



Swansea University  
Prifysgol Abertawe



## Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

---

This is an author produced version of a paper published in :  
*Göttinger Miszellen*

Cronfa URL for this paper:

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa11757>

---

### Paper:

Sagrillo, T. (2005). The mummy of Shoshenq I re-discovered?. *Göttinger Miszellen*, 205, 95-102.

---

This article is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Authors are personally responsible for adhering to publisher restrictions or conditions. When uploading content they are required to comply with their publisher agreement and the SHERPA RoMEO database to judge whether or not it is copyright safe to add this version of the paper to this repository.

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/iss/researchsupport/cronfa-support/>

Offprint of Troy Leiland Sagrillo. 2005. “The Mummy of Shoshenq I Re-discovered?” *Göttinger Miscellen: Beiträge zur ägyptologischen Diskussion* 205:95–102.

Published by the Seminars für Ägyptologie und Koptologie der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Germany

Copyright ©2005 Troy Leiland Sagrillo. All rights reserved world-wide.

## The Mummy of Shoshenq I Re-discovered?\*

TROY LEILAND SAGRILLO

Departement Oosterse en Slavische Studies  
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

**ABSTRACT:** In *Göttinger Miszellen* 198 (2004):55–62, R. L. Miller identifies a mummy formerly in the collection of the Niagara Falls Museum with that of Shoshenq I (though other candidates are not ruled out), primarily on the basis of a tree-ring calibrated radiocarbon date. A re-examination of the historical evidence cited by Miller in support for this contention makes such an identification implausible.

Recently, R. L. Miller (2004) has proposed that the probable royal mummy formerly in the collection of the Niagara Falls Museum,<sup>1</sup> Ontario, Canada, may be that of king Shoshenq I, the Libyan founder of Dynasty XXII. As part of a series of examinations undertaken by Miller, samples of tissue—abdominal skin and muscle (Miller 2004, 61)—were submitted for <sup>14</sup>C AMS testing in 1994. This yielded an uncalibrated determination of 2734 ±60 BP, which can be calibrated with a probability of 95.4% to the period 1010–790 BCE using the OxCal 3.8 calibration (Miller 2004, 55, 57). Miller (2004, 56–58) argues that low peaks on the calibration graph would not rule out proposals to identify the mummy with one of the sons of Ramesses II, or with one of the Ramesside kings of Dynasty XX (Miller 2004, 58, citing personal communications with S. Orel, 1994 and 2001; see also Rose 2003, 23). It would, however, exclude earlier New Kingdom dates, and thus making the widely repeated claim that this is the mummy of Ramesses I particularly unlikely.<sup>2</sup>

---

\* The author would like to express his gratitude to Marleen De Meyer, Aidan Dodson, Aayko Eyma, and Gayle Gibson for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper.

1. With the assistance of James Douglas Jr. of Québec, this mummy was originally purchased by Colonel Sydney Barnett—the son of Thomas Barnett, the founder of the Niagara Falls Museum—in Thebes by 1860. (The exact date is unknown; for discussion see Rose 2003, 21.) It remained in the museum's collection until 1999, when it was purchased by the Michael C. Carlos Museum, at Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia. After extensive study and conservation, the mummy was ultimately returned to Egypt in October 2003, and is now located in the Luxor Museum. The mummy has widely been identified in the media and popular press as being that of Ramesses I (first suggested by Arne Eggebrecht [Lacovara, D'Auria, and O'Gorman 2001, 26]), predominantly due to the crossed arms (right over left) typical of New Kingdom royal mummies, as well as a physical resemblance to known Dynasty XIX mummies. However, this identification is by no means a secure one (Rose 2003, *passim*).
2. A tentative identification with Haremheb, mooted as a possibility by S. Ikram (Rose 2003, 26), would therefore be even less likely.

Given this radiocarbon determination and the fact that the mummy is almost certainly a royal personage—due the position of its arms being crossed high up on the chest, the high quality of the mummification technique, as well as indications that the mummy once wore gold toe stalls (Lacovara, D’Auria, and O’Gorman 2001, 26; Rose 2003, 23)—Miller suggests it may be that of Shoshenq I. This conclusion is based on a number of lines of reasoning. The OxCal 3.8 calibration graph (Miller 2004, 56, 58) has a sharp spike *ca.* 970–960 BCE, which is broadly inline with the generally accepted date of *ca.* 924 BCE for the death of Shoshenq I (Kitchen [1996], §260). As support, Miller (2004, 58) cites a heart scarab, two canopic jar fragments, and “heirloom gold jewellery,” all supposedly belonging to Shoshenq I, which were discovered by Montet in the royal necropolis at Tanis (Montet 1951, 44–45; 1960, 76). Because no burial place of Shoshenq I is known at Tanis, on the basis of these items Montet (1960, 76, plate 49) had opined the king’s mummy may have temporarily rested in the tomb of Shoshenq III (Tanis Royal Tomb v), before being moved elsewhere. Basing himself on Montet’s conclusions, Miller (2004, 58–59) proposes the mummy of Shoshenq I was transported from this temporary Tanite burial to Thebes, where it formed part of the Dayr al-Baḥrī mummy *cachette* in Theban Tomb 320, and was ultimately looted from that burial place by the ‘Abd al-Rasūl brothers, sometime before 1860 when the mummy was purchased.

At first glance Miller’s thesis seems to provide the best synthesis of radiocarbon and historical evidence, but there are a number of quite serious objections that may be raised against it. One of the most critical is the crossed position of the mummy’s arms. As even Miller (2004, 57) notes, there is no documented mummy known to have fully crossed arms after the end of the New Kingdom (Ikram and Dodson 1998, 122; Rose 2003, 19). For example, the mummy of Pinudjem I (Dynasty XXI) does not have its arms crossed over the chest in the New Kingdom-fashion, but has the hands placed over the pubic area (Ikram and Dodson 1997, 51). Moreover, the mummification techniques employed point much more strongly to a Dynasty XIX date than early Dynasty XXII. In particular, linen bundles in the mummy’s chest, abdomen, and pelvis (Lacovara, D’Auria, and O’Gorman 2001, 26), as opposed to the full body stuffing typical of Third Intermediate Period mummies, point to an earlier date (Ikram and Dodson 1998, 118–128). The remaining scraps of original linen wrappings on the exterior of the mummy suggest a Dynasty XIX date to some researchers as well (S. Ikram, cited in Rose 2003, 23).

The material discovered by Montet, and cited by Miller as evidence for the removal of Shoshenq I’s burial from Tanis to Dayr al-Baḥrī, is likewise problematic. The “heirloom gold jewellery”<sup>3</sup> was found re-used in the burial of Shoshenq II, Shoshenq I’s grandson, and is not specifically funerary in nature. Its presence at Tanis is therefore unremarkable. One of the

canopic jar fragments discovered by Montet is inscribed with the name of a king Shoshenq<sup>4</sup> (Montet 1960, 76, plate 49b; Dodson 1994, 93–94, 178–179, text 50). However, it does not name *ḥd-ḥpr-rʿ stp-n-rʿ ššnq mry-ımn*, Ḥedj-kheper-Reʿ, Chosen of Reʿ, Shoshenq I, Beloved of Amun, but rather a Delta-based king of late Dynasty XXII, *ḥd-ḥpr-rʿ stp-n-rʿ ššnq mry-ımn s3 b3s.t.t ntr ḥq3-ıwnw*, Ḥedj-kheper-Reʿ, Chosen of Reʿ, Shoshenq “quartus,”<sup>5</sup> Beloved of Amun, Son of Bastet, God, Ruler of Thebes (for whom see Rohl 1989/1990, 66–67; Dodson 1993; Dodson 1994, 93–94; Kitchen [1996], §Y; Kitchen 2001, 3–5).

The heart scarab is a bit more problematic. Montet (1960, 76) states it was discovered with the canopic fragments in Tanis Royal Tomb v, but that it was subsequently stolen before he could examine it in detail. (There is no photograph or illustration of the piece, nor any copy of the actual text, in his publication.) Despite this, Montet felt confident enough to write “j’avais cependant déjà reconnu sur le plat du scarabée le chapitre xxxv du Livre des Morts et le nom de l’Osiris-roi Hedjkheperre-Sotepenre.”

Based on Montet’s sketchy information, later writers<sup>6</sup> (including Miller) have quite naturally assigned the scarab to Shoshenq I and used it as evidence for the king’s burial at Tanis, if only in a secondary burial in Tanis Royal Tomb v. However, Yoyotte (1988, 47, note 11) signals the scarab undoubtedly entered the collection of the Brooklyn Museum of Art (BMA 61.10) in 1961 (the year following the publication of Montet 1960). The Brooklyn heart scarab does in fact bear Utterance 30B of the *Book of the Dead*, as Montet notes, but has the name of Usermaʿet-Reʿ, Chosen of Reʿ, Shoshenq, Beloved of Amun, Son of Bastet; that is, Shoshenq III, in whose tomb the scarab was discovered.<sup>7</sup> Further, according to von Bothmer (in a letter cited by Yoyotte [1988, 47, note 11]), Montet probably personally never saw the scarab. Based on this, the heart scarab cannot in any way provide evidence for a Tanite burial of Shoshenq I.

3. This jewellery consists of two gold arm bands (Cairo JE 72184 A & B) inscribed with the cartouches of Shoshenq I (Montet 1951, 45/226 and 227, plate 29; Association française d’Action artistique 1987, 264–265/97; Bongioanni, Sole, and Accomazzo 2001, 421), and an openwork gold pectoral (Cairo JE 72171) naming Shoshenq as “Great Chief of the Me(šhwesh), Chief of Chiefs” (Montet 1951, 43–44, figure 13, plate 28; Bongioanni, Sole, and Accomazzo 2001, 418–419)

4. The second fragment belongs to the same set of canopic jars, but the royal name is now lost.

5. *Apud* Schneider 1994, 393; the numbering of this king by some authors as “Shoshenq IV” (with the previously known king of that designation being renumbered as “Shoshenq VI” [Kitchen [1996], §Y]) is particularly confusing.

6. Such as Jacquet-Gordon 1975, 259; Dodson 1988, 229; Kitchen [1996], §93, note 167, §451.

7. The reading of the name as being that of Shoshenq III is confirmed by Richard Fazzini (letter to Troy Sagrillo, 20 September 2002).

Thus it is evident that there is, in fact, absolutely no material whatsoever that can be directly and conclusively associated with Shoshenq I from Tanis Royal Tomb v. Indeed, there is at this time no known evidence for associating the king's burial anywhere at Tanis. The only funerary item known that can be firmly connected with Shoshenq I at all is a canopic chest donated to the Ägyptisches Museum Berlin (ÄMB 11000) in 1891 by Julius Isaac, unfortunately without further documentation (Dodson 1994, 83–84; Ikram and Dodson 1998, 289–290, figure 431; Lull García 2002, 36, figure 10). It is generally presumed to have come from Tanis, but this is based primarily on the assumption that Shoshenq I was interred there. In actuality there is no evidence for either assumption, though the chest itself perhaps did come from the Delta region.

As stated above, Miller (2004, 58–59) has opined that the mummy of Shoshenq I was moved from Tanis at some later date to Theban Tomb 320 where it was part of the Dayr al-Bahrī mummy *cachette*. While the notion of a Tanite burial is not currently supportable,<sup>8</sup> a Theban burial of Shoshenq I in TT320 is likewise itself highly unlikely; these are, however, two separate issues. The latest known dated burial in TT320 is that of Djed-Ptah-*iw-ef-ankh* A (CG 61097), which bears at least one linen band dated to Year 10 of Shoshenq I (Maspero 1889, 573; Gauthier 1914, 308/6–7).<sup>9</sup> There is no indication that any burial occurred much later than that, nor is there any reasonable evidence that the body of the king himself was interred in the tomb. Miller's suggestion (2004, 59) that the Berlin canopic chest of Shoshenq I may have come from TT320 and was pillaged from it by the 'Abd al-Rasūls is unsubstantiated. With the exception of this chest, no other item of a funerary nature that might be connected to Shoshenq I is known from anywhere in Egypt. A king who ruled as long and effectively as Shoshenq I, particularly given his extensive building programme and military activities, would have certainly been lavishly furnished with many rich mortuary goods in a proper tomb, as even the minor burials in the Tanite royal necropolis attest. This indicates strongly that the burial of Shoshenq I remains yet to be discovered.<sup>10</sup>

---

8. It should likewise be noted that the mummy examined by Miller was re-wrapped at a later period, apparently during Dynasty XXI (Rose 2003, 23). It seems unlikely the mummy of Shoshenq I would have been re-wrapped (and certainly not in Dynasty XXI!) if it had been interred directly in TT320, without a previous burial elsewhere.

9. There is a second linen band from the same mummy that may possibly be dated to Year 11 of Shoshenq I (Maspero 1889, 573; Gauthier 1914, 309/8), but this is potentially a typesetting fault for "Year 10" on the part of Maspero; for discussion, see Sagrillo 2005 [*forthcoming*].

