

**The It Neter or father of the god: A case study of cultural dislocation and (re)location in Kemet. Part II: The temple, Ay and Joseph<sup>7</sup>**

**KIMANI S. K. NEHUSI, Ph.D.**  
Temple University

**Abstract**

This paper presents the second part of a study of the *It Neter* or ‘father of the god,’ a key office in Kemet, ancient Egypt. It combines approaches from history, sociolinguistics, and cultural analysis to interrogate some of the available information. The results demonstrate that the Eurocentric perspective currently predominant in Egyptology has proven to be very inadequate in scholars’ attempts to understand this office. Here, the limitations of Egyptology arise from a failure to understand the concept of ‘father’ that is alive in the term. This is not a European father in a nuclear family based on blood alone, with a narrow and rigid set of roles. Insistence upon this erroneous view has prevented Eurocentric scholars from recognizing a non-blood or social father that is part of Afrikan tradition. In this culture, the concept of father is not confined to an immediate biological ancestor. *It Neter* describes a set of roles that is larger than what is usually obtained in the European model of the father, and which may be grouped under the title Vizier in ancient Egyptian, and prime minister or mentor in today’s terminology. Afrocentric methodology illuminates the concept of ‘father of the god’ by relocating it within the history and culture of Afrika to which it has always properly belonged. This is the only approach that makes sense, or full sense, of the available information.

**Keywords:** *It Neter* or ‘father of the god,’ father, Africology, Afrikan culture, Egyptology, Eurocentrism, the temple, Ay, Joseph.

---

<sup>7</sup>An early synopsis of the entire study was published as “The *It Netjer* or father of the god in Kemet.” *Revista de la Sociedad Uruguaya de Egiptología (R.S.U.E n°30, 2013)*. Sociedad Uruguaya de Egiptología, Montevideo. Part I of the full study, is entitled “The *It Neter* or father of the god: A case study of cultural dislocation and (re)location in Kemet. Part I: The royal court, miscellaneous examples, and Senenmut.”

## Introduction

A very significant factor in the conception, birth and evolution of Egyptology has been Europe's project to colonize other parts of the world. Intellectual violence was invariably an accomplice in the military violence that was usually Europe's entry into other peoples' lands and lives. (Nehusi, 2019; Elkins, 2022; Elkins, 2005; Tharoor, 2016; Hochschild, 1998). It is not at all co-incidental that when Alexander conquered Egypt, he had Aristotle with him, and that the latter obtained much of the work later accredited to him from Afrikans in Kemet (James, 1985, 1-2; 14, 17-19, 45-53, etc), or that this symbiotic relationship between European military violence and European intellectual violence was mirrored, on a grander scale, when Napoleon embarked upon the military conquest of Egypt. His army of soldiers and sailors was 'accompanied by a corps of (French) scholars' (Barb, 1988, 141; See also Assmann, 1999, 143). British and French colonialism was a determining factor in the birth of Egyptology. The new area of academic engagement did not escape its nefarious origins. European colonial attitudes were imposed upon the information about ancient Egypt and upon the interpretation of that information (Nehusi, 2011; Asante & Mazama, 2002). Egypt has not been exempted from the widespread looting of artifacts from plundered lands by western Europeans. A few items have been returned recently, but there is a continued refusal to return most of them to their rightful owners around the colonized world (Hicks, 2020; Brown, 2021; Hickey, 2021). The entire western European project has been summed up by Molefi Asante and Ama Mazama: "Along with the European physical and political incursions into the realms of others went intellectual colonization to the degree that information was structured to support European hegemony." (Asante & Mazama 2002, 1). Eurocentrism, which is the attempt of Europeans to universalize their values, standards and views, is the systemization of perception, thought, action and reality that has resulted from this hierarchical, racist, sexist and otherwise decadent vision of humanity.

One consequence of this origin has been Egyptology's attempt to appropriate the identity of ancient Egypt and a corresponding silence upon, obfuscation and often outright denial of the Afrikan origins and identity of its subject for most of the very long history of that country (Diop, 1974; Browder, 1992; Asante, 2002; Keita, 2022). Many Egyptologists approach their subject from the unproved (and unprovable) assumption that the facts they examine belong to European culture. The figure known as the  *It Neter* or father of the god provides an illuminating case study. This paper adopts an Afrocentric approach to the study of instances of language and ideology, as well as one important location of this office and two personages, one semi-historical and the other historical, who performed its roles. Interrogation of this figure from these vantage locations shows that Egyptology has so far failed to provide it with an adequate analysis and explanation. It argues that this is because the facts do not fit into a European cultural paradigm, and it demonstrates that those facts cannot fit into such a paradigm. It also shows, on the other hand, that it is only by returning those facts to the Afrikan cultural and historical context, of which Kemet, Ancient Egypt, is a distinctive aspect, that scholarship can make sense, or full sense, of the information about this important figure in the ancient Egyptian state and society.

