

Introduction

Julia Budka

Egyptian royal ideology and kingship under periods of foreign rulers

The theme of the 9th Symposium on Egyptian Royal Ideology and Kingship held from 31 May to 2 June 2018 at Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich at the Institute of Egyptology and Coptic Studies was “Egyptian royal ideology and kingship under periods of foreign rulers – case studies from the first millennium BC”.

The first millennium BC is a period of intense international networks throughout the ancient world, especially within the Mediterranean, and it is the era when Egypt was repeatedly under the influence of foreigners.¹

Much has already been written about specific aspects of royal ideology and authority in Egypt under the rule of the Libyans, the Kushites, the Persians, the Ptolemies and the Romans.² The Saites, clearly kings of Libyan descents, but appearing as 100% Egyptian

1 See G. VITTMANN, *Ägypten und die Fremden im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*, Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 97, Mainz am Rhein 2003; C. JURMAN, „Wenn das Fremde zum Eigenen wird“. Identitätsbilder und Repräsentationsstrategien im multiethnischen Milieu Ägyptens während der Dritten Zwischenzeit, in: A. PÜLZ/E. TRINKL (eds.), *Das Eigene und das Fremde: Akten der 4. Tagung des Zentrums Archäologie und Altertumswissenschaften an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 26.–27. März 2012, *Origines* 4, Wien 2015, 33–49; G. VITTMANN, *Zwischen Integration und Ausgrenzung: zur Akkulturation von Ausländern im spätzeitlichen Ägypten*, in: R. ROLLINGER/B. TRUSCHNEGG (eds.), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante*. Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag, *Oriens et Occidens* 12, Stuttgart 2006, 561–595. For more general archaeological records of foreigners see T. SCHNEIDER, *Foreigners in Egypt: Archaeological Evidence and Cultural Context*, in: W. WENDRICH (ed.), *Egyptian Archaeology*, *Blackwell Studies in Global Archaeology*, Chichester 2010, 143–163; cf. also M. BIETAK, *Nahostpolitik: Fremdherrschaft und Expansion*, in: S. PETSCHER/M. VON FALCK (eds.), *Pharao siegt immer: Krieg und Frieden im alten Ägypten*. Gustav-Lübcke-Museum Hamm, 21. März – 31. Oktober 2004, Bönen 2004, 140–144. For aspects of methodology and Egyptology-specific challenges see T. SCHNEIDER, *Foreign Egypt: Egyptology and the Concept of Cultural Appropriation*, in: *ÄgLev* 13, 2003, 155–161.

2 See, e.g., J. WILLEITNER, *Taharqa: Ägypten unter nubischer und assyrischer Fremdherrschaft*, in: K. DORNISCH (ed.), *Sudan: Festschrift für Steffen Wenig zum 65. Geburtstag*, *Nürnberger Blätter zur Archäologie*, Sonderheft, Nürnberg 1999, 89–112; K. JANSEN-WINKELN, *Die Fremdherrschaften in Ägypten im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, in: *Or* 69, 2000, 1–20; C. J. CHIMKO, *Foreign pharaohs: self-legitimization and indigenous reaction in art and literature*, in: *JSEA* 30, 2003, 15–58; S. PFEIFFER (ed.), *Ägypten unter fremden Herrschern: zwischen persischer Satrapie und römischer Provinz*, *Oikumene: Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte* 3, Frankfurt am Main 2007; H. STERNBERG-EL HOTABI, *Ägypten und Perser. Eine Begegnung zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand*. Photographs by Enno Fedderken and Hendrik Fedderken, *Archäologie, Inschriften und Denkmäler Altägyptens* 4, Rahden, Westfalen, 2016.

rulers, are usually not regarded by scholars as the prime candidates when it comes to foreign kings and are often omitted from such lists.³

Bringing together case studies focusing on distinct features of kingship of foreigners ruling Egypt during the first millennium BC, we aimed to tackle the subject within this volume from a fresh perspective, high lightening common features and stressing specific differences. Aspects which were discussed during the meeting and are included in its written output – as new food for thought and not as definite arguments – are among others:

- Patterns of succession
- Divine aspects of kingship and associated building activities
- Royal costume and names
- Function, titles and organisation of the administrative elite

In the last years, much research has focused on the complexity of sources for royal ideology and kingship. Especially within the framework of the study of foreign influences and rulers, questions of acculturation, adaption or cultural entanglement connected with periods of foreign rulers have been addressed recently.⁴ The corresponding terminology has been debated and various models to describe these processes were proposed. A very convincing scheme was introduced, for example, by Claus JURMAN for the so-called Egyptianisation of the Libyans.⁵ This scheme can also be used to describe some aspects of the Kushite ‘foreignness’.⁶

There has been a general shift in perspectives, a new awareness of biases in our sources during the last years. Royal and elite references are mostly provided by pictorial and textual sources and are thus influenced by a historical narrative; archaeology offers more direct traces of activities and of believe`systems across social strata.⁷ In line with this, there are diverse sets of memories from the periods of foreign rule in Egypt, all manipulated to a certain degree

3 See JANSEN-WINKELN, *Or* 69, 2000, 1–20. Cf. also A. SPALINGER, The Concept of Monarchy during the Saite Epoch – an Essay of Synthesis, in: *Or* 47, 1978, 12–36; J. F. QUACK, Papyrus CtYBR 2885 rt. Reste einer demotischen Königsliste auf Papyrus, in: *Journal of Egyptian History* 2, 2009, 107–113.

4 See P. BRIANT, Inscriptions multilingues d’époque achéménide: le texte et l’image, in: D. VALBELLE/ J. LECLANT (eds.), *Le décret de Memphis. Colloque de la Fondation Singer-Polignac à l’occasion de la célébration du bicentenaire de la découverte de la Pierre de Rosette*: Paris, 1^{er} juin 1999, Paris 1999, 91–115. Cf. also S. A. STEPHENS, Seeing double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria, *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 37, Berkeley 2003, 181–182. For general aspects of entanglement, one of the buzz words of the last decade within Nubian archaeology, see S. T. SMITH, Colonial entanglements. Immigration, acculturation and hybridity in New Kingdom Nubia (Tombois), in: M. HONEGGER (ed.), *Nubian Archaeology in the XXIst Century. Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference for Nubian Studies*, Neuchâtel, 1st–6th September 2014, *OLA* 273, Leuven 2018, 71–89. The Hyksos can be named as another case study of mixing in Egypt, see B. BADER, Cultural Mixing in Egyptian Archaeology: The ‘Hyksos’ as a Case Study, in: *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 28.1: *Archaeology and Cultural Mixture*, 2013, 257–286.

5 JURMAN, ‚Wenn das Fremde zum Eigenen wird‘, 33–49.

6 Cf. J. BUDKA, Individuen, indigene Gruppe oder integrierter Teil der ägyptischen Gesellschaft? Zur soziologischen Aussagekraft materieller Hinterlassenschaften von Kuschten im spätzeitlichen Ägypten, in: G. NEUNERT/K. GABLER/A. VERBOVSEK, *Sozialisatonen: Individuum – Gruppe – Gesellschaft, Beiträge des ersten Münchner Arbeitskreises Junge Aegyptologie (MAJA 1)*, 3. bis 5.12.2010, *GOF IV/51*, Wiesbaden 2012, 45–60, here: 54–55.

7 See, e.g., W. WENDRICH, *Egyptian Archaeology: From Text to Context*, in: W. WENDRICH (ed.), *Egyptian Archaeology*, *Blackwell Studies in Global Archaeology*, Chichester, 1–14, especially 12.

by Egyptian ideology. A very illustrative case study can here be given with the example of early Ptolemaic ideology and references to Achaemenid rule. Here, in some texts royal piety is described in direct opposition to foreign impiety.⁸ A diverse picture emerges, however, by means of archaeology and material evidence. I would like to follow Henry COLBURN in what he stressed for the Achaemenid Period as a general aspect of foreign dominion: “rule of Egypt was experienced differently by different people, and that modern historical narratives obscure that diversity.”⁹ We should try to address with all possible means this ancient diversity which is often concealed by the monumental discourse of texts and reliefs. Material remains may provide additional answers, but are very often insufficient for other questions. Keeping this in mind, one also needs to stress that it is sometimes impossible for us to differentiate between the simple display of kingship and proper evidence of royal ideology meaning records of a belief system/mind-set. These *caveats* are also to be considered for several assessments throughout this volume.

Foreign kingship display

The display of kingship by foreign rulers is discussed in several chapters. Egyptian iconography and textual symbolism was used in different ways (for Kushite examples see Shih-Wei HSU in this volume). The question of the ‘otherness’ or ‘Egyptianisation’ of the Libyans – an ongoing debate within Egyptology – was most recently re-addressed by Karl JANSEN-WINKELN, who also pointed out methodological issues in trying to reconstruct patterns of Libyan kingship and especially of “Königsideologie”.¹⁰

Kushite building activities are well attested in Egypt and help to address questions of religion and power, as is highlighted in this publication by the papers of Angelika LOHWASSER and Essam NAGY. Anthony SPALINGER presents new material of war scenes of Pianchy at the Great Amun Temple at Gebel Barkal, trying to reconstruct the archaeological setting of these early Kushite scenes.

The Persians as Egyptian kings are discussed in this volume on the basis of the famous Susa-statue of Darius I (see the contribution by Anke BLÖBAUM).¹¹ Darius I may also be mentioned as a follow-up on remarks about a temple relief from the time of Amasis (Twenty-sixth Dynasty) at Amheida in Dakhla Oasis discussed by Olaf KAPER in this volume. The relief depicts the god Seth spearing the serpent Apopis and a similar depiction in the temple of Hibis can be named for Darius I as foreign living Horus in exactly the same pose. In both cases, the king is accompanied by a lion – whether this can be viewed as a ‘Persian element’ in an otherwise ‘Egyptian’ scene is debated and leaves space for interpretation, especially

8 H. P. COLBURN, *Memories of the Second Persian Period in Egypt*, in: J. M. SILVERMAN/C. WAERZEGGERS (eds.), *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*, *Ancient Near East Monographs* 13, Atlanta 2015, 165–202, here: 168.

9 COLBURN, *Memories of the Second Persian Period in Egypt*, 195. Cf. also BUDKA, *Individuen, indigene Gruppe oder integrierter Teil der ägyptischen Gesellschaft?*, 45–60.

10 K. JANSEN-WINKELN, „Libyerzeit“ oder „postimperiale Periode“? Zur historischen Einordnung der Dritten Zwischenzeit, in: C. JURMAN/B. BADER/D. A. ASTON (eds.), *A True Scribe of Abydos. Essays on First Millennium Egypt in Honour of Anthony Leahy*, OLA 265, Leuven/Paris/Bristol, CT, 2017, 203–238, here: 208–209.

11 For Persian kingship display in Egypt see M. WASMUTH, *Ägypto-persische Herrscher- und Herrschaftspräsentation in der Achämenidenzeit*, *Oriens et Occidens* 27, Stuttgart 2017.

because of its use by Amasis.¹² The scene in the temple of Hibis can, however, be associated with a particular approach to Egyptian kingship and was described by Melanie Wasmuth as follows: “The specific translation of Egyptian kingship and the double role of the ruler as pharaoh and Great King into visual display is dependent on its regional setting in the western oases with its local variant of Seth with falcon head. As with the statue of Darius and especially its base, this display allows a number of interpretations – probably deliberately: apart from the reading as ‘living foreign Horus’, the scene can be understood on a solely divine level – as an icon for general Egyptian kingship by the slaying of Apophis by Horus/Seth or as an elaborate depiction of Seth of the Oases. Additionally, the merging of Horus and Seth into one may have evoked the integration of the roles as Egyptian pharaoh and his Asiatic royal foe into one ruler.”¹³ The divine level of kingship, this time in relation to the god Osiris, is also addressed in this book in the paper about ancestor veneration (see the contribution by Julia Budka).

Another case study for iconography in relation to foreign kingship is Udjahorresnet with his famous statue Museo Gregoriano Egizio 22690 showing elements of the ‘Persian’ costume (see Alexander Schütze in this volume).¹⁴

Indigenous aspects of foreign rulers: Kushite case studies

The Munich conference developed a certain focus on the Twenty-fifth Dynasty and aspects of Kushite kingship which is also reflected in this volume. This is with full intention, because remains of the Kushite rulers in both Egypt and Sudan have much potential for the above mentioned aspects of royal ideology (see the contributions by Hsu, Spalinger, Nagy and Lohwasser). It is well known that indigenous aspects of foreign rulers as Egyptian kings are especially evident for the Kushites.¹⁵ Regarding Kushite chronology and the succession of the rulers, we follow throughout this volume the new sequence recently established by Jurman and others.¹⁶

12 Pro Persian element see M. Wasmuth, Political Memory in the Achaemenid Empire: The Integration of Egyptian Kingship into Persian Royal Display, in: J. M. Silverman/C. Waerzeggers (eds.), Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire, Ancient Near East Monographs 13, Atlanta 2015, 203–237, here: 214–215, fig. 3; contra see Kaper, in this volume.

13 Wasmuth, Political Memory in the Achaemenid Empire, 215.

14 Cf. also K. Smoláriková, Udjahorresnet: the founder of the Saite-Persian cemetery at Abusir and his engagement as leading political person during the troubled years at the beginning of the Twenty-Seventh Dynasty, in: J. M. Silverman/C. Waerzeggers (eds.), Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire, Ancient Near East Monographs 13, Atlanta 2015, 151–164; M. Wasmuth, Persika in der Repräsentation der ägyptischen Elite, in: JEA 103, 2018, 241–250.

15 See, e.g., A. Lohwasser, Fremde Heimat: Selektive Akkulturation in Kusch, in: E. Czerny/I. Hein/H. Hunger/D. Melman/A. Schwab (eds.), Timelines. Studies in Honour of Manfred Bietak, OLA 149.3, Leuven 2006, 133–138.

16 C. Jurman, The Order of the Kushite Kings According to Sources from the Eastern Desert and Thebes. Or: *Shabataka was here first!*, in: Journal of Egyptian History 10(2), 2017, 124–151; see also K. Jansen-Winkel, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Dritten Zwischenzeit, in: Journal of Egyptian History 10(1), 2017, 23–42, here: 40. Cf. also E. Pischikova/J. Budka/K. Griffin, Introduction, in: E. Pischikova/J. Budka/K. Griffin (eds.), Thebes in the First Millennium BC: Art and Archaeology of the Kushite Period and Beyond, GHP Egyptology 27, London 2018, 1–6, here: 1–2 with more references.

Texts and titles: Saite rulers and their officials

Texts, titles and other prosopographical data are of interest for reconstructing administrative patterns in first millennium BC Egypt. Therefore a large number of statues, both royal and non-royal, are discussed in this volume. Three contributions are focusing on aspects during the Saite dynasty (see Carola KOCH and Alexander SCHÜTZE in this volume). Of particular interest was whether “the agency of high officials in the reinterpretation of Egyptian royal ideology under foreign rule” (SCHÜTZE in this volume) was traceable. KOCH had a close look at vizier’s position after the New Kingdom and whether the executive powers of this office changed in times of alternating powers and fluctuating territories.

Double images: Ptolemies and Romans

The latest phase of the first millennium BC, the periods of Ptolemaic and Roman rule in Egypt, is a very special case when it comes to royal ideology. Important aspects are addressed in this volume by Martina MINAS-NERPEL, Ewa LASKOWSKA-KUSZTAL and Filip COPPENS. MINAS-NERPEL focused on the specific power and role of Ptolemaic queens and discussed whether and to what extent these queens and their cults are connected with the heyday and expansion of the Isis cult beyond the borders of Hellenistic Egypt. LASKOWSKA-KUSZTAL presented with case studies from the First Cataract region and Deir el-Bahari new ideas about Ptolemaic compilations of religious images holding the prime function to provide protection for the ‘foreign’ ruler by establishing references to deified mortals. A study of the *sn-ḥ3* (“Kissing the Earth”) ritual, executed by the foreign ruler before the deities of Egypt during the Ptolemaic and Roman eras is presented by COPPENS. Possible reasons for the discontinuity of the occurrence of this ritual are discussed and contextualised.

Outlook

This book examines Egyptian royal ideology and kingship under periods of foreign rulers with a selection of case studies from the first millennium BC.¹⁷ A variety of sources was presented with a focus on indigenous aspects, but also on cultural mixing and the adaptation of various subjects and religious ideas into the Egyptian system. The main aim was to trace evidence for Egyptian kingship during the rule of foreigners, be it authentic Egyptian or a modified version of royal ideology. Some of the topics which appeared as dominant while preparing this volume, and seem to be worth to follow in future studies, are:

- Creation of new religious concepts/images relating the king/queen to deities
- Osiris and temples and their relation to the ruler
- Tombs and temples and their significance to royal ideology
- Officials and their relation to the court/king

Fresh studies like the papers presenting material from new excavations in Abydos, Karnak, Gebel Barkal and other sites underline a novel awareness within the field to conduct a more concise contextualisation for material relating to foreign rulership. The research collected

¹⁷ Other case studies from Egypt could be named in particular from the second millennium BC and here especially the Hyksos, see, e.g., M. BIETAK, The enigma of the Hyksos, in: *BiOr* 75 (3/4), 2018, 227–247; T. SCHNEIDER, Hyksos Research in Egyptology and Egypt’s Public Imagination: A Brief Assessment of Fifty Years of Assessments, in: *Journal of Egyptian History* 11(1–2), 2018, 73–86 with further literature.

in this volume brings together diverse approaches to aspects of the Kushite, Saite, Persian, Ptolemaic and Roman kingship.

The future aim should be to put these data into a wider context and to try to enlarge the material evidence for certain interpretations and assessments proposed in this book. First millennium BC scholarship in Egypt and Sudan has already advanced during the last decade to a new level,¹⁸ but needs to be further strengthened in the future. It is my hope that this volume can provide some thought-provoking contributions and will inspire new studies on the ideology, religion and kingship of ancient Egypt during periods of considerable political changes but with strong ideological constants in the royal display.

¹⁸ See, *e.g.*, E. PISCHIKOVA/J. BUDKA/K. GRIFFIN (eds.), *Thebes in the First Millennium BC*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2014, *passim*; E. PISCHIKOVA/J. BUDKA/K. GRIFFIN (eds.), *Thebes in the First Millennium BC: Art and Archaeology of the Kushite Period and Beyond*, GHP Egyptology 27, London 2018.