* 8: 215-39.
- Zandee, J. 1963. "Seth als Sturmgott," *ZÄS* 90: 144-56.

Notes

1. The foreign dynasties discussed maintained contacts with lands outside Egypt during their reigns, and for this reason art of these dynasties occurs outside Egypt as well. For the purposes of the present study, I will be confining myself primarily to art found within Egypt, although occasional reference may be made to other items where appropriate.
2. The period of the Libyan dynasties (XXI-XIV) will be discussed below (§ IV); seeing as their rise to power took place within Egypt itself, the Libyan period will not be considered here as a 'foreign' occupation.
3. I will be using the term 'Hyksos' to refer specifically to the *ḥkꜣ ḥꜣswt*, or 'foreign princes' that are assumed to have taken over the kingship, and not to the *ꜥꜣmw*, or 'Asiatics,' that is, the cultural group of Levantines now known to have established themselves in increasing numbers in the Delta as the Middle Kingdom drew to a close. I agree with those scholars that maintain the term should not be used to designate the cultural group as a whole but only a possible subset that claimed rulership, which may or may not have been previously associated with the *ꜥꜣmw* in the Delta or in Upper Egypt. (cf. Redford, 1992: 100; 1970: 17; 1986: 240-2; Oren, 1997: xxi). On the presence of Asiatics in Egypt during the Middle Kingdom, cf. Hayes, 1955; Albright, 1954; Gardiner, [1947] 1968.
4. For the reconstruction of the chronology, names and king list, see now, for example, Ryholt, 1997. Redford's opinion is that "the persons named here carry us back to the very generation of the conquest, and quite likely reflect the federated chiefs attending Shesy/Salitis on the morrow of his victory" (1992: 111, cf. also Redford, 1997: 25). The period, however, continues to engender debate.
5. Cf. Bietak, 1979; 1987; 1991, etc. The site is accepted as the ancient Hyksos capital of Avaris, and later that of the Ramesside kings, Pi-ramesse. Archaeological data indicates that the culture of Tell el-Dab'a, and of nearby sites such as Tell el-Maskhuta, is identical with that of Middle Bronze IIB culture in Palestine and Phoenicia (cf. Redford, 1992: 100).
6. See the reconstructions of Meyers (ed.): 133; Redford, 1992: 108-109; van Seters 1966: 160; Säve-Söderbergh 1951: 56.
7. Ryholt's XVth Dynasty reads 1. Samuqenu; 2. 'Aper-'Anati; 3. Sakir-Har; 4. Khayan; 5. Aphophis; 6. Khanudi. For his complete reconstruction of the 2IP, cf. Ryholt, 1997: 336-405, 408-410.
8. For scarab/monument references, cf. Ryholt, 1997; Redford, 1992: ns. 56-63. For finds of Hyksos seals at Kerma in Nubia, cf. Reisner, 1923: 28, fig. 168 nos. 56-60. For scarabs of Khayan and

Apophis, cf. Winlock, 1947: 147.

9. Daressy, 1893: 26; Helck, 1975: 54 [no.71]. Inscribed “[...] Sewoserrenre [...] Khiyan, [given life] like Re, forever,” Redford, 1997: 6 [no.27].

10. Helck, 1975: 54 [no.70]. Inscribed “Horus: he-who-embraces-the-lands (*ibdw*), son of Re, Khiyan, beloved of his *ku*,” Redford, 1997: 6 [no.26].

11. *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 150, #125; BM 987 [340]; Helck, 1975: 55 [no.74]). Inscribed “The Perfect God, Sewoserrenre,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.30]. Original provenance unknown.

12. Betancourt, 1997: 429; Hutchinson, 1962: 197; *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 149, #124; Helck 1975: 54 [no.72]. Inscribed “The Perfect God, Sweoserrenre, Son of Re, Khiyan,” Redford, 1997: 6 [no. 28].

13. Stock, 1963: 73-80; Helck, 1975: 55 [no.74]). Inscribed “[...Se]woserren[re...Kh]iyan, [given life] like Re forever,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.29].

14. Bietak, 1981: 63-71; *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 155-6, #133. Inscribed “[... Sweoser]en[re] ... Khiy[an], beloved [of...]; king’s eldest son Yansas-oden,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.31].

15. Daressy, 1893: 26; Helck 1975: 56 [no.79]. Inscribed “Live the Perfect God, ‘A-woser-re [...],” Redford 1997: 7 [no. 42].

16. Hall, 1914: pl. 18; Helck, 1975: 57 [no. 84]. Inscribed “(1) Horus: pacifier-[of-the-Two-Lands...], Son of Re, Apopi, given life. (2) [He made it as his monument for his father Seth (?), making] for him many flag-staves and a fixture (?) of bronze for this god,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no. 35].

17. Simpson, 1959: 233 & figs. 18-19; *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 154, #130-1; Hein & Satzinger, 1993: 162-4; Helck 1975: 57 [no.83]. Inscribed “[...] {end of cartouche}; king’s sister Ta-na, may she live! The ... Hura –(?) Apop,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.37].

18. von Beckerath, 1965: 274; Petrie, 1885: pl.3 [17c], 13 [6]; Helck 1975: 56 [no.77]. Inscribed “The Perfect God, ‘Akenenre, Son of Re, Apopi, given life; beloved of [Seth],” Redford, 1997: 7 [no. 36].

19. Capart, 1914; Wolf, 1929: 67-79; Vandier 1958: 204-11. The Tanis sphinxes were once thought to represent Hyksos kings themselves because of the Apophis cartouches; it is now generally accepted that they are representations of Amenemhat III, thanks to the studies of Golenischeff (1893) and Evers (1929).

20. Simpson, 1959; *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 153, #129; Labib, 1936: 30, Tf. 6; von Beckerath, 1964: 129-274; Helck 1975: 57 [no. 82]. Inscribed “[...] Apopi, given life; king’s sister Ta-na; the Treasurer Aper [...],” Redford, 1997: 7 [no. 38].

21. *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 153, #128; Kamal, 1909: 61 [no.23073]; Helck, 1975: 55 [no.76]. Inscribed “(A) Horus: pacifier-of-the-Two-Lands, the Perfect god, ‘A-kenen-re, may he live! (This is) what he made as his monument for his father [Seth], lord of Avaris, affixing his flag-staves, that he might make ‘given-life’ like Re forever. (B) Horus: pacifier-of-the-Two-Lands, the Perfect God, ‘A-kenen-re, may he live. (This is) what he made as his monument for his father, [Seth] lord of Avaris, when he placed all lands under his feet,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.33]. Van Seters, 1966: 171, believes that the table once stood in a temple of Seth in Avaris.

22. Helck, 1975: 57f. [no.85]. Inscribed (1) “Palette made by the king, the scribe of Re, whom Thoth himself taught, whom [] outfitted [...] to/of all things; multi-talented on the day when he reads faithfully all the difficult (passages) of the writings as (smoothly as [?]) flows the Nile (2) [...] with a great [...], [unique (?)] [...], stout-hearted on the day of battle, with a greater reputation than any (other) king, protector of strange lands (3) who have never (even) had a glimpse of him; living image of Re upon earth, solving (?) [.....] people. King of Upper and Lower Egypt, ‘A-woser-re, Son of re, Apopi, given life every day like Re forever. (4) I was [.....] to (?) his teaching, he is a judge (?) of the needy (?) commons – there is no false statement in that – there is indeed not his like in any land! (5) [.....] Son of Re, of his body, whom he loves, Apopi, given life. Palette given by the king to the scribe Atju,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.44].

23. James, 1961; Helck, 1975: 55 [no.73]. Inscribed “The Perfect God, ‘A-woser-re, beloved of Sobek, lord of Su-menu,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.39].

24. Daressy, 1899: 115-20; van Seters, 1966: 71-2; Helck, 1975: 55 [no.75]. Inscribed (1) “The Perfect God, Lord of the Two Lands, Neb-khopesh-re, son of Re Apop, given life; (2) his lord’s retainer Nakhman,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no. 32].

25. Carter, 1916: 147-54; Helck, 1975: 56 [no.80]. Inscribed “(1) The Perfect God, ‘A-woser-re, (2) Son of Re, Apopi, (3) the king’s daughter Arita,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.40].

26. Helck, 1975: 56 [no.78]. Inscribed “The Perfect God, ‘Akenenre, Son of Re, Apopi, given life and dominion,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.34].

27. Gamer-Wallert, 1978: 39f.; Fajardo and Parcerisa, 1983-4: 284-7. Inscribed “A. (in rectangle) The Perfect God ‘A-woser-re, Son of Re, Apopi; the king’s sister Ta’awa, may she live.” B. (around rim) “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, ‘A-woser-re, Son of Re, Apopi; the king’s sister Ta’awa, may she live. The Perfect God, Lord of the Two Lands, whose might has reached the limits of the foreign lands – there is not a country exempt from serving him,” Redford, 1997: 7 [no.41].

28. van Seters, 1966: 164.

29. Cf. Bietak, 1997b, McGovern & Harbottle, 1997, Oren, 1997b, Betancourt, 1997, and Davies & Schofield, 1995.

30. Holladay, 2001: 147, 170.

31. Holladay, 1997: 209. Holladay even goes so far as to hypothesize that the desire for a ‘Canaanite trading diaspora’ with Avaris as a central node may have been a catalyst for a forceful Amorite establishment of the XVth Dynasty.

32. Redford, 1992: 116.

33. Redford, 1992: 120; Winlock: 147. The assumption here is that the vase was passed down to Amenhotep as an heirloom, a gift perhaps from the court at Avaris in peaceful times, or that Arita was married into the Theban court, van Seters, 1966: 168.

34. Daressy, 1899: 117.

35. This should be qualified by pointing out that in this case, the practice of adopting Egyptian names makes it more difficult to distinguish Asiatic officials from contemporary native Egyptian bureaucrats. Nevertheless, the point remains valid even if there was a variable ratio of Asiatic to Egyptian administrators in the Hyksos kings’ employ. Some such officials, such as one *H3r*, have scarab distributions as wide-ranging as the pharaohs themselves, Säve-Söderbergh 1951: 65; Stock, 1955: 68; van Seters, 1966: 159; Bietak 1997a: 114.

36. Helck, 1975: 56 [no.81]; Redford 1997: 7 [no.43]; *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 156-7, #134. On the papyrus’ title page we read: “Now this book was copied in the year 33, month 4 of the inundation season [under the majesty of the] King of [Upper and] Lower Egypt, A-user-Re (*ʕ-wsr-Rʕ*) given life, in likeness to writings of old made in the time of the King of Upper [and Lower] Egypt, [*Nj-mʕ*]ʔt-[*Rʕ*]. The scribe Ahmose writes this copy,” Chace, 1979: 85.

37. Redford, 1986: 163; 1992: 122; Bietak, 1997a: 115; Säve-Söderbergh 1951: 65; Möller, 1909: 18. On the *Admonitions*, van Seters, 1966: 104-20; Albright, *BASOR* 179 (1965): 40f. We might mention in the same vein the survival of the king-list tradition despite the ‘chaos’ of the 2IP, in connection with which Redford believes that “whatever destruction attended the coming to power of this alien, West Semitic speaking dynasty in Egypt, it is clear that within half a century at the very least the ‘barbarians’ had assumed a respect for Egyptian culture and mores” (1986:163). For a further discussions on the role of literature in pharaonic policy, cf. Assmann (ed.), 1999.

38. Parkinson, 1999: 183, 186, 190. This ‘Eulogistic Account of a King’ shows parallels with many MK works, including the ‘Loyalist Teaching’ and the ‘Teaching of Ptahhotep.’ The recto of BM EA 10475 contains a tale involving the House of Life, further suggesting true literary as opposed to simply ‘royal’ or ‘propagandistic’ output. It seems to occur in a courtly setting, typical of MK narrative tales. Both sides of the papyrus are written in Late Middle Egyptian.

39. See above, n. 33.

40. Cf. Erman, 1901: 86ff.

41. Winlock, 1947: 145ff., suggests that Khayan may even have ruled Thebes, with the Hyksos in Gebelein by 1640 BC, but concedes to our stated problem that “anything else the Hyksos conquerors

might have left in Thebes would surely have been destroyed by the indignant upper Egyptians once they had thrown out the Asiatics”. A tale from the time of Merneptah (the Tale of Apophis and Seqenenre), shows that when Seqenenre receives a note from Apophis claiming that he cannot sleep in Avaris because of the noise of the hippopotami in Thebes (an obvious post-occupational slight on the monarch’s intelligence, or an assertion of his being an unreasonable ruler), his reply is conciliatory, suggesting that he was still under the sway of the northern king, Steindorff & Seele, 1957: 28.

42. Cf. Winlock, 1947: 146.

43. Cf. *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 42, fig. 30.

44. Bietak, 1987: 50.

45. Nehesy appears in the Turin canon after the XIIIth Dynasty. Other Asiatic rulers from this period we know of include *ʿ3-n3-tj* and *bbnm*, possibly contemporary with Egyptian kings of the XIIIth Dynasty such as Neferhotep and Sobekhotep, Ryholt, 1997: 69-117.

46. O’Connor, 1997: 52, has suggested, in discussing the non-royal scarabs bearing the title *ḥk3 ḥ3swt*, that “because this title was consistently used by the members of the [XVth Dynasty], they were not likely to permit contemporary Canaanite leaders in Egypt to assume it. We can therefore conclude that these other ‘rulers of foreign lands’ antedate the Fifteenth Dynasty and formed either a dynasty controlling much of the eastern Delta or contemporaneous rulers each with his own ‘slice of Egypt’”. Perhaps Nehesy was a member of such a dynasty or one such ruler. If Nehesy does in fact antedate the XVth Dynasty, we can conclude that even at these early stages of assuming power, the ‘foreign princes’ were casting themselves in a very Egyptian light.

47. One possible exception is an intriguing little ivory sphinx discovered in a tomb at Abydos, Garstang, 1928: 46-7. The pharaoh depicted (suggested by Garstang to be Khayan), seems to have decidedly Asiatic features, and is shown trampling an Egyptian! Säve-Söderbergh, 1951: 66, believes the tomb to belong to a Hyksos ‘sympathizer’.

48. Bietak, 1975; 1979; 1984: 312-49; Meyers, 1997: 134. On burial customs cf. esp. Brink, E.C.M., 1982.

49. An obelisk fragment of the aforementioned Nehesy from Tanis reads “[...] the king’s son Nehsy (2) [He made it as] his monument for Seth, lord of *R3-3ḥt* ... (3) [...] the [king’s] eldest son Nehsy, beloved of Seth, lord of *R3-3ḥt*,” Bietak, 1990: 14. Van Seters, 1966: 103, believes that Nehesy’s reign marks a break with the traditions of the XIIIth Dynasty and the adoption of a more foreigner-friendly regime. For more on Seth worship in Hyksos period Egypt cf. Bietak, 1990.

50. Speaking of a specific subset of these names, Redford, 1992: 111, maintains that “the fact that none displays any *Egyptian royal* epithets, but only an expression long used for *foreign* rulers, places them within a known political category: they are not kings of Egypt, but rulers of and from alien lands who have, however, come sufficiently within the penumbra of Egyptian culture and

government for someone to deem it appropriate to write their names in Egyptian.” Cf. also above, n.3. This type of vassalage is consistent with what van Seters terms ‘Amorite politics’, allegiance being achieved through the taking of oaths. Further proof for the employment of this system is seen on *Kamose II* when in a letter from the Hyksos ruler to the Nubian one, the former refers to the latter as ‘my son’ (cf. van Seters, 1966: 168). For further discussion, cf. van Seters, 1966: 158, 170-1; Redford 1970: 18-19.

51. Bietak, 1979.

52. Redford, 1992: 121; Weinstein, 1974: 56; Weinstein, 1975: 9-10.

53. It should be said here that it is likely the army did more pillaging and destruction than perhaps the pharaoh would have liked. The same thing occurs in the reign of Cambyses, which we will examine later.

54. Redford, 1997: 8.

55. On this dearth of information, cf. Winlock, 1924.

56. Redford, 1997: 8; 1992: 104. The stela of Sânkhtah, chamberlain of the king Rahotep of the XVIIth Dynasty is a good example. Under the offering scene, the inscription reads: “Sânkhtah, justifié – [quand] Il sort en beauté lors de la Grande Sortie, lors de toute festivité du ciel, lors de la sortie d’Oupouaout et de Min-Horus-le-Victorieux, à l’occasion des travaux effectués au mur d’enceinte pendant la restauration du temple d’Osiris,” translation in Clère, 1982: 65, and Redford, 1997: 8 [no.45]. Clère, 1982: 67-8, believes that “ainsi, il se confirme que Sêkhem-Râ-Ouah-Khâou Râhotep [...] eut à coeur de réparer les dommages causés aux sanctuaires de son royaume durant les temps difficiles de la Seconde Période Intermédiaire, et sans doute imputables en partie aux envahisseurs hyksos des deux dynasties précédentes”. In his Karnak Stela, Se^cnkhenre Montuhotpi speaks of having “drove back all foreign lands, and rescued his city in his might without [smiting (?)] people, as one who acts [.....] (8) throughout the Two Banks like Sakhmet in the year of her pestilence,” Redford 1997: 9 [no.50].

57. For translations see Redford, 1997: 13-14 [nos. 68-9].

58. Cf. Haran, 1998.

59. The inscription of Ahmose, son of Abana, suggests that the following the sack of Avaris, Ahmose pursued the Asiatics into the southern Levant, Redford, 1997: 15 [no. 70].

60. Harvey, 1994: 3; 1988: 302.

61. Harvey, 1994: 4; 1988: 325, 327, believes that “although no textual labels have been found which might specify the ethnic identity of these Asiatics, some indications exist which allow their provisional association with the Hyksos”; for example “it would seem extremely unlikely that the named figure is any other than a Hyksos, since the use of Apophis as an Egyptian personal name is

unattested during the New Kingdom.”

62. Harvey, 1988: 325.

63. *Aegyptica*, fragment 42 from Josephus, *Contra Apionem* i.14, §§ 73-92.

64. II. 36-42; tr. in Allen, 2002: 5.

65. Redford, 1997: 17-18 [no.74].

66. Van Seters, 1966: 173.

67. In fact, in the papyrus itself, after insisting Apophis worshipped only Seth, the scribe goes on to concede that “he did not trust in any other god in the en[tire land], except Amunre, king of the gods,” Redford 1997: 18.

68. Redford, 1970: 32.

69. For references to the ‘vile Asiatic’ during the Asiatic campaigns of the XIXth Dynasty, cf. Davies, 1977, and Lorton, 1973: 65-70. The praenomens with theophoric R^c elements were also omitted from the Turin Canon, (cf. Gardiner, 1959), and omitted altogether from the Abydos and Memphite king-lists (Redford, 1970: 34).

70. *Pharaonen und Fremde*, 1994: 287; Habachi, 1974: 95ff.; Vandier, 1969: 188f.; Weill, 1935: 14 & Pl. II.

71. Leibovitch, 1953: 103.

72. Bietak, 1990, has explained Egyptian identification in the delta with seafaring deities such as Ba^cal-Zephon, Proteus, and a multitude of Canaanite gods. Mettinger, 2001, has chronicled the similarities between the Ba^cal cycle and that of Osiris, while many others have shown similarities between the Ba^cal cycle and Egyptian mythologies. cf. Schmidt, 1963; de Moor, 1971; Watuston, 1989. For more of the Ba^cal Cycle cf. J.C.L. Gibson, 1984.

73. Cf. Bietak, 1990: 11ff.; Stadelman, *Lexikon der ägyptologie* VI: 1039-43; and von Beckerath, 1993, with references.

74. For translation, cf. Redford 1997: 18-19 [no.75].

75. Goedicke, 1981: 67, based on the annotation *Sth-n-r^cmssw dj.f^cnh nb*, believes that “the deity is Ramesses II’s own form of Seth and is not identical with the one whose 400th year is mentioned in the text. This refers unquestionably to the ‘Ombite’, i.e. Upper Egyptian Seth” and therefore maintains that the stela commemorates the cult of the Ombite Seth in Avaris *before* the arrival of the Hyksos (for more on the pre-Hyksos devotion to Seth, cf. von Beckerath, 1965: 263). Whether or not this is the case is a moot point for our artistic analysis; anyone observing the stela would be unable to dismiss its Asiatic character.

76. Bietak, 1990: 11-12, provides an excellent elucidation of the iconography.
77. Both quotes in Redford, 1986: 198-9.
78. Bietak, 1990: 12.
79. Badawi, 1943: 21.
80. This statue from Tanis was originally a monument of Sesostris III, re-inscribed by Merneptah in honor of Seth, in much the same way that Apophis usurped the statuary of Amenhotep III (cf. Weill, 1935: 14 & pl.II).
81. Habachi, 1954: 508. Interestingly, Seth's name has been obliterated from this stela, suggesting a subsequent antipathy towards Seth in this region (below, §V). Yet, Seth on this stela is remarkably similar to the depiction on the 400-Year Stela, suggesting to van Seters, 1966, 135-6, that they go together.
82. For further representations of Seth-Ba'al, cf. te Velde, 1967: 126, n.2.
83. Cf. Schaeffer, 1931: 10-11.
84. Montet, 1947: pl.7, no.44.
85. E.g., on a large statuary group, Montet, 1930: 21; on scarabs, Newberry, 1906: pl.21 #1; on numerous stelae, Prisse, 1847: pl. 37; Wreszinski, 1923: II 164a; Cledat, 1919: 207-8; Pleyte, 1863.
86. Wreszinski, 1923: II 41, where they are called "Anat protects me" and "Anat is sanctified", respectively.
87. Cf. Gardiner & Gunn, 1918: 39; Sethe, 1910: 84ff. Another possible allusion to the Hyksos occupation occurs on a stela of Tuthmosis I, *Urk. IV*: 102 and 651:10; Sethe, 1910: 73-4. Gardiner & Gunn, 1918: 55, believe that "there can be little doubt that the age of terror alluded to was the Hyksos period."
88. Bietak, 1997a: 125. The temple continues to be excavated.
89. Shaw: 2001.
90. See, for example, *The Contest of Horus and Seth for the Rule* (ANET, 14-17), *Astarte and the Tribute of the Sea* (ANET, 17-18), *The Deliverance of Mankind from Destruction* (ANET, 10-11), *Treaty Between the Hittites and Egypt* (ANET, 199-203), and *The Egyptians and the Gods of Asia* (ANET, 249-50); also Gardiner, 1933: 98; van Seters, 1966: 178f.; CT 581, 607, 631, 941, 1069, 1179 in Faulkner, 1973-8. For a discussion of Seth as Ba'al in the Coffin Texts, cf. Zandee, 1963: 144-56.

91. Cf. *Papyrus Sallier* IV: IX, 4. Interestingly, as Seth is depicted with a Baʿal-like head on Egyptian stelae, so “Anty, lord of the East” is depicted with the head of the Seth animal in the Sinai. Further evidence of his foreign associations comes from his mention as god of the Libyans on the Israel Stela of Merneptah, te Velde, 1967: 114, and that on the *Marriage Stela* of Ramses II it is Seth that gives him power over foreign lands: “I know that my father Seth has decreed me victory over every country...” (I.6, 12).

92. Te Velde, 1967: 132.

93. Te Velde, 1967: 66, 111.

94. Te Velde, 1967: 126; as an example see the iconography of Seth at Hibis, Capart, 1946: 29-31, fig. 3.

95. Te Velde, 1967: 119.

96. Van Seters, 1966: 176-7, points out that 1) there is no reason to suspect an interruption in Seth worship at Avaris (as confirmed by the 400-year stela); 2) many foreigners probably remained in the Delta after the expulsion; 3) there is ample evidence for the domestication of foreign deities (cf. Helck); and 4) scarabs show a wide variety of syncretic deities.

97. Van Seters, 1966: 180.

98. Leibovitch, 1953: 111.

99. Jacquet-Gordon, 1960: 23, believes that “by the time Osorkon II came to the throne, although ‘Great Chief of the Ma’ continued to be widely used among them as an honorary title, there was no real link binding them to their country of origin or to the related tribes which had remained behind there.”

100. O’Connor, 1983: 235, agrees that “power was apparently amicably transferred from the Twenty-first to the Twenty-second dynasty.” This seizure of power is in contrast to the military takeovers of the Nubians, Persians, and (possibly) the Hyksos (see below on this criterion, § VII.2). For an extensive survey of this period’s history and art, see Fazzini, 1988.

101. Dates in Kuhrt, 1995: 624.

102. For excellent summaries of both monumental and popular arts, see Fazzini, 1988; Myśliwiec, 1998: 30-3.

103. Leclant, 1963: 75-8, fig. 1, a fragment of a sandstone stela from Elephantine mentions “Khnum-Re, lord of the Cataract” and “Satet, lord (of Elephantine),” as well as the titulary “Son of Re, lord of the Two Lands, Kashta.”

104. Leclant, 1963: 77, 80, figs. 2-5. One other small item, a faience fragment with Kashta's cartouche, is known, cf. Dunham, 1950: 34, fig. 7c & pls. lxii-lxiii.
105. Grimal, 1981: pls. Vff. For Pi(ankh)y's throne names, cf. Von Beckerath, 1999: 206-7.
106. Pi(ankh)y may have modeled his titulary on that of Tuthmosis III, Morkot, 2000: 169.
107. Myśliwiec, 2000: 76.
108. Myśliwiec, 2000: 79.
109. Benson & Gourlay, 1899: 370, pls. XX-XXII.
110. Despite his burial there, his wife Peksater was buried at Abydos, Morkot, 2000: 176; Leahy, 1994: 171-92, pls. XXIV-XXV.
111. James, 1984: 742, characterizes this archaism as a "pious archaeology, inspired no doubt by a respect for the past which, as far as the Kushite kings were concerned, formed part of their general desire to be seen as acceptable rulers of Egypt." This is also highlighted by Pi(ankh)y's usurpation of several ram statues of Amenophis III, cf. Kitchen, 1986: 369.
112. One scene is an expansion of the stela scene, others show Pi(ankh)y running alongside the Apis bull or celebrating the Opet festival at Thebes, Morkot, 2000: 170.
113. Kitchen, 1986: 378, n.765.
114. The temple of Ptah *hb-sd* porch and temple of Re-Horakhti [blocks reused by Taharqa].
115. The temple entrance.
116. The temple at the second pylon entrance.
117. For a list of works, cf. Kitchen, 1986: 378-82.
118. Cf. the stela showing Shabako offering incense to Termuthis, *PM* II: 294.
119. Cf. Fazzini, 1988: 7, pl. XXXIV. For an attempt to redate the Shabako Stone to the Ptolemaic period (which for our purposes would suggest at the very least a respect for his attempt and his reign), cf. R. Kraus, 1999.
120. Kitchen, 1986: 382.
121. A seal of his has been found at Nineveh and an amphora handle from Megiddo also bears his name, suggesting he was adept at maintaining trading contacts with Assyria, an important prerogative of a good pharaoh and a trait maintained by the Hyksos earlier, cf. Myśliwiec, 2000: 89.

122. Leclant, 1965: 59-61, §16, pls. 36-7.

123. Leclant, 1965: 139-40, §40.

124. Inscribed “un prêtre pur (*w^cb*) du roi, le dieu bon Chabataka, justifié,” Leclant, 1965: 269; cf. also Kitchen, 1986: 387.

125. He is attested at Memphis, Coptos, Karnak, Luxor, Medinet Habu, Deir el-Medina, Asphysis, Qasr Ibrim, Buhen, Semna West, Sedeinga, Kawa, and Gebel Barkal. For a complete list of items, cf. Fazzini, 1988; Myśliwiec, 1988: 31-3 and Kitchen, 1986: 388-92.

126. The stelae from years 2-8 and 8-10 record his gifts to the temple of Gematen, Macadam, 1949: 4-14; 32-41. One from year 6 records his pious building activities, Macadam, 1949: 14-21, and another from the same year the high Nile inundation that resulted, Macadam, 1949: 22-32; Griffith, 1938: 423-30. This event is also recorded on the Nile texts at Karnak, an important textual source for the chronology of this period, cf. von Beckerath, 1966: 52, and also on other copies at Tanis and Coptos, Myśliwiec 2000: 93. A fifth stela commemorates the opening of Taharqa’s temple at Gematen, Macadam, 1949: 41-44.

127. 2nd stela of Year 6, lls. 6, 10, 18; Griffith, 1938: 428-9.

128. Myśliwiec, 2000: 95-6.

129. Myśliwiec, 2000: 93.

130. Cf. Myśliwiec, 2000: 97.

131. Myśliwiec, 2000: 106.

132. Loprieno, 1996: 277, 287, explains the *Königsnovelle* as “a form of Egyptian narrative which focuses on the role of king as recipient of divine inspiration or as protagonist of the ensuing decision making process,” which is an “ideal setting for a politically motivated use of history.” Having a long tradition in Egyptian literature, in the 3IP and Late Period, it is manifested in the form of oracular decrees, such as those on the stela of Taharqa (above, n. 129), and the Tantamani Dream Stela (see below). As such, it constitutes the employment of a traditional literature for the legitimization of the Nubian kings, as well as a reverence on their part for traditional Egyptian forms of literature.

133. Lines 2-7, tr. in Loprieno, 1996: 288. Interestingly, Loprieno also discusses the 400-Year stela in conjunction with the concept of the *Königsnovelle*, cf. 292.

134. Myśliwiec, 2000: 87-8. On the iconography of the XXVth dynasty kings, cf. esp. Russman, 1974 and Myśliwiec, 1988.

135. O’Connor, 1983: 245.

136. Cf. der Manuelian, 1994: 297-322, pl. 13; Caminos, 1964: 74-5.

137. James, 1984: 743. No study of the XXVIth dynasty would be complete without P. der Manuelian's (1983, 1994) studies on archaism in the Saïte artistic and literary program. For a summary of archaism in all periods, cf. Josephson, 1997a. For sculpture see Josephson, 1997b and 1997c, and Baines, 1989. For archaism in the 3IP cf. Fazzini, 1988.

138. Tr. in der Manuelian, 1994: 298-306; Caminos, 1964: 74-5. There has been some confusion regarding under whom exactly Nitocris was placed. If Nitocris is seen as being placed under the tutelage of Shepenwepet and not of Amonirdis, the passage might be construed as showing that Psamtik was supplanting Amonirdis' legitimate claim to the office of God's Wife rather than respecting it. Psamtik's declaration of uprightness, however, coupled with his open use of Taharqa's name and respectful titulary (the mutilation came after, as we will see), as well as Caminos's convincing argument show rather conclusively that a respectful interpretation is the correct one.

139. On these items, cf. Yoyotte, 1951: 232-4, a-g.

140. For a complete list of mutilated monuments, cf. Yoyotte, 1951: 217-24; for mutilated inscriptions cf. Gauthier, 1916: IV, 10-57.

141. Cf. Champollion in Yoyotte, 1951, n.2.

142. Yoyotte, 1951: 216.

143. With the exceptions of three monuments of Piankhy from Sanam and Gebel Barkal (whose mutilations were partially reconstructed), all of the mutilations occur within Egypt, and the majority of the Nubian rulers' monuments at Gebel Barkal, Sanam, Kawa, and Nuri remained untouched. We also read on a stela from Karnak that "l'armée de Ta Majesté a envoyée contre la Nubie, elle a atteint la région de Pnoub, [intacte (?)] et sans {pertes (?)}..." col.5, tr. in Yoyotte, 1951.

144. Yoyotte, 1951: 235-6, a-f, fig.2.

145. Yoyotte, 1951: 236-7, a-d.

146. Yoyotte, 1952: 160.

147. Yoyotte, 1952: 174. If we accept the iconography of the double uraeus as signifying rule over Egypt and Nubia, then the appearance of this trait on royal Napatan statuary after the XXVth Dynasty (cf. the statues of Senkamaniskeñ, Anlamani, and Aspelta [Dunham, 1970: pls. XII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXXII] and the stelae of Aspelta and Harsiotef [Grimal, 1981a]) would lend credence to this possibility.

148. Grimal, 1981a: 192-3. This interpretation is further strengthened by the usurpation of a monument of Sheshonq I which highlights Nubian victories, cf. *PM* II, 35. It might also be noted here that some Saïtes also mutilated the cartouches of Necho II, who was not Nubian, cf. de Meulenaere, 1968: 184.

149. This politically motivated hatred is in the same vein as previous Egyptian pharaohs who took similar actions against their political enemies. That this was a function strictly of politics and not of ethnicity is evident, for example, on the reliefs of Mentuhotep during the first intermediate period when the symbolic smiting of Egyptians is shown iconographically in place of where foreigners would normally have been.

150. Cf. Myśliwiec, 2000: 90.

151. III.27-29, principally Cambyses was accused of murdering the Apis bull. We will see, however, that this is highly unlikely, cf. Devauchelle, 1995: 69-70. This seems to have been a standard accusation railed against any hated ruler at this time as it is applied to Artaxerxes Ochus and Alexander later on. For a discussion of the discrepancy between Herodotus' account and the Egyptian sources, cf. Spiegelberg, 1990. Herodotus seems to have been in Egypt c. 450 BC; as he himself relates: "When Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, marched against Egypt, vast numbers of Greeks flocked thither, some, as was likely enough, to engage in trade, others to take military service, and others again merely to see the country" (III.139).

152. Cf. for example, *Diodorus Siculus*, I.95. For Egyptian sources, there is the *Demotic Chronicle* (ll. D6-12) recording the maltreatment of temples in Egypt.

153. E. Cruz-Uribe's (2003) recent article is a step in this direction. He has put forth a detailed examination of the sources for this vilification and weighed them against the evidence from all quarters, not just the artistic. The artistic evidence presented here would seem to agree with his assessment that Cambyses was unfairly treated by Herodotus and others, based on a desire to posthumously vilify him and present pretexts for his conjectured 'madness' (2003: 44ff.). He also suggests that Cambyses may have been the victim of an effort on the part of Darius to cast himself in a greater light than his predecessor (2003: 50).

154. There is somewhat of a watershed at the end of the reign of Darius in regards to the Egyptian attitude towards Persian rule. Cambyses and Darius seem to have been the only rulers to have invested any effort in the governance of Egypt. Xerxes had his own problems with the Greeks, and indeed it was the defeat at Marathon toward the end of Darius' reign that precipitated rebellion in Egypt. It was at that time that the Persian policy switched from one of appeasement to one of dictatorship, and this from a group of rulers (after Darius) that never even set foot on Egyptian soil. For example, in the Stela of the Satrap, which records hostilities towards Xerxes for his revocation of land from the temple of Buto, his name is not even in a cartouche, Gyles, 1959: 41ff. It is likely for this reason that very little survives from this period after the reign of Darius, and the defamation tradition was likely a product solely of the latter reigns. Therefore, I will be discussing primarily the nature of Persian rule in Egypt under Cambyses and Darius.

155. In fact, it seems as though a degree of tolerance and assimilation was a matter of Achaemenid political policy in all areas of the Empire, cf. Root, 1991; Briant, 1987. On Cambyses and Darius in Egypt, cf. esp. Atkinson, 1956.

156. Tr. in Posener, 1936: 31-3.

157. For discussions of Udjahorresnet and his tomb, cf. Cruz-Uribe, 2003: 10-15; Bareš, 1996: 1-9; Bareš, 1999.

158. Lloyd, 1982: 169-70.

159. Lloyd, 1982: 169-70.

160. A similar sentiment is expressed by Amasis on his Apis stela when he says “j’ai mis la crainte que l’on a de toi dans le coeur des Egyptiens, et (dans celui) des étrangers de tous les pays étrangers qui étaient en Egypte étant donné que j’ai fait dans ta Ouabet,” Vercoutter, 1962: item H: 61, pl. VII. Cruz-Uribe, 2003: 39-40, has argued that perhaps the expulsion of these men from the sanctuary may have been the result of motives other than the pleas of Udjahorresnet, though historically the result is the same. For a deeper examination of this question, cf. Menu, 1995a. It is likely that these were military men, for some evidence exists for acculturated and respectful Persian settlers. A number of funerary stelae depicting Persians settled in Egypt at this time have been found in the Serapeum at Memphis, possibly from this same group, cf. von Bissing, 1930; Devauchelle, 1986, 1994a, 1994b and 2000; Johnson, 1999: 213-14. There is also the process of Egyptianization delineated by the letters of the brothers Atiyawahi and Ariyawrata, cf. Johnson, 1999: 213-14; Posener, 1936: 178, and the temple at Aswan constructed by a Persian garrison chief, cf. Lemaire, 1991. For more on this, cf. Sternberg-el Hotaby, 2000.

161. Cf. Posener, 1936: 36-41.

162. Cf. Winlock, 1941; Cruz-Uribe, 1986: 166; Root, 1979: 126ff. Cruz-Uribe’s work at Hibis has revealed that Darius remodeled the temple begun during the Saite Dynasty, that he did in fact adopt a traditional Egyptian titulary, and that he certainly adopted traditional iconography, although he may never have actually visited the temple, 2003: 36; personal communication. For a number of stelae from the Serapeum bearing his name and depicting him performing cult see Vercoutter, 1962: items K, L, N and possibly M, O, P, and Q, 78ff. & plates.

163. Cf. Clarke, 1922: 27.

164. *Demotic Chronicle*, ll. C8-16; tr. in Devauchelle, 1995: 74-5; confirmed in *Diodorus Siculus*, I.XCV.4-5. Cruz-Uribe’s examination, 2003: 48, of this codification has revealed that the *hp* that Darius codified may not have been laws per se, but rather a series of administrative practices allowing a better government of Egypt on the local level. Again, the results historically would have been the same, that Darius here was making an effort to codify Egyptian practices rather than imposing Persian ones.

165. Winlock, 1941: 7, maintains that one of the prenomens used is only applied during the historic coronation ceremony, suggesting Darius was in fact coronated in Egypt. Cruz-Uribe has also maintained that Darius adopted a traditional titulary (personal communication).

166. For an excellent summary of the sources and arguments for the various stages of construction of the Red Sea Canal, cf. Redmount, 1995 and Tuplin, 1991. It is apparent that Darius completed a canal from the Nile to the Red Sea, though various sources refer to similar efforts by Sesostri I, Necho II, and Ptolemy II. In Redmount's opinion, the canal was probably begun by Necho II and completed up to Tell el-Maskhuta. Darius was likely responsible for its reexcavation and/or completion to the Red Sea.

167. The traditional view of a changed version of Darius' name later in his reign has been challenged by Cruz-Uribe, 1992-3.

168. Tr. in Kent, 1942: 419.

169. Cf. Kervran, et.al., 1972; Root, 1979: 68ff.

170. Tuplin, 1991: 244.

171. Tr. in Kuhrt, 1995: 668, with refs.; cf. also Herodotus, II.110.

172. Cf. Cooney, 1954a; von Bothmer, 1960: 76-7.

173. For another example of this dress, and a discussion of the motif, cf. von Bothmer, 1960: 83-4.

174. An interesting parallel can be seen around Darius III's neck on the famous Alexander mosaic.

175. Cooney, 1954a. For more discussion of Ptahhotep, cf. Bareš, 1999.

176. Cf. Tresson, 1930.

177. Presumably Nectanebo II.

178. Presumably a reference to the reconquest of Egypt by Artaxerxes III.

179. This word is followed by the same determinative used for the word "enemy" (1) in other parts of the stela, cf. Devauchelle, 1995: 77.

180. Presumably a reference to the battle between Alexander and Darius III, tr. in Lichtheim, 1980: 42.

181. So Menu, 1994: 319: "La seconde domination perse a laissé de mauvais souvenirs en Égypte: Ochos et Bagoas auraient pillé et profané les temples, cependant, il faut faire la part de la propagande anti-perses développée par les Grecs." See also Lefebvre, 1923-4: 11; Briant, 1989. The institution of God's Wife, honored by the Nubians, was also abolished at this time, Ankhnesneferibre being the last God's Wife to hold the office, cf. de Meulenaere, 1968: 187, Ayad, 1995: 1-3. Ayad has convincingly described the fall of the God's Wives of Amun as a direct result of the status of women in Achaemenid society. An almost total absence of political power-wielding on the part of Persian women in any capacity, royal or otherwise, resulted in a lack of training and expectation that women

hold such powerful positions. This thesis is especially convincing in light of the fact that the office was so powerful before the Persians' arrival, and especially pertinent since it represents what would have been a marked deviation from a policy of customs adoption.

182. Cf. Lefebvre, 1923-4. On the dating esp. 10ff. For a more recent reexamination cf. Menu, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1996, 1998, and 1999.

183. Menu, 1994: 319, 326.

184. Cf. also references to "a man of a foreign country being the governor in Egypt" (*rmt ḥ3swt m ḥk3 Kmt* [59, 2] and *rmt ḥ3swt m ḥk3 B3kt* [62, 3]).

185. Tr. in Lichtheim, 1980: 46.

186. There was, as is to be expected, a larger adoption of Persian motifs in the minor arts that had to do more with trade than with political sympathy. For more on the influence of Persia on the minor arts in Egypt, cf. Roes, 1952; Cooney, 1954b.

187. Redford, 1970: 10.

188. Redford, 1970: 32. One could still maintain that the Egyptian use of the term 'foreign princes' speaks volumes for a disdainful attitude towards the Hyksos. Let us not forget, however, that this was the first time in Egypt's history that a foreign occupation had occurred. I would suggest that the term was employed initially, and possibly derisively, as a way to distinguish them from a native Egyptian pharaoh, but that as they showed themselves to be respectful rulers, the derision subsided while the designation stuck. The post occupational evidence, at any rate, argues for this interpretation.