Part I of this study demonstrated these conclusions by studying some important linguistic issues relating to this office, the operationalization of the office itself in its most important location of the royal court, some miscellaneous examples in its evolution and development, and the partial biography of Senenmut, an important official who discharged the functions of the office. Here, Part II focuses attention on some significant aspects of language, on how the office functioned in the temple, which was without doubt its second most important location, and on the relevant information concerning Ay and Joseph, one historical figure and one semi-historical figure, who are rendered significant for our purpose because they were occupants of this office.

## Language

It is entirely appropriate to recall here that a people's language is a record of and a witness to that language community's perception of reality (cosmology, cosmogony, philosophy, epistemology, ontology) and their progress through space and time. The people of Kemet themselves sometimes made distinctions between biological definitions of persons and their socially defined roles and personages. In the *Medew Neter*, there is a clear distinction between *s' n ht.f*, literally 'son of his body' or a biological son, and *s' n ib.f*, literally 'son of his heart,' a social son. There are records of *s't nsw n tht.f*: 'king's daughter of his body.' The records also preserve a distinction between a biological and a spiritual mother (Naguib, 1998, 443). It is a formulation that clearly calls into existence a construction that represents a biological mother. This is almost tautological. Other obvious examples exist in the sons in the Sebayat<sup>8</sup> and the son in son of Ra, a royal title that was ubiquitous after the 12th dynasty.

More research is needed on this aspect of language and the social environment of Kemet; however, it seems instructive that the Egyptians used these corresponding terms interchangeably. In the case of Ay, examined below, terms for biological and non-biological son carry the same social and legal weight. Perhaps it is a distinction only of origin, not one of function and meaning. When placed in its true cultural context, the semantic domain is clarified. There are numerous examples.

The father of the god falls into and is indeed totally consistent with this pattern. Further, as we shall shortly see again, there can be no doubt about the real meaning of a socially constructed father in these powerful examples examined here, irrespective of whether he is built upon a base of blood relations, or friendship or some other occasion that stands at the beginning of the relationship.

### **Amenhotep III: Afrikan fatherhood and Eurocentric arrogance**

A very interesting example of the use of the term *It*: 'father' to mean ideological/political father is found in an inscription on a red granite lion from the temple of Soleb in Egypt. Here the term is deployed to describe the relationship between Amenhotep III and Tutankhamon. A biological relationship is rendered impossible by the advanced ages of both Amenhotep and Queen Tiy, the would-be parents if it was indeed a blood relationship that this usage described. It seems certain that the term in this context could refer only to Tut's return to, and continuation of, specific characteristics of Amenhotep's ideological project after the disruption represented by Akhenaton's own unique departures from fundamental ideological norms. It is largely this sense of difference arising out of breaching the ideological norms and therefore not belonging to the ideological family in the consequent political project of managing the nation's affairs, which has caused some pharaohs to be excluded from some of the 'king lists.' These lists are based not only or at all on blood relations but on membership of this ideological project.

Peter Clayton's view that the term *It Neter* "was used very loosely" to describe Tut's relationship to Amenhotep (Clayton, 1994, 130), cannot therefore be sustained by the evidence. The ancient Egyptians were much too aware of meaning and much too precise in their diction to consistently apply this term "loosely" in this and similar contexts. Such consistency in usage by the ancient Egyptians do not amount to any defect in these contemporary expert witnesses' understanding and practice of their own language. In fact, it demonstrates a meaning that is quite different from the one Clayton appears to insist upon, and an ideological standpoint that

---

<sup>8</sup> 'Written teachings' or 'Instructions' (Gardiner, 1988, 588, 616,626) in which a much-accomplished person, usually a vizier, passes on the wisdom he has acquired in public service. The recipients are his 'sons', usually relatively inexperienced successors. See 'Within the royal court' in Part I for explanation.

very clearly leads this important scholar into a regrettable disregard of the cultural context of his concern and the agency of the human actors he contradicts.

The bias of some Egyptologists has prevented them from observing the ancient Egyptians through the latter's own cultural lens and delayed the full and proper understanding of this society. The impatience of another scholar with cultural difference, or perhaps a failure to recognize that difference, is evident even when the scholar in question recognized the confusion that reigned in early Egyptology over the meanings of these terms:

The paucity of Egyptian kinship terminology (father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter being the only terms used), and the tendency to apply these terms rather loosely so that 'sister' could be used to describe a sibling, a wife or a lover, confused many early Egyptologists." (Tyldesley 2006, 17).