10. For further discussion, see Sagrillo 2005 [*forthcoming*].

What is similarly lacking is a firm motivation for Shoshenq I to have been buried in the Theban region in the first place. The New Kingdom royal mummies discovered in TT320 were re-interred therein for security reasons, their own tombs having likely been plundered by tomb robbers (officially or not<sup>11</sup>) long previous. However, after Dynasty XX the royal necropolis in the Valley of the Kings was no longer being actively utilised for royal burials.<sup>12</sup> By Dynasty XXI, as well as in most later dynasties (with the major exceptions of the Nubian and Persian dynasties), royal burials were made in a dynastic necropolis situated within the *temenos* of the main temple in the governing city (Lull García 2002, 246, 251) in order that they might be directly monitored by temple personnel.<sup>13</sup> There is no indication that Shoshenq I, or one of his descendents, revived the New Kingdom style of royal burial in the Theban region.

The question then remains where the burial of Shoshenq I may have been located. It has generally been assumed that the king was buried at Tanis, perhaps in an undiscovered second royal necropolis (Dodson 1988, 229; Dodson 2004, 88–89). However, given that Shoshenq's residence was located elsewhere at “Per Iset, the Great *ka* of Re<sup>c</sup>-Ḥarakhty,”<sup>14</sup> and that there are only a bare handful of inscribed blocks from Tanis which may possibly name the king (and none of these come from an *in situ* building complex contemporary with his reign), it is unlikely that he ruled from, or was buried at, Tanis. It could be that Shoshenq I was buried in a temple courtyard at his residence of “Per Iset, the Great *ka* of Re<sup>c</sup>-Ḥarakhty,” but unfortunately, as the exact location of this establishment is yet unknown, there is no way to verify this notion.

One location that has not heretofore been considered for the place of Shoshenq's burial is the Ptaḥ temple enclosure of Memphis. It is recognised that Shoshenq I built fairly widely in the area, undoubtedly including a pylon and forecourt at the Ptaḥ temple (Kitchen 1988,

- 
11. For the suggestion that the Egyptian state may have itself been responsible for opening the tombs as part of an official policy, see Hornung 1990, 47; Reeves 1990, 273–278; Jansen-Winkel 1995.
  12. The mummy and coffin of “king” Pinudjem I in TT320 have indications that they were originally buried elsewhere in the Theban region (Reeves 1990, 255). As a First God's Servant of Amun, Pinudjem was, however, politically active in the Theban region, making his previous burial somewhere else in the area not completely unexpected.
  13. The use of tombs for multiple—primarily family—burials may additionally be indicative of differing funerary beliefs among the ethnically Libyan rulers (Leahy 1985, 61; Gosline 1995; Lull García 2002, 246, 252).
  14. Mentioned in Ġabal al-Silsilah Quarry Stela 100 (Caminos 1952, plate 13:40). It likely is to be specifically associated with the old Ramesside residence of “Per Ramesses, Beloved of Amen, *life, prosperity, health!*, the Great *ka* of Pa-Re<sup>c</sup>-Ḥarakhty” (Gardiner 1918, 136–137) at Qantīr. For discussion regarding this identification of Shoshenq I's residence, see Caminos 1952, 55/40; Redford 1986, 307–308; Kitchen [1996], §259, note 314; Sagrillo 2005 [*forthcoming*]).

149–150; Sagrillo 2005 [*forthcoming*]). It is, therefore, not completely improbable that he likewise built his tomb in the region. The funerary cult surrounding his “House of Millions of Years of Shoshenq, Beloved of Amun”<sup>15</sup> was functioning several generations after its establishment at the temple (Ibrahim Aly Sayed 1996, 14). The “House of Millions of Years of Shoshenq, Beloved of Amun” was probably the forecourt and pylon of the Ptaḥ temple, which, if the royal necropoleis at Tanis, Saïs, and Mendes are taken as a models, could very well have contained a royal burial within it or the *temenos*. If the burial place of Shoshenq I was located at Memphis, it would go far in explaining why the king’s funerary cult lasted for some time at the site after his death.<sup>16</sup> Similarly, had the king’s body been removed for some inexplicable reason and reburied in TT320 (almost immediately after his death as there is no evidence the *cachette* was re-opened until it was plundered in the nineteenth century), it seems unlikely that his funerary cult would have been maintained for so long at Memphis.

Based on this analysis, it is difficult to support any suggestion that Shoshenq I was ever interred in the Theban region whence the Niagara royal mummy originated. It is, therefore, highly improbable that the mummy is that of Shoshenq I, despite the radiocarbon date. The method of mummification utilised points directly to the New Kingdom, particularly the Ramesside Period. If the calibrated radiocarbon date *truly* rules out an identification with Ramesses I,<sup>17</sup> it bears repeating—as Miller (2004, 58, 60, citing S. Orel) notes—that the locations of the mummies of several Ramesside kings are currently unknown, including Ramesses VII, VIII, and X.<sup>18</sup> Given that the linen packing in the body cavity suggests a Dynasty XIX date (Rose 2003, 23), one of the sons of Ramesses II could perhaps be suggested, but there is no evidence to support the notion that the princes would have been mummified in the style of a king. Regardless, unless other evidence is forthcoming from the mummy itself, it currently is best to rule out Shoshenq I as a plausible candidate.

---

15. Mentioned on a stela (Şaqqārah Magazine 4:1847) discovered on the wall immediately opposite the entrance to the Lesser Vaults of the Serapeum (Ibrahim Aly Sayed 1996, 8, line 10). The “House of Millions of Years for the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ḥedj-kheper-Re’, Chosen of Re’, Son of Re’, Shoshenq, Beloved of Amun, that is at Ḥut-ka-Ptaḥ” (*ḥw.t n.t ḥḥ.w rnp.wt n.t nsu bity ḥd-ḥpr-r’ stp-n-r’ s3 r’ ššnq mri-imn n.ty m ḥw.t-k3-ptḥ*) is also mentioned in an oracular decree from the peristyle court north of the Sixth Pylon of the Great Temple of Amun at al-Karnak (Vernus 1975, 13, lines 5–6, 8). On this institution, see Ullmann 2002, 564–570; Sagrillo 2005 [*forthcoming*].

16. For further discussion, see Sagrillo 2005 [*forthcoming*].

17. It must be remembered that radiocarbon determinations are statistical probabilities and not fixed dates.

18. See also the comments of A. Dodson cited in Rose 2003, 23, who favours Ramesses VII if Ramesses I is to be excluded.



References Cited<sup>19</sup>

- Association française d'Action artistique  
1987 *Tanis: L'Or des pharaons*. [Paris]: Ministère des Affaires Étrangères and Association française d'Action artistique.
- Bongioanni, Alessandro, Croce Maria Sole, and Laura Accomazzo, eds  
2001 *The Illustrated Guide to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.
- Caminos, Ricardo Augusto  
1952 "Gebel el-Silsilah No. 100." *JEA* 38:46–61.
- Dodson, Aidan Mark  
1988 "Some Notes Concerning the Royal Tombs at Tanis." *ChronEg* 63:221–233.  
1993 "A New King Shoshenq Confirmed?" *GöttMisz* 137:53–58.  
1994 *The Canopic Equipment of the Kings of Egypt*. Studies in Egyptology, ser. ed. Alan Brian Lloyd. London: Kegan Paul International.  
2004 "Lull, J.—*Las tumbas reales egipcias del Tercer Periodo Intermedio (dinastías XXI–XXV)*, BAR International Series 1045. Archaeopress, Oxford, 2002." *BiOr* 61:88–91.
- Gardiner, Alan Henderson  
1918 "The Delta Residence of the Ramesides." *JEA* 5:127–138, 179–200, 242–271.
- Gauthier, Henri  
1914 *Le livre des rois d'Égypte: Recueil de titres et protocoles royaux, noms propres de rois, reines, princes, princesses et parents de rois*. Volume 3: *De la XIX<sup>e</sup> à la XXIV<sup>e</sup> dynastie*. Vol. 3 of 5 vols. MIFAO 19. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire.
- Gosline, Sheldon Lee  
1995 "Libyan Period Royal Burials in Context." *LibStud* 26:1–20.
- Hornung, Erik  
1990 *The Valley of the Kings: Horizon of Eternity*. Translated by David Warburton. New York: Timken Publishers, inc.
- Ibrahim Aly Sayed, Mohamad  
1996 "Une stèle inédite du Sérapéum mentionnant le nom de Sheshonq I<sup>er</sup>." *BSEG* 20:5–16.
- Ikram, Salima, and Aidan Mark Dodson  
1997 *Royal Mummies in the Egyptian Museum*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.  
1998 *The Mummy in Ancient Egypt: Equipping the Dead for Eternity*. London and New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Jacquet-Gordon, Helen  
1975 "K. A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)*." *BiOr* 32:358–360.
- Jansen-Winkeln, Karl  
1995 "Die Plünderung der Königsgräber des Neuen Reiches." *ZÄS* 122:62–78.
- Kitchen, Kenneth Anderson  
1988 "A Note on Asychis". In *Pyramid Studies and Other Essays Presented to I. E. S. Edwards*, edited by John R. Baines, Thomas Garnet Henry James, M. Anthony Leahy, and A. F. Shore. Occasional Publications 7. London: The Egypt Exploration Society. 148–151.  
[1996] *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 BC)*. 3rd ed. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Limited.  
2001 "The Shoshenqs of Egypt and Palestine." *JSOT* 93:3–12.

19. The abbreviations utilised here follow Bernard Mathieu. 1999. *Abréviations des périodiques et collections en usage à l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale*. 3rd ed. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire. They are also given on the IFAO's website at <http://www.ifao.egnet.net/> (current as of October 2004).

- Lacovara, Peter, Sue H. D'Auria, and Thérèse O'Gorman  
2001 "New Life for the Dead: Atlanta's Emory University Unveils a Unique Collection of Egyptian Mummies and Decorated Coffins." *Archaeology* 54/5 (September/October):22–27.
- Leahy, M. Anthony  
1985 "The Libyan Period in Egypt: An Essay in Interpretation." *LibStud* 16:51–65.
- Lull García, José  
2002 *Las tumbas reales egipcias del Tercer Período Intermedio (dinastías XXI–XXV): Tradición y cambios*. BAR-IS 1045. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Maspero, Gaston Camille Charles  
1889 "Les momies royales de Déir el-Bahari." In *MMAF*. Vol. 1 (fascicle 4). Paris: Ernest Leroux, éditeur. 511–788.
- Miller, R. L.  
2004 "A Radiocarbon Dated Theban Royal Mummy from Niagara Falls." *GöttMisz* 198:55–62.
- Montet, Jean Pierre Marie  
1951 *La nécropole royale de Tanis*. Volume 2: *Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis*. Fouilles de Tanis, ser. ed. Jean Pierre Marie Montet. Paris: [n. p.].  
1960 *La nécropole royale de Tanis*. Volume 3: *Les constructions et le tombeau de Chechanq III à Tanis*. Fouilles de Tanis, ser. ed. Jean Pierre Marie Montet. Paris: [n. p.].
- Redford, Donald Bruce  
1986 *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*. Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities Publications 4, ser. ed. Loretta M. James. Mississauga: Benben Publications.
- Reeves, Carl Nicholas  
1990 *Valley of the Kings: The Decline of a Royal Necropolis*. Studies in Egyptology. London and New York: Kegan Paul International.
- Rohl, David M.  
1989/1990 "The Early Third Intermediate Period: Some Chronological Considerations." *JACF* 3:45–70.
- Rose, Mark  
2003 "Mystery Mummy: A Royal Body May be That of Rameses I, But Can We Ever be Sure?" *Archaeology* 56/2 (March/April):18–25.
- Sagrillo, Troy Leiland  
2005 *The Reign of Shoshenq I of the Egyptian Twenty-Second Dynasty*. Doctoral dissertation; Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Departement Oosterse en Slavische Studies (Het Oude Nabije Oosten).
- Schneider, Hans Diederik  
1994 *Lexikon der Pharaonen: Die altägyptischen Könige von der Frühzeit bis der Römerherrschaft*. 2nd ed. Zürich: Artemis & Winkler Verlag, (Reprinted München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1996).
- Ullmann, Martina  
2002 *König für die Ewigkeit; Die Häuser der Millionen von Jahren: Eine Untersuchung zu Königskult und Tempeltypologie in Ägypten*. *ÄAT* 51, ser. ed. Manfred Görg. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Vernus, Pascal  
1975 "Inscriptions de la Troisième Période Intermédiaire: I. Les inscriptions de la cour péristyle nord du VI<sup>e</sup> pylône dans le temple de Karnak." *BIFAO* 75:1–66.
- Yoyotte, Jean  
1988 "À propos de Psousennes II." *BSFFT* 1:41–49.