

# “Nubianess” and the God’s Wives of the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. Office Holders, the Institution, Reception and Reaction

*Angelika Lohwasser*

In the 1<sup>st</sup> mill. BC, two of the God’s Wives of Amun (GWAs) who actually reigned and at least one, but perhaps two women designated to hold this office were not Egyptian but rather Kushite.<sup>1</sup> In this paper I want to focus on these Nubian women as well as on the influence their “Nubianess” might have exercised on the institution of the GWA. Another section deals with the possible reception of this institution in Nubia itself. The final section will deal with the Egyptian reaction to this Nubianess, and how Egyptians coped with the fact that some GWA were Nubian, not Egyptian.

## 1. The Nubian GWAs: Amenirdis I, Shepenwepet II, and Amenirdis II<sup>2</sup>

The first GWA, Amenirdis I, was a daughter of King Kashta, and her mother was Pabatma, as attested in the inscription on the back pillar of the statue CG 42198, where the filiation is expressed with the words *s3.t nsw Kashta, mw.t=s Shepenwepet and msj n Pabatma*.<sup>3</sup> The meaning of *msj n* is “born of” and *mw.t=s* is “(adoptive) mother”, as discussed by Macadam (1949, 120). For the purposes of this paper I want to point out that although the biological filiation is purely Nubian – both mother and father have Kushite names and are members of the Kushite royal family – the constructed filiation is Egyptian. With the expression of Egyptian as well as Nubian descent, Amenirdis I grants herself a twofold identity. An offspring of Kushite parents, she also has an Egyptian mother who passes on to her not only the office of the GWA, but also Egyptian identity.

The same is true for Shepenwepet II, a daughter of King Piye as is attested several times on various monuments. The Kushite woman Paabtameri is identified as “*mw.t ntr n dw3.t ntr*” in the text of her burial stela, but no name of the *dw3.t ntr* is mentioned. Some colleagues consider her the mother of Shepenwepet II, while others think she was the mother of Amenirdis II.<sup>4</sup> There are good arguments in favor of the first alternative but in the end we cannot be sure. Shepenwepet II’s adoptive mother was Amenirdis I, which results in an interesting combined identity: Amenirdis I acted as her *Egyptian* adoptive mother with an *Egyptian* name and bequeathed to her an *Egyptian* office, although, in actuality, she was biologically *Nubian*. The filiation of Shepenwepet II is therefore Nubian by descent, but hybrid through adoption.

Amenirdis II, Taharqa’s daughter, was adopted by Shepenwepet II. This is mentioned explicitly in the text of the adoption stela of Nitocris: “I (= Psammetik I) will give her (= Nitocris) as her (=Amenirdis II’s) eldest daughter, likewise, as it was done with her (=Amenirdis II) to the sister

---

<sup>1</sup> Within this article, I define “Nubian” and “Kushite” in the following manner: Nubian is the underlying ethnic affiliation and the cultural horizon. It is expressed by physiognomic dissimilarity to Egyptians and non-Egyptian traditions. Kushite designates the specific form of Nubian tradition, in effect in the realm of Kush (from the 9<sup>th</sup> cent. BC to the 4<sup>th</sup> cent. AD) in the Middle Nile region. Several Nubian cultural markers were basic for the identity of the Kushites and formed the background for their kingship ideology. But the prominence of Egyptian cultural elements, likewise essential for ideology, is fundamental for Kushite culture.

<sup>2</sup> The problem of the GWA mentioned in the Enthronization stela of Aspelta as well as the enigmatic Meritefnut are dealt with further below.

<sup>3</sup> Legrain 1914, 6–8; Lohwasser 2001, 24–25 with literature; Jansen-Winkel 2009, 259.

<sup>4</sup> See the discussion with literature in Lohwasser 2001, 173.

(=Shepenwepet II) of her (=Amenirdis II's) father (=Taharqa).<sup>5</sup> Again we can detect Nubian descent (mention of Taharqa) and the adoptive relationship to Shepenwepet, here expressed with verbs of transfer (administrative) and not filiation (personal). That there is no document stating the two lines of filiation as in the case of Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II might be the result of the brevity of Amenirdis II's membership in the institution of the GWA. But as with Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II, the statement of a twofold lineage, Nubian and Egyptian (in the hybrid sense for Shepenwepet II) is expressed in the Adoption Stela of Nitocris.

I interpret the parallel versions of the descent of the Nubian GWAs – the biological Nubian, which was never hidden, and the official Egyptian – as the two strategic aspects of the institution of the GWA in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, providing the link between Kushite royal power and the influential Egyptian clergy. The women themselves incorporated the political power as representatives of the reigning dynasty in the Thebais, as well as the spiritual and economic power of the established sacral institution. These GWAs embodied this link of politics and religion, of Nubianess and Egyptianess. With their twofold filiation they managed to tie together the two most influential institutions of their time – territorial kingship and the sacral realm.



Fig. 1: The names of the Kushite GWAs

The following section deals with the names of the ladies (Fig. 1). We have to bear in mind that they did not use their Kushite names; instead, they adopted Egyptian names. This is in contrast to the kings. Even the rulers of the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, who made great efforts to adapt their appearance and adopt practices compatible to Egyptian customs, kept their Kushite personal names. For the remaining four elements of their titularies they chose meaningful Egyptian names but their non-Egyptian son-of-Re names made them readily recognisable as Kushites. The GWA did not even keep their birth names; at any rate, we do not know of any Kushite birth names of the Kushite GWAs. They were known by purely Egyptian names: Shepenwepet and Amenirdis. In fact, the Kushites chose only one new name for the princesses who became GWA – Amenirdis – since the name Shepenwepet had been introduced by the Egyptian 23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty. Therefore, the selection of the name Shepenwepet linked the Kushite woman to an ancestral Libyan predecessor. The only name invented for a Kushite office holder is Amenirdis: “Amun-is-the-one-who-gave-her”. On the one hand, the Amun-element of course relates the women to her divine consort, but on the other hand, he is the foremost god of the Kushite Kingdom. Amun, the state god of the Kushites, delivers the crown to the king, thereby conferring upon him sovereignty of Egypt, Kush, and all foreign lands. Most of the temples erected by the Kushites are dedicated to Amun in his diverse manifestations.<sup>6</sup> Even in the Meroitic period, when indigenous Meroitic gods achieved high status in the pantheon, Amun retained his power and influence. Therefore, the name “Amun-is-the-one-who-gave-her” was an unambiguous statement for the Kushites: it is the state god himself who chose the princess as his sacral wife.

Two women bore the name Amenirdis: the first Kushite GWA, a daughter of Kashta, and the third GWA, a daughter of Taharqa. By contrast to the Kushite custom of using a name only once, the GWAs often reemploy the names of their predecessors, in line with Egyptian usage. The reuse of the name Amenirdis, as well as Shepenwepet by the Kushites, suggests that the Egyptian practice was followed when choosing the name. The connection to another, presumably ancestral person was embedded in Egyptian culture,<sup>7</sup> but alien to the Kushites. Therefore although the chosen name Amenirdis reflects

<sup>5</sup> Reading according to Blöbaum 2003, 35. See there for relevant literature.

<sup>6</sup> Rocheleau 2008.

<sup>7</sup> Vernus 1982, 329–330.

explicitly Kushite ideology, the decision to reuse the name for a second princess shows Egyptian influence.

There is one more person who may have been a member of the institution of the GWA, although her claim is very questionable. Pope (2014, 204–232) discusses several possible identities for the enigmatic Meritefnut. One of them (which however, Pope himself rejects) is that she was another GWA in the late 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty who died quite soon after assuming the role.<sup>8</sup> The name Meritefnut is suggestive of the myth of the Sun’s eye, since Tefnut herself is sometimes identified with the furious eye of the sun.<sup>9</sup> This suits Taharqa and his strategy of legitimation extremely well. His sons bear the names Nes-Shu-Tefnut and Nes-Onuris, again referring to the same myth. Inscriptions on various monuments identify Taharqa himself with one of the gods who pacified and brought back the sun’s eye. His monumental statue, found in the cachette at Gebel Barkal, depicts him as the god Onuris.<sup>10</sup> In the reliefs of his Mut temple at Gebel Barkal, several motifs refer to the myth.<sup>11</sup> The name Meritefnut would be very appropriate for a daughter of Taharqa and thus an admirably suitable name for a GWA of that time. But, on the other hand, Pope (2014, 214–215) rightly states that it would be quite unthinkable to postulate a reigning GWA in a period with an otherwise well-documented and complete succession of reigning GWAs: Shepenwepet II and Nitocris.

Besides their new chosen personal name, the GWA had also throne names just like kings. Mariam Ayad has made a detailed study of these names as well as of their patterns in the royal titularies.<sup>12</sup> It would seem that Shepenwepet I made reference to the name of Hatshepsut in her titulary, while Amenirdis I linked herself to the contemporary Kushite kings. The focus of the former’s chosen name *Hnm.t jb Jmn* (“united with the heart of Amun”) was her divine husband. Amenirdis I bears the name *H’j nfrw Mw.t* (“the beauty of Mut appeared”), which makes reference to Amun’s divine consort, Mut. Those GWAs who followed Amenirdis I constructed their names after her example: Shepenwepet II: *Hnw.t nfrw Mw.t* (“the mistress of beauty is Mut”), Nitocris: *Nb.t nfrw Mw.t* (same meaning) and Ankhnesneferibre: *Hk3.t nfrw Mw.t* (again more or less the same meaning).<sup>13</sup> Possibly, the choice of Amenirdis I could be understood as inferior to the Amun-based name of Shepenwepet I,<sup>14</sup> but I think that, by contrast to Shepenwepet I whose name expresses her role as the mortal wife, united with Amun, Amenirdis I’s name stresses her position as the divine wife. This choice may be related to her Nubianess: in Kush, Mut plays a central role as the female counterpart of the state god.<sup>15</sup> Mut is depicted on several monuments of the Kushites and she is addressed in various documents. The role of Mut is essential in the ideology of kingship, since she serves as one of the mothers of the king. The status of Mut is given emphasis through building activity in Nubia, but also in Karnak, where the kings of the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty undertook some construction in the Mut precinct. Mut as the divine consort of Amun has a close connection to the GWA, who acts as his mortal wife. The vulture headdress, typical for Mut’s iconography, is also the headdress of the GWA. A name chosen that mentions Mut demonstrates the fusion of the GWA with the goddess. Moreover, the two names of Amenirdis I taken together combine an Amun-based given name and a Mut-based throne name to demonstrate the universal embedment of the GWA in the sacral sphere of Kushite state ideology.

The intertwining of Amun and Mut in the two names of a single person consolidates the union of the two primary gods of Kushite kingship. The vital embodiment of this ‘entanglement’ is the GWA Amenirdis I and the GWA who succeeded her.

<sup>8</sup> Pope 2014, 213–215.

<sup>9</sup> von Lieven 2003, 47.

<sup>10</sup> Dunham 1970, pl. VII, VIII.

<sup>11</sup> Robisek 1989, 77–78.

<sup>12</sup> Ayad 2009a, 29–33.

<sup>13</sup> Since the promulgation of a throne name takes place after the inauguration, Amenirdis II never had one.

<sup>14</sup> Török 1997, 148.

<sup>15</sup> Lohwasser 2001, 398–399.

Let me stress that although all the names from Amenirdis I to Anhknesneferibre are constructed with reference to Mut, there is a difference in the choice of the words used by Amenirdis I and the GWAs who followed her. Amenirdis I is the only GWA whose name includes the verb *hꜥj* that seems to have a special meaning for the Kushites.<sup>16</sup> Amenirdis I represents herself as the living personification of Mut, while the following GWAs construct their names as a title expressing a link to the goddess but not embodiment of her.

In this context, I want to mention one more detail linking Amenirdis I to the Kushite pantheon. Ayad (2009b, 47–48) discusses the odd absence of any reference to the lineage – neither biological nor adoptive – in the texts of the chapel of Osiris Heqa-Djet. The 23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty chapel there was enlarged by Amenirdis I and although Ayad could detect a sophisticated duplication and adaption of the legitimizing motifs of Shepenwepet I by Amenirdis I, there is no clear statement of their ‘adoptive’ relationship. Moreover, there is no mention of Amenirdis I’s father Kashta, which is unusual. She appears only as an offspring of Osiris. The texts repeatedly affirm: “Amenirdis I, she made it as a monument for her father Osiris Heqa-Djet”.<sup>17</sup> This could be symptomatic of a systematic policy to establish state authority,<sup>18</sup> but it may also hint at a very complex construction of Amenirdis I’s legitimacy in Kushite ideology. Her names bound her to the primary state god Amun and to the primary female goddess Mut, while a link to Osiris incorporates her into the royal cycle of the renewal of power.<sup>19</sup> Osiris represents the deceased king, but also the transformative phase of rebirth and renewal of kingship. As the focus of processions and rituals in many chapels in Karnak, Osiris is inextricably associated with the state cult of the era. Amenirdis I, by representing herself as an offspring of Osiris Heqa-Djet, Ruler of Eternity, is thus involved on the highest level.

There remains one more aspect of the personalities themselves to be discussed: the pictorial representation and physical appearance of the GWA.

The costume of the Nubian GWAs is the same as the costume of the Egyptian GWAs. They wear a long dress<sup>20</sup> and a long wig with a vulture headdress and a crown with two tall falcon feathers (like Amun).<sup>21</sup> All these elements which mimic the costume of the Egyptian GWA are the same in depictions of Shepenwepet I and Nitocris as well. The costume and regalia provides not the slightest hint that Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II are non-Egyptians.

A meticulous investigation of the artistic monuments of the GWA remains a *desideratum*. The rendering of Kushite physiognomy in depictions of the GWA parallels the manner in which the kings are shown. Comparison of representations of Shepenwepet I and Amenirdis I in the reliefs of the chapel of Osiris Heqa-Djet,<sup>22</sup> as well as those of Shepenwepet II and Nitocris in the Karnak-chapels, reveals that there is no distinct disparity between the portraits of the Libyan/Kushite and those of the Kushite/Saite GWA. This may of course be due to their poor state of preservation as well as the poor quality of published photographs. As for sculpture in the round, Bothmer (1960, 1) noted the typical Kushite fold between the nostrils and the cheek in the presentation of Amenirdis I. Mysliwiec (1988, 44) also would observe here an experiment to combine Negroid physiognomy with classical Egyptian patterns of royal images, but other scholars have found no features (or only a few) of Nubian physiognomy in the sculpture of the GWA.<sup>23</sup> If these faces be compared to the face of contemporaries such as Montuemhat clear parallels can be recognized,<sup>24</sup> but Montuemhat is not a Nubian, and so his

<sup>16</sup> Ayad 2009a, 31–32.

<sup>17</sup> Legrain 1900, 126–127.

<sup>18</sup> Ayad 2009b, 48; Ritner 2009, 339.

<sup>19</sup> Kendall 2014, 675–678.

<sup>20</sup> By contrast to the Nubian queens, who wear a typically Nubian costume consisting of a cloth, a sash and a small tab-like element hanging down behind the feet – in my interpretation, a fox tail (Lohwasser 2001, 210–216).

<sup>21</sup> See the compilation of Mysliwiec 1988, 96, pl. D.

<sup>22</sup> See Mysliwiec 1988, pl. XXVI–XXVII.

<sup>23</sup> Vandersleyen 1975, 264; Wenig 1975, 410.

<sup>24</sup> Most significantly, the face of Montuemhat’s striding statue CG 42236 (Legrain 1914, 85–87, pl. 44–45).

physiognomy cannot hint at a Nubian ethnic background, but rather reflects instead the style of 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty art.

## 2. Nubian influence in the institution of the GWA

In the mid-8<sup>th</sup> cent. BC a strong power to the south of Egypt began to extend influence and exercise sovereignty northwards, eventually invading Egypt. We do not have any detailed information about who, when, how, and why this happened; only hints aid in reconstructing a quite fragmentary story. The main document is the triumphal stela of King Piye, which is dated to his 21<sup>st</sup> regnal year. It presents a detailed account of the successes and failures in the campaign and the final conquest of Egypt. But there are indications that Upper Egypt, at least up to and including the Theban region, was already under Kushite control before that invasion. We know of a stela of King Kashta from Elephantine and the fragment of annals in Karnak bearing his name and the date “year 1” which allows us to assume that he already reigned in the Theban region.<sup>25</sup> Let me add that my study of the so-called small – or sandstone – stela of Piye, mentioning Amun’s donation of the kingdom of Kush and Egypt to a king, has provided strong arguments in favor of ascribing this monument to a predecessor of Piye, and I want to suggest that he might be Kashta or even Alara, although proof is yet lacking.<sup>26</sup>

Another indication that the Thebais was already under Kushite control when Piye started his campaign is found in line 12 of his triumphal stela. The king, yet in Nubia, instructs his soldiers: “When you reach the residence of Thebes opposite Karnak, you shall enter into the water and you shall cleanse in the river, you shall clothe in best linen, unstring the bow and relieve the weapons.”<sup>27</sup> This means there was no need to conquer Thebes. Some specialists have often stated that the stable power in the Thebais was based on the influence of the GWAs – that Amenirdis I had already been installed as the successor of Shepenwepet I at the time and thus Piye could count on Kushite family bonds there. But there are others who argue that these women were installed by their brother. Support is forthcoming for both hypotheses.

Morkot (1999, 194–196) compiled all the evidence for GWAs who were installed by their father. Only Amenirdis I eludes us, and of course it is most crucial to know if she had already been installed by her father Kashta. On analogy with all other known installations, it is plausible that also in her case it was her father. In Nubia, there are at least three inscriptions naming the brother as the person who installed his sister as priestess; this could be interpreted as evidence of Nubianess tangible in our sources.<sup>28</sup> From two nearly parallel texts of Taharqa, Kawa IV (l. 16–19) and Kawa VI (l. 23), we learn that the ancestral king Alara delivered his sisters to Amun, who granted the kingship to Alara’s family. The text of stela Kawa VIII reports that King Anlamani, only a few decades after Taharqa, installed his four sisters as sistrum players in the four main Amun temples. There exists a slightly later stela – year 3 of Aspelta – where the office of one of these sisters is handed over to her daughter.<sup>29</sup> The last sentence of this stela explains that this practice should continue in perpetuity: the office should pass to her children and to the children of her children. This stela makes it evident that it was the daughter who was appointed, and that the office should be passed to the next generation. At least this inscription confirms that the installation in a sacral office occurred in a vertical configuration. Recently another stela with similar content was excavated in Dokki Gel (Kerma).<sup>30</sup> It is likewise dated to the third year of Aspelta. Sadly, the stela is very fragmentary; only the introduction is preserved. It tells of the arrival of Aspelta in the company of several functionaries. Although it is only partially preserved, similarities in these two stelae can be detected. The main objective of the inscription is lost and with it, the intent of the text. But

<sup>25</sup> Priese 1970.

<sup>26</sup> Anne Sörgel and myself carry out an investigation of this problem.

<sup>27</sup> Translation according to Goedicke 1998, 162.

<sup>28</sup> Koch (2012, 25) prefers installation by their brother, in accordance with Nubian practice. Ayad (2009a, 142–143) likewise argues that all GWAs prior to the 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty were installed by their brothers. See also Morkot in this vol., p. 112.

<sup>29</sup> Schäfer 1895; FHN I, 259–268.

<sup>30</sup> Valbelle 2012.



in the lunette which is also only partially preserved, the feet of a god and a goddess (Amun and Mut?) facing a king and one (or possibly two<sup>31</sup>) women. Perhaps we can posit a parallel for the purpose of the visit, since we know from the stela Kawa VIII that Anlamani presented one of his sisters to Amun of Pnubs. If so, we can suggest that the Dokki Gel-Stela again describes the transfer of the office to a daughter (either of the king or of the priestess).

These sources allow us to conclude that the Nubian procedure in general was to install a sister, although there are also sources which point to the investiture of a daughter. The Egyptian custom was to install a daughter. Since we know about Amenirdis II and can suggest in the case of Shepenwepet II that the two princesses were installed in the Egyptian manner by their father, I should like to propose that the same was true of Amenirdis I. The office of the GWA is an Egyptian institution with a long history that the Kushites used to fortify their power in the Thebais. It would have been effective to adopt the Egyptian custom of induction into this institution; the representations of the ladies also reflect a very Egyptianized picture – by contrast to the Nubian women who did not occupy other Egyptian offices.

But can we detect any Nubianess in the institution of the GWA, at least in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty? As we have seen, the system adopted to pass on the office, as well as the names and costume, are Egyptian. On the other hand, the immense power, in ritual, politics, and economy, especially in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, was influenced by the Kushite concept of kingship. As demonstrated in my doctoral thesis, Kushite kingship was based on the two aspects of masculine and feminine potency.<sup>32</sup> These powers were complementary. The king needed a female counterpart – his mother as well as a queen – to possess the ability to reign. In the later Meroitic phase there are reigning queens, and to reign, they always needed a male counterpart.<sup>33</sup> In Egypt, this concept was not embedded in kingship, or at least only on a minimal level. But to reign as king, both in Kush and in Egypt, the Kushite king needed the female counterpart. In Kush there are many depictions of the king with his royal mother and his royal consort. In Egypt, it is the GWA who can act as his complement. Of course, this is not often depicted and especially not outside the Thebais, but this balance of male and female power provides the background for the ideology of kingship. In my opinion, this is the strongest Nubian element in Kushite domination of the institution. The GWA seemed to be more active from Shepenwepet I onward, at the beginning of the phase that saw more intensive contact with the emerging Kushite realm. The institution of the GWA was already increasing in power, and this situation was instrumentalized by the Kushites. The institution lost influence after the withdrawal of the Kushites. The installation of Nitocris, the daughter of Psametik I, might reflect the strategy of this king for making peaceful inroads in Upper Egypt. We have to bear in mind that it was a period when the Saites had to reestablish the Egyptian administration in Lower Egypt after the intervention of the Assyrians. The High Steward Ibi states in his autobiography:<sup>34</sup> “The priests ... came and said: Your majesty has already heard that the institution of the GWA is declining. There is no supervisor there ...”. Therefore Ibi was installed as High Steward (of Nitocris) to restore the administration and economy. The institution of the GWA, already declining in the 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, ceased with the invasion of the Persians (27<sup>th</sup> Dynasty),<sup>35</sup> never to be reintroduced again.

I want to argue that the Nubianness detectable in the institution of the GWA reflects the power and influence that accrued to this office in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. The interrelations of male and female potentials, both necessary for the functioning of Kushite kingship, were expressed by the king and the GWA in Egypt.

As for possible Nubian influence, I want to comment on the suggestion of Koch (2012, 36–37) that the chapels in Medinet Habu might be cenotaphs. Since no verifiable burials of Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II were found in Egypt, they might be buried in Kush, like the kings. In Medinet Habu

<sup>31</sup> Valbelle (2012, 21) notes only one woman, but it is possible that two women stood quite close to each other.

<sup>32</sup> Lohwasser 2001, 335–344.

<sup>33</sup> Lohwasser 2000.

<sup>34</sup> Graefe 1994.

<sup>35</sup> According to Ayad 2001, Persian royal women played their role in the Achaemenid ideology, but this was not linked to the Egyptian politics.

several objects bearing the names of the GWA were found, but all of them could be equipment for a cenotaph with its memorial chapel. However, some ushebtis were found, too, which Koch attributes to Nubian influence since in the Nuri tombs, royal ushebtis were distributed among the members of the court.<sup>36</sup> Since no document in Nubia yet concerns the GWAs Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II, nor are their names even mentioned, I would argue against burial in their homeland. By contrast to the kings, who exercised power and built temples in Egypt as well as in Kush, preserving at least traces of their Nubianess (e.g., names, some iconographic elements, some rituals at their coronation<sup>37</sup>), the Nubian GWAs had influence in the Thebais only, and their building activity is restricted to that region, abandoning their Nubianess completely. Therefore interment in the Thebais – at Medinet Habu, Deir el Medineh or elsewhere – is more likely than inhumation in Nubia. This is again an indication of their “Egyptianess”. The Kushite kings practiced their double sovereignty over Egypt and Kush, trying to combine Egyptian and Kushite cultural and ideological traces, but were buried in the Royal Cemeteries in Kush, at El Kurru and Nuri. The almost completely Egyptianized GWAs arranged for their burial in the region of their realm, in the Thebais.

### 3. Nubian reception of the institution of the GWA

Did the Nubian GWA or the institution have any reception in the Nubian homeland? Until today, we do not know of any representations of them in Nubia nor of mention of them in texts there.<sup>38</sup> Several authors argue in favor of a comparable institution in Nubia. Their sources are the commitment of the Kushite kings to deliver their sisters or daughters to Amun, mentioned above, and the silver-amulet found in El Kurru depicting a queen being suckled by Isis.<sup>39</sup> But although royal women had to assume ritual roles and act as priestesses, we have no trace of an institution – with all its economic, administrative, and political influence – in Nubia like the GWA in Egypt.

There is, however, a single mention of a Divine Adoratrice in the Enthronement stela of Aspelta that expresses his lineage with the words (Fig. 2):

His father was my son, the Son of Re .... justified,  
 and his mother was the King’s Sister, King’s Mother, Mistress of Kush, the Daughter of Re, ...  
 may she live forever,  
 whose mother was the King’s Sister, Divine Adoratrice of Amun-Re, king of the gods of Thebes ...  
 justified,  
 whose mother was the King’s Sister ... justified,  
 whose mother was the King’s Sister ... justified,  
 whose mother was the King’s Sister ... justified,  
 whose mother was the King’s Sister ... justified,  
 whose mother was the King’s Sister, Mistress of Kush, ... justified,



Fig. 2: Enthronement stela of Aspelta (JE 48866), l. 19–21 (after Grimal 1981, pl. VI)

<sup>36</sup> In this context she cites my interpretation of this evidence, but not entirely correctly: I think that in some cases – or at the very least, in that of Nasalsa – the ushebtis of a prominent person were taken to another burial as a special honor or to act as a mediator, but not actively distributed as “gifts” to these persons.

<sup>37</sup> Lohwasser 2001, 267–282.

<sup>38</sup> A plaque found in Hillat el Arab, decorated with a female figure shaking a sistrum before the ram-headed Amun, was discussed as being the depiction of a GW. This was contradicted by Vincentelli (2006, 158), arguing that it is a depiction of the goddess Mut. See also the discussion in Pope 2014, 217–218. For an inclusive discussion of GW in Nubia, see Lohwasser 2001, 300–301; Pope 2014, 215–223.

<sup>39</sup> All these arguments are discussed at length by Pope 2014, 215–219.

All names have been excised, but the title ‘Divine Adoratrice’ survives. Although we cannot identify this lady, the text provides proof that at least her identity was known and passed down in Nubian archives. This has led to the hypothesis that there existed a kind of GWA in Nubia, too.<sup>40</sup> But this sole occurrence of the title on a Nubian monument, preserved in an archive, might nevertheless not have reflected a standard practice. The priestesses installed by Anlamani bear the title *shmy.t*, and the sacral office passed by Matiqen to her daughter Henuttakhebit in Sanam is called *jhy.t*. Both titles express the ritual function of the queens in Kush: shaking sistra and singing to pacify the god.<sup>41</sup> Anlamani appointed four sisters as priestesses, by contrast to the Egyptian practice of hierarchical order with only one High Priestess at the top.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, there is no mention of an economic institution, the original purpose for founding it.

Nevertheless, there is the title of Divine Adoratrice listed in Aspelta’s Enthronement stela and the destroyed name in the cartouche remains a problem. Several researches have argued that she was Amenirdis II, who never assumed the role but returned to Nubia, where she married<sup>43</sup> and bore children – one of whom was the next lady in the line of succession.<sup>44</sup> But the Divine Adoratrices assumed the title only when they took the office – i.e., when the predecessor died.<sup>45</sup> There is no document explicitly assigning any title of a GWA to Amenirdis II; and according to the evaluation of the documents attributed to her by Koch (2012, 44–50), very few even hint at Amenirdis II.

Macadam suggested that the entire line of ascent consisted of adoptions.<sup>46</sup> If *mw.t=s* refers to an adoptive relationship, one can of course insert a GWA without constructing a ‘second life’ with a family after her departure from Egypt. But again the problem arises that Amenirdis II was never Divine Adoratrice! Thus it must have been some other Divine Adoratrice. The suggestion that the lady might be Shepenwepet II results in chronological problems, since she lived more than two generations before Aspelta. Moreover, if the women listed, always associated as *mw.t=s*, were adopted, a dead end again results. We know the adoptive mother of Shepenwepet II – viz. Amenirdis I – and we also know that the adoptive mother of Amenirdis II was Shepenwepet II.<sup>47</sup> But none of the other women are called God’s Hand, God’s Wife or Divine Adoratrice – therefore the names cannot be those of Amenirdis I or Shepenwepet II.

Another suggestion has been made by Mariam Ayad (2009a, 154–155) who constructs a line of female divine worshippers in Nubia parallel to the one in Thebes. This would suit the title *hnw.t n Kš*, given the earliest of the women mentioned, which cannot be the title of a Third Intermediate Period GWA. But we have no evidence for a Nubian GWA or analogous female clergy and, most informative, the Divine Adoratrice in the line is a *dw3.t ntr n Jmn-Rc nsw ntr.w n W3s.t* – which refers very explicitly to Thebes. Therefore, this Divine Adoratrice cannot be a hypothetical GWA in Kush. I think there is no way to identify the Divine Adoratrice of Aspelta’s text in lieu of additional documents. Although arguments can be cited against every hypothesis so far proposed, I would like to add one more.

Perhaps the Divine Adoratrice cited is not a Divine Adoratrice in the sense of the Theban institution of GWA, since such women either were not permitted to bear children or, if these are adoptive relationships, the GWA-titles of their mothers are missing.

A solution would be to read the title Divine Adoratrice in the Kushite archives not as a functional title of the Theban institution, but merely as the title of a woman playing the role of a priestess of Amun at Thebes. There are female officials in the clergy and in the royal court of the divine consort as well. The woman in the text on Aspelta’s stela could have been one of the priestesses of Amun in Thebes,

<sup>40</sup> Ayad 2009a, 154. See the discussion of all the relevant literature in Pope 2014, 219–223.

<sup>41</sup> For the ritual role of the queens, see Lohwasser 1998.

<sup>42</sup> Contra Török 1997, 240, who comprehends the investiture of the female clergy in accordance with the Theban model of the GWA.

<sup>43</sup> Habachi 1977.

<sup>44</sup> Morkot 1999, 199–200.

<sup>45</sup> Koch 2012, 64–65; Jansen-Winkel 2009, 337.

<sup>46</sup> Mentioned for the first time by Macadam 1949, 126–127.

<sup>47</sup> This hypothetical lineage is presented as variant in Pope 2014, 221, but rightly rejected.



though not the GWA herself. Although this suggestion may sound very far-fetched at first, there is supporting evidence.

Pope (2014, 222–223) states that the titles constructed with the term *hnw.t* express a sociopolitical or territorial function. The first and the last women in the line of succession bear the title *hnw.t n Kš* which hints at a political function of queens. Four queens had no other title than *sn.t nsw*, which associates them with royalty and with political involvement in regard to legitimacy through inheritance.<sup>48</sup> The title of the *dw3.t ntr n Jmn-R<sup>c</sup> nsw ntr.w n W3s.t* does not have any political implications, although the bearer is also *sn.t nsw*. Within the framework of legitimacy in respect to the succession, this title is exceptional. The reference to a sacral role of the queen is unique in the sequence, but in general, the discussion of this section of the stela is dominated by the reconstruction of the possible ritual functions of the queens. Obviously, Divine Adoratrice is not a political or territorial title, but on the other hand, nor is it a common title referring to the cult. Within Kush, only *jhy.t*, *shmy.t* and *hn.w* are attested.<sup>49</sup> Therefore, the choice of the title *dw3.t ntr*, as well as the specification of Thebes, hints at an exceptional construct, but one understandable in Kush. It does not imply that the Egyptian meaning of the title was transferred to Kush nor that the persons, titles or institution of the GWA had any influence in Kush. In my opinion it is the Kushite term for a member in the clergy of Thebes.

The specific usage of the title *dw3.t ntr n Jmn-R<sup>c</sup> nsw ntr.w n W3s.t* is without parallel in the documents of the GWA in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. When it occurs in the Third Intermediate and Late Periods, the title is usually cited in its abbreviated form: “God’s Wife, God’s Hand, Divine Adoratrice” without mention of the name of the god Amun. There are only a few examples including Amun,<sup>50</sup> and only one is yet known that gives the complete NK title sequence: *hm.t ntr n Jmn-R<sup>c</sup> m Jp.t-sw.t*.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, the choice of *W3s.t*, rather than of *Jp.t-sw.t*, in the text of Aspelta’s stela is singular (Fig. 3a–c). The citation of Thebes instead of Karnak is unique and again proof of a non-canonical handling with its insertion into Aspelta’s genealogy. But most significant is the orthography of *dw3.t ntr* which is not written in abbreviated form as was common in the title of a Divine Adoratrice. The sign N 14 (*dw3*) is complemented with G1, X1, H8, B1 and therefore written like the verb “to venerate”. In the 18<sup>th</sup> Dyn, the deputy of the GWA was called *dw3.t ntr*.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, there is evidence that, at least in the 18<sup>th</sup> through the 20<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, the word “to venerate” can be written with *ntr* (R8) as a determinative.<sup>53</sup>



Fig. 3a: Standard TIP/LP-title of the GWAs



Fig. 3b: NK-title of the GWAs



Fig. 3c: Title given in the text of the Enthronement stela

The curious variant *W3s.t*, instead of *Jp.t-sw.t*, together with the writing of *dw3.t* which diverges significantly from the abbreviated form of the title, suggests to me that the Egyptian title is not cited in the Kushite archives, but rather the name of the woman with a cultic role in the clergy of Amun of Thebes. Since all other titles of priestesses in Kush were used only once or twice,<sup>54</sup> I understand *dw3.t ntr* in this case also as a reference to the role of a priestess, a narrative description of her function and not a fixed title. Accepting this proposal overcomes the difficulties which the line of succession presents: the grandmother of Aspelta was a royal lady with a cultic function in the Theban clergy, but not an Egyptian GWA.

<sup>48</sup> For an interpretation of this term see Lohwasser 2001, 241–242.

<sup>49</sup> Lohwasser 2001, 193–194.

<sup>50</sup> Gitton – Leclant 1975, 799; Jansen-Winkel 2009, 297, 310, 316.

<sup>51</sup> Jansen-Winkel 2009, 321.

<sup>52</sup> Graefe 1981, 96, 106.

<sup>53</sup> Graefe 1975, 75–81.

<sup>54</sup> See the compilation in Lohwasser 2001, 194.

Having described the GWA's lack of influence or even reference in Kush, we may ask if they had any contact with their homeland. There is at least one document which provides a clue. A theophorus statue in the State Museum of Western and Eastern Art in Kiev bears the name Amenirdis incised on the upper arm.<sup>55</sup> The statue owner's name is Nes-neb-Neteru and his titles are *jmj-hn.t hm.t ntr* (Chamberlain of the GW) and *wpy.t nj dw3.t ntr r t3 stj* with the meaning "Messenger of the Divine Adoratrice to the Land of Nubia".

The role of this messenger is problematic. Did he have only one mission to fulfill in Nubia? Or was Nes-neb-Neteru a messenger who maintained contact between the Nubian GWA and their homeland? The content of the messages and the recipient(s) remain enigmatic. And since it is the only attestation of the title known so far its occurrence cannot be used to demonstrate continuous contact of the Kushite GWA with their homeland.

#### 4. Reflections of the Kushite GWAs in Egypt

After the Assyrian conquest, the Saite kings of the 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty ruled in Egypt. Initially it seems that there was no hostility towards the few Nubians we know to have remained in Egypt. In addition to the GWA, there is evidence for only few Kushites, most of them in Thebes and at Abydos.<sup>56</sup> The most prominent among them was Udjarenes, the wife of Montuemhat and granddaughter of Piye (?)<sup>57</sup> who is mentioned on the Adoption stela of Nitocris and is depicted several times in the tomb of her husband,<sup>58</sup> either as Nubian or Egyptian, depending upon the context of the representation. In the Saite Oracle Papyrus, datable to the reign of Psametik I after the union of Lower and Upper Egypt, Harkhebi, grandson of Shabaqo, is mentioned as a witness to the document and he is shown with dark skin. In the same document, the skin of the famous Montuemhat, ruler of the Thebais during the transitional years of the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, the Assyrian war, and Psametik I's countrywide consolidation, is slightly lighter, but nevertheless darker than the skin of other figures.<sup>59</sup>

The continuous mention of Kushites in their official capacities suggests that at least no evidence survives for hostile action against them or their representations.

But in the later 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, evidence is forthcoming for a negative attitude towards the Kushites. On several monuments the names of the Kushite kings were erased. The names Kashta, Piye, Shabaqo, Shebitqo and Taharqa, as well as Tanwetamani, were attacked with the chisel. This strategy started after the death of Nitocris, but it was not pursued without exception. On inaccessible objects like the sarcophagus of Nitocris all the names were left untouched.<sup>60</sup> A specific pattern of attack can be discerned by examining the monuments of the GWA left exposed in the open. We must bear in mind that these monuments stood in a sacred space and that the activity was sanctioned by the office-holders in the highest posts of ritual power at the time. Nevertheless, we can also observe that only the names of the kings were singled out in the filiation of the GWA, not the names of the GWA themselves (Fig. 4)! There are numerous examples showing the name of Nitocris accompanied by the cartouches of Shepenwepet II and Amenirdis I.<sup>61</sup> Even after her death, Shepenwepet II was called "*mwt=s* Shepenwepet II *m3c hrw*" by Nitocris.<sup>62</sup> In the inscription on a pivot we read "Nitocris, *nh, s3.t dw3.t ntr* Shepenwepet II, *m3c hrw*".<sup>63</sup> This means that the Kushite GWAs retained their places in the line of succession also their death.

<sup>55</sup> Moss 1960, 269–271; Graefe 1981, 41–42, § 17; Valloggia 1976, 192, 228.

<sup>56</sup> Vittmann 2007; Leahy 2014; Pischikova 2014; Leahy 1994.

<sup>57</sup> The name of her father, *s3 nsw* (Piye) *h3-rw*, can be read as "King's Son, Piye-har" or "King's Son of Piye, Har". According to Vittmann (2007, 145) the latter is to be preferred.

<sup>58</sup> Russmann 1997, 25–34.

<sup>59</sup> Vittmann 2007, 151; Parker 1962, 4–6.

<sup>60</sup> For a discussion of dating the destruction of the cartouches, see Koch 2014.

<sup>61</sup> E.g. on a block in Karnak all three cartouches survived, and at another place Nitocris is again mentioned with Shepenwepet II and Amenirdis I, the latter two labeled "justified." (Christophe 1951, 47).

<sup>62</sup> JE 25582 (Koch 2012, 105, No. 2).

<sup>63</sup> Graefe 1981, Tf. 23, 15\*, 16\*.



Fig. 4: Typical erasure of the Kushite name of the father alongside the intact name of the GWA in the chapel of Amenirdis I in Medinet Habu (Photo: Lohwasser)

The same is true for the era of the last GWA, Ankhnesneferibre when the destruction of the Kushite legacy was at its peak. Laurent Coulon<sup>64</sup> mentions blocks of Ankhnesneferibre preserving the succession Amenirdis I – Shepenwepet II – Nitocris – Ankhnesneferibre without any erasures.

Although in the later 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, the destruction of the names of virtually all Kushite *kings* on view was general, the names of their *daughters* were esteemed. They were neither chiseled out nor neglected in the filiations of later GWAs.

Initially, I believed that the Egyptians distinguished between the political foreign rule and the ritual office. We know from the kings’ lists at Abydos and Saqqara that non-Egyptian rulers were not included in the sequence of legitimate Egyptian pharaohs. But after detecting more and more data for the Egyptianess of the GWAs, I am quite sure that those sent to erase the names distinguished between *Nubian* and *Egyptian* and that the GWA were felt to be Egyptian. They had Egyptian names, were dressed in Egyptian costume and held a purely Egyptian office. Nothing hints at their Nubianess, except the paternal filiation. Therefore, I suggest that the destruction focused on the *Kushite* kings and left unharmed the GWA with their *Egyptian* identity. The fact that the GWA epitomized continuity of the traditional rituals for the state god Amun may have played a role as well. Nevertheless, it was their Egyptianess which saved them from annihilation.

Each monument with deleted names has to be analyzed by itself.<sup>65</sup> There are few monuments that preserve the names of Kashta or Piye; they survive primarily on small objects like scarabs, but there are several prominent monuments with untouched cartouches, too. The fragmentary lower part of a seated statue of Amenirdis I (CG 42198) is inscribed on the back pillar, and all cartouches are preserved.<sup>66</sup>

Another example is the statue of Shepenwepet II, found in the cachette and bearing her name and that of her father Piye on the back pillar.<sup>67</sup> On the sphinx of Shepenwepet II, likewise from the cachette,

<sup>64</sup> Personal communication at the conference.

<sup>65</sup> See the examples in Koch 2014, 405–407.

<sup>66</sup> For text and literature see Legrain 1914, 6–8; Lohwasser 2001, 24–25 with literature; Jansen-Winkel 2009, 259.

<sup>67</sup> GC 42200 (Legrain 1914, 9, pl. 8).



the name of her father was chiseled out.<sup>68</sup> But on the corresponding sphinx of Shepenwepet II, discovered in the sacred lake at Karnak, the name of her father Piye was left untouched.<sup>69</sup>

The only common feature discernable when these statues are compared is the possible preservation of the king's name when it occurs on the back pillar.<sup>70</sup> Perhaps the names were chiseled out when visible, but the statues themselves were not removed and therefore the inscriptions on the back pillars, standing neatly up against walls, were inaccessible.

Therefore I suggest two parameters in the destruction of the Kushite names. Firstly, only Kushite names – and Kushite identities – were destroyed. And secondly, only visible cartouches were chiseled out.<sup>71</sup>

## Conclusion

The aim of this article was to detect the Nubianess of the GWAs and of their institution, as well as the Egyptian response to this Nubianess. In fact, it appears that there is not so much Nubianess represented in the monuments known so far. Amenirdis I, Shepenwepet II, and Amenirdis II were, of course, biologically Nubian as expressed in their filiation by mention of their Kushite fathers – and in the case of Amenirdis I, of her Kushite mother as well. But it seems that from the moment they entered the traditional Egyptian institution of the GWA, they adopted the appearance of Egyptian office holders in nearly every aspect. They assumed an Egyptian name – of course, carefully chosen to suit the legitimization strategy of the kings, claiming an association with Amun (Amenirdis I and II) and a link to the ancestors and predecessors in the office (Shepenwepet II, Amenirdis II). Their iconography is completely Egyptian. Neither their titles and names, nor the phraseology of their inscriptions or the motifs and iconography of their depictions reveal any Nubianess. The office itself, the incorporated rituals, the hierarchy, administration and economic influence are purely Egyptian and not copied in Kush. But the political influence and power of this institution was fruitfully used by the Kushites to stabilize their rule in Egypt. This is the only Nubianess which I could detect. Based on the Kushite ideology of kingship, the males needed a female counterpart to rule successfully. In Egypt, queenship had not the same weight as the complement to kingship as in Kush. But the institution of the GWA, in existence for a long time and revived in the 23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty also with the aim of consolidating power, fulfilled the Kushite requirements. They intensified its influence and increased its power. Moreover, they assimilated the possibilities of self-representation to those of the kings to convey a balance of male and female components of (ritual) power, at least in the Thebais.

The Egyptian response to the non-present Nubianess was appropriately placid. Only the visible Nubian elements were rejected, i.e. the names of the Kushite fathers were erased. The (Nubian) GWAs were considered Egyptian by the Egyptians – and it seems by the Kushites, including the GWAs themselves, as well.

## Addendum

Jeremy Pope's article "Shepenwepet II and the Kingdom of Kush: Implications of a Recent Study", in Richard Jasnow and Kathlyn Cooney (eds), *Joyful in Thebes. Egyptological Studies in Honor of Betsy M. Bryan*, Atlanta 2015, 357–364, appeared after this contribution had been submitted for publication. It deals with the list on the Enthronement stela of Aspelta in an effort to identify the anonymous Divine Adoratrice of the text. Supported by substantial reasoning, he rightly points out that Amenirdis II is an impossible candidate. Nevertheless, the arguments he proposes in favor of his alternative –

<sup>68</sup> CG 42201 (Legrain 1914, 9–10, pl. 9) and Aufderhaar, this volume.

<sup>69</sup> Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung Berlin Inv.-Nr. 7972 (for literature see Aufderhaar in this volume).

<sup>70</sup> E.g. the striding statue of Taharqa bears an inscription on the back pillar with the name is preserved, whereas the cartouche on the belt is destroyed (CG 42202. S. 10, pl. X.).

<sup>71</sup> There exists a rock inscription at Gebel Tagug, Elephantine, where the Majordomo Harwa left an inscription naming also Amenirdis I and Kashta (Seidlmayer 2008, pl. IX). Neither name was chiseled out. At the moment, the reason why the name of the Kushite king survived at this specific place cannot be determined.

Shepenwepet II – do not convince. In particular, his suggestion all listed women were queens, following the first mentioned woman, the mother of Aspelta who should have been a queen. But Shepenwepet II is never addressed with the title *hm.t nsw*. Although a reconstruction with the name Shepenwepet II is chronologically within reason – the absolute dating of the reigns from Piye to Taharqa is far from clear – a titulary mentioning only *sn.t nsw* does not suit her. Usually she bears the title *s3t. nsw* with the titles of a God’s Wife. Moreover, Shepenwepet II never bears the title of a GWA in the form occurring on the Enthronement stela.

### Bibliography

- Ayad 2001                      Mariam Ayad. Some Thoughts on the Disappearance of the Office of the God’s Wife of Amun. In: JSSEA 28, 1–14.
- Ayad 2009a                     Mariam Ayad. God’s Wife, God’s Servant: The God’s Wife of Amun. London.
- Ayad 2009b                     Mariam Ayad. The Transition from Libyan to Nubian Rule: The Role of the God’s Wife of Amun. In: Gerard P. F. Broekman – Robert J. Demarée – Olaf E. Kaper (eds.). The Libyan Period in Egypt. Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21<sup>st</sup>–24<sup>th</sup> Dynasties. Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25–27 October 2007. EGU 23. Leiden/Leuven, 29–49.
- Blöbaum 2003                 Anke I. Blöbaum. Einige Bemerkungen zur Adoptionsstele der Nitokris. In: Anke I. Blöbaum – Jochem Kahl – Simon D. Schweitzer (Hrsg.). Ägypten – Münster. Kulturwissenschaftliche Studien zu Ägypten, dem Vorderen Orient und verwandten Gebieten (= FS Erhart Graefe). Wiesbaden, 33–44.
- Christophe 1951              Louis A. Christophe. Karnak-Nord III (1945–1949). FIFAO 23. Le Caire.
- Dunham 1970                 Dows Dunham. The Barkal Temples. Excavated by G. A. Reisner. Boston.
- FHN I                             Tormod Eide – Tomas Hägg – Richard H. Pierce – László Török (eds.). Fontes Historiae Nubiorum. Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Cent. BC and the Sixth Cent. AD. I: From the Eighth to the Mid-Fifth Cent. BC. Bergen.
- Gitton – Leclant 1975        LÄ II (1975) 792-812 s.v. Gottesgemahlin (M. Gitton – J. Leclant).
- Goedicke 1998                Hans Goedicke. Pi(ankh)y in Egypt. A Study of the Pi(ankh)y Stela. Baltimore.
- Graefe 1975                    Erhart Graefe. Bemerkungen zu zwei Titeln der Spätzeit. In: SAK 3, 75–84.
- Graefe 1981                    Erhart Graefe. Untersuchungen zur Verwaltung und Geschichte der Institution der Gottesgemahlin des Amun vom Beginn des Neuen Reiches bis zur Spätzeit. ÄA 37. Wiesbaden.
- Graefe 1994                    Erhart Graefe. Der autobiographische Text des Ibi, Obervermögensverwalter der Gottesgemahlin Nitokris, auf Kairo JE 36158. In: MDAIK 50, 85–99.
- Habachi 1977                 Labib Habachi. Mentuhotep, the Vizier and Son-in-law of Taharqa. In: Ägypten und Kusch. Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 13, 165–170.



- Jansen-Winkel 2009 Karl Jansen-Winkel. *Inschriften der Spätzeit, Teil III: Die 25. Dynastie (Nubierzeit)*. Wiesbaden.
- Kendall 2014 Timothy Kendall. Reused Relief Blocks of Piankhy from B 900: Toward a Decipherment of the Osiris Cult at Gebel Barkal. In: J. R. Anderson – D. A. Welsby (eds.), *The Fourth Cataract and Beyond. Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> International Conference for Nubian Studies. British Museum Publication on Egypt and Sudan 1*. London, 663–686.
- Koch 2012 Carola Koch. „Die den Amun mit ihrer Stimme zufriedenstellen“. *Gottesgemahlinnen und Musikerinnen im thebanischen Amunstaat von der 22. bis zur 26. Dynastie. SRaT 27*. Dettelbach.
- Koch 2014 Carola Koch. Usurpation and the Erasure of Names during the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. In: Elena Pischikova – Julia Budka – Ken Griffin (eds.). *Thebes in the First Millennium BC*. Cambridge, 397–413.
- Leahy 1994 Anthony Leahy. Kushite Monuments at Abydos. In: Christopher Eyre – Anthony Leahy – Lisa Montagno Leahy (eds.). *The Unbroken Reed. Studies in the Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt. In Honour of A. F. Shore. EESOP 11*. London, 171–192.
- Leahy 2014 Anthony Leahy. Kushites at Abydos: The Royal Family and Beyond. In: Elena Pischikova – Julia Budka – Ken Griffin (eds.). *Thebes in the First Millennium BC*. Cambridge, 61–95.
- Legrain 1900 Georges Legrain. Le temple et les chapelles d’Osiris à Karnak. In: *RecTrav 22*, 125–136.
- Legrain 1914 Georges Legrain. Statues et statuettes des rois et particuliers (CG 42192–42250). *Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire 3,1*. Le Caire.
- Lieven 2003 Alexandra von Lieven. Wein, Weib und Gesang – Rituale für die Gefährliche Göttin. In: Carola Metzner-Nebelsick (Hrsg.). *Rituale in der Vorgeschichte, Antike und Gegenwart. Internationale Archäologie. Arbeitsgemeinschaft, Symposium, Tagung, Kongress 4*. Rahden/Westfalen, 47–55.
- Lohwasser 2000 Angelika Lohwasser. König/Königin – Gott/Göttin. Zur Komplementarität von Männlichem und Weiblichem in napatanscher und meroitischer Zeit. *IBAES 2*. Berlin, 63–74.
- Lohwasser 2001 Angelika Lohwasser. Die königlichen Frauen im antiken Reich von Kusch. 25. Dynastie bis zur Zeit des Nastasen. *Meroitica 19*. Wiesbaden.
- Macadam 1949 M. F. Laming Macadam. *The Temples of Kawa I. The Inscriptions*. London.
- Morkot 1999 Robert Morkot. Kingship and Kinship in the Empire of Kush. In: Steffen Wenig (Hrsg.). *Studien zum antiken Sudan. Akten der 7. Internationalen Tagung für meroitistische Forschungen vom 14. bis 19. September 1992 in Gosen/bei Berlin. Meroitica 15*. Wiesbaden, 179–229.
- Moss 1960 Rosalind Moss. The statue of an Ambassador to Ethiopia at Kiev. In: *Kush 8*, 269–271.

- Mysliwicz 1988 Karol Mysliwicz. *Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI–XXX*. Mainz.
- Parker 1962 Richard A. Parker. *A Saite Oracle Papyrus from Thebes in the Brooklyn Museum (Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3)*. *Brown Egyptological Studies* 4. Providence.
- Pischikova 2014 Elena Pischikova. *Kushite Tombs of the South Asasif Necropolis. Conservation, Reconstruction, and Research*. In: Elena Pischikova – Julia Budka – Ken Griffin (eds.). *Thebes in the First Millennium BC*. Cambridge, 121–160.
- Pope 2014 Jeremy Pope. *The Double Kingdom under Taharqo. Studies in the History of Kush and Egypt, c. 690–664 BC*. CHANE 69. Leiden/Boston.
- Priese 1970 Karl-Heinz Priese. *Der Beginn der kuschitischen Herrschaft in Ägypten*. In: ZÄS 98, 16–32.
- Ritner 2009 Robert K. Ritner. *Fragmentation and re-integration in the third intermediate period*. In: Gerard P. F. Broekman – Robert J. Demarée – Olaf E. Kaper (eds.). *The Libyan Period in Egypt. Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21<sup>st</sup>–24<sup>th</sup> Dynasties*. *Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25–27 October 2007*. EGU 23. Leiden/Leuven, 327–340.
- Robisek 1989 Christian Robisek. *Das Bildprogramm des Mut-Tempels am Gebel Barkal*. *Veröffentlichungen der Institute für Afrikanistik und Ägyptologie der Universität Wien* 52. Wien.
- Rocheleau 2008 Caroline M. Rocheleau. *Amun Temples in Nubia. A typological study of New Kingdom, Napatan and Meroitic Temples*. BAR Int. Ser. 1850. Oxford.
- Russmann 1997 Edna R. Russmann. *Mentuemhat’s Kushite Wife (Further Remarks on the Decoration of the Tomb of Mentuemhat, 2)*. In: JARCE 34, 21–39.
- Schäfer 1895 Heinrich Schäfer. *Die aethiopische Königsinschrift des Louvre*. In: ZÄS 33, 101–113.
- Seidlmayer 2008 Stephan Seidlmayer. *10. Rock Inscriptions*. In: Dietrich Raue et al. *Report on the 37<sup>th</sup> season of excavation and restoration on the island of Elephantine* [http://www.dainst.org/projekt/projectdisplay/25953#\\_LFR\\_FN\\_\\_projectdisplay\\_WAR\\_daiportlet\\_view\\_downloads](http://www.dainst.org/projekt/projectdisplay/25953#_LFR_FN__projectdisplay_WAR_daiportlet_view_downloads) (View 30.8.2015).
- Strudwick 2006 Nigel Strudwick. *Masterpieces of Ancient Egypt*. London.
- Török 1997 László Török. *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of Napatan-Meroitic Civilisation*. HdO I, 31. Leiden.
- Valbelle 2012 Dominique Valbelle. *Les stèles de l’an 3 d’Aspelta*. BdE 154. Le Caire.
- Valloggia 1976 Michel Valloggia. *Recherche sur les “messagers” (wpwtyw) dans les sources égyptiennes profanes*. *Hautes Études Orientales* 6. Genève/Paris, 192–228.
- Vandersleyen 1975 Claude Vandersleyen. *Das Alte Ägypten*. *Propyläen Kunstgeschichte* 15. Frankfurt am Main.
- Vernus 1982 LÄ IV (1982) 329–330 s.v. Namensgebung (P. Vernus).

- Vincentelli 2006 Irene Vincentelli. *Hillat El-Arab. The Joint Sudanese-Italian Expedition in the Napatan Region*. SARS 15 = BAR Int. Ser. 1570. Oxford.
- Vittmann 2007 Günter Vittmann. *A Question of Names, Titles, and Iconography. Kushites in Priestly, Administrative and other Positions from Dynasties 25 to 26*. In: *Der antike Sudan*. MittSAG 18, 139–161.
- Wenig 1975 Steffen Wenig. *Die Kunst im Reich von Kusch zur Zeit der 25. Dynastie und der Herrscher von Napata*. In: Claude Vandersleyen. *Das Alte Ägypten. Propyläen Kunstgeschichte* 15. Frankfurt am Main, 400–412.