The strange notion that the ancient Egyptian scribes, after years of rigorous training, were consistently "loose" in writing their own language is therefore not limited to the example of Peter Clayton. Such a conclusion is much the same as insisting that English professors consistently misuse some key term in their own language, with the implication that they do not really know and understand the meaning of the particular term, but that some other person, an observer from a different culture and a different age, does. The fact that there is unanimous and consistent agreement among indigenous authorities of Kemet upon a specific usage, ought to warn any observer that such experts knew and understood exactly what they intended to convey. The disagreement of Clayton and Tyldesley with ancient Egyptian authorities appears to suggest more about the mindset of some modern observers than about the alleged or implied linguistic incompetence — in their own language and field of specialization — of these ancient Afrikan people of outstanding achievement in numerous fields.

The casual disregard of ancient Afrikan authorities by these two scholars is a manifestation of the Eurocentrism that is referred to above, in the Introduction to this paper. The result of such action, especially because they belong to a syndrome that is both widespread and systematized, is the reduction or erasure of the agency of Afrikan people. Michael Tillotson defines such threats to the well-being of Afrikan American people as Agency Reduction Formations (ARF), but the threat is to Afrikan people everywhere. Tillotson defines ARF as "Any system of thought that distracts, neutralizes, or reduces the need and desire for assertive collective agency by African Americans." (Tillotson, 2011, 60). The challenge of western European colonial values and colonial attitudes did not disappear with the removal of western European physical control over colonized lands and people.

The error of these two scholars illustrates a general failure of Eurocentric scholarship to locate Afrikan phenomena within the historical and cultural contexts of Afrika. The same mindset and the same result are repeatedly demonstrated in Egyptology's attempts to understand the figure of the father of the god.

### **Inside the temple**

Apart from the royal court studied in Part I, another distinctly different location in which these same roles evolved under the same title was the temple. Davies defines and elaborates this example of the office as "a class of the priesthood; here the term 'God' refers to the living King on whose behalf the priests act out their divine functions. The priest's relationship with his sovereign is usually based on a close filial union." (Davies, 1994, 96, note 164). It is difficult to see how, in a real-life context that seems to be implied here, "a close filial union" was simultaneously attainable between the king and each of this relatively large number of priests who operated in widely different geographical locations throughout the land. As shown below, it

seems necessary to conclude that this was a mentoring service provided by the priests upon the demand or request by the pharaoh.

We are told that the title '*Vater der Götter*' (father of the gods), (Erman & Grapow, 1982 I, 141) and the singular '*Vater des Gottes*' (Erman & Grapow, 1982, 142) was the title of a class of priests, more precisely, the 'name of a class of elder priests' (Gardiner, 1988, 555). It is significant that Gardiner stipulates that these were elder priests. It is a reiteration of a point he made in his oft quoted article on this subject, which is that in the Middle and early New Kingdoms "only the very highest priests," that is, "any priest of sufficient age and standing for him to expect the Pharaoh to adopt a filial attitude towards him" could become a father of the god, remembering of course that the pharaoh was (at least in theory) the chief priest of each temple, that is, of Amun, of Baset, of Ptah, and so on (Gardiner, 1947 I, 51).

Gardiner's focus here upon age and standing is especially significant because of the role of elders in general, and fathers in particular, in the cultural milieu of Kemet. The idea of seniority based upon age and status is further emphasized as the basis of the hierarchical structure within this group of priests, for they were graded into first god's father, second god's father, third god's father, fourth god's father and so on, according to these criteria (Gardiner, 1947 I, 48-49). It is this context that clarifies a mentoring role to the pharaoh of the priests who were fathers of the god, though it would be inconceivable that younger priests within the temple were not also mentored by these fathers (of the god), because of the collectivist nature of ancient Egyptian society. Here the expanded meaning of fatherhood is deployed in the temple to indicate the roles of a particular set of priests who were older than their charges, who comprised the king (theoretically) in the first instance and most likely also the younger priests. Again, this fact of being elder is amplified and clarified once the concept of elder is located within the cultural context in which it occurred. An elder in Kemet carries influence, meanings and expectations of roles which include those of mentor to anyone who is younger and in need. It is the same in contemporary Afrika, including some communities in the Diaspora, for example among the Dagara (Somé, 1999, 121-138), Igbo (Ogbaa, 1992, 67-70), Yoruba (Karenga, 1999, 37, 43, 86, 97, 132, 133, 166), Akan (Wiredu, 1996, 67-68), Minianka in Mali (Diallo & Hall, 1989 25-26, 44-47) and in the generality of the Afrikan world (Golden, 2015, 398-399; Nobles, 2009, 236-238). In this specific instance of the temple the recipients of the father's attention are the pharaoh and quite possibly the younger priests.

A possible difficulty with the foregoing interpretation ought to be pointed out. How could elderly priests in each temple of the land simultaneously be "fathers," really mentors, to the pharaoh? It appears that this arrangement may have been one of availability upon demand, or purely theoretical, as in the idea of the pharaoh being the chief priest of each temple. Perhaps it constitutes evidence of the evolution of this aspect of the office, for at an early stage in the development of the institutions of Kemet, it is conceivable that a senior priest of the leading temple acted as father to the pharaoh, at least in spiritual matters, including pharaoh's duties in this domain. Expansion of the pharaoh's office to cover the entire land necessitated a show of unity that in this case may have been fulfilled only by the theoretical arrangement pointed out above, as it was physically impossible for the pharaoh to be simultaneously in effective contact with all his (spiritual) fathers who were distributed over such a comparatively vast area. The ritual visitation of each pharaoh to temples in localities throughout the land, which occurred between the time of his assumption of power and the time of his actual coronation, confirms his theoretical headship of each temple. We must note that in both the *It Ntr* in the royal circle and the *It Ntr* in the temple, it is the identical idea of fatherhood that is represented. The sole difference is the location of the person who discharged this mentoring role, though for obvious reasons it would be expected that the priests' attention would have been more on spiritual matters.

There is another potential contradiction which ought to receive our attention here. This is, as Gardiner pointed out, “the paradox of one and the same person being at once the servant and the father of the god.” (Gardiner, 1947 I, 51-52). We can confirm Gardiner’s hypothesis, mentioned above, that the resolution lies in the recognition that the term father of the god in a temple meant a priest who had obtained sufficient age and status that the pharaoh could be a son to him and he a father to the pharaoh. This information clarifies this definition as being beyond age to that of only status, that is, despite age. This clarification also renders the interpretation that restricts this office to a junior priest (See Dodson & Hilton, 2010, 40) to be misleading. It must be said also that such a contradiction would have occurred only to someone viewing the information from a standpoint which does not recognize the extension of the role of father beyond blood ties. That is a Eurocentric standpoint. Again, it is this specific Afrikan cultural construction of fatherhood which resolves the apparent contradiction.

Egyptology sources tend to suggest different meanings to the title father of the god, depending upon the predominant role(s) of the office visible to the scholar observing specific manifestation(s) of the office in a particular location and point in time, most especially whether the post holder resided in the royal court or in the temple. The reality is that it does not matter much where the post was located or which of its aspects was visible to the observer. Each of these is an indicator of something greater than itself. The royal court was obviously much busier and an *It Neter* stationed there would be much closer to the god in question and so tended to generate more references. But conceptually it was really the same title with the same roles and same meaning. The official performed the same functions, and the pharaoh was always the recipient of this particular example of mentoring.

## Ay

The outline of the career of Senenmut was presented in Part I of this study. It was shown that his career started at a lower level in the state administration and that as he progressed toward the pinnacle he achieved in the office of father of the goddess, he acquired several titles that together illustrated his rise. Yet, as outstanding as Senenmut obviously was, the most striking example of this evolution to the very pinnacle of power in Kemet is of course Ay. He was of non-royal birth, became tutor to Akhenaton and Tutankhamon and eventually *It Neter* or father to Tutankhamon, before himself becoming Pharaoh by performing the rites of a son, including the Opening of the Mouth Ritual, at Tutankhamon’s funerary rituals. It was because he performed these rites of a son to Tut that Ay inherited Tut’s office of Pharaoh, for the performance of the rights of the son of Tut rendered him the son of Tut. Here it was plainly his social role that was decisive; it was not his biology, for Ay was not the biological son of Tut. That was quite impossible, since he was older (and by far) than Tut.

Ay’s career progression, like that of Senenmut, is outlined by his acquisition of titles. His *shenu* or cartouche is significant because of his incorporation of the non-royal title *It Neter*, his favorite among his titles, into his nomen. This, according to Schaden, was against the tradition of Kemet (Schaden 1977, 219-220). His cartouche reads , that is:  = father of the god’ +  = ‘Ay’. At one stage he referred to Tutankhamon as his son (Schaden, 1977, 77, 150, 185, 190), a fact which Schaden speculates was for ‘propaganda purposes’ (Schaden, 1977, 190).

This attribution is interesting for two reasons. First, Schaden appears to downplay or ignore the powerful influence of the role of son in Ay becoming pharaoh. Secondly, Schaden, regarding Ay, wrote that “it is likely that anyone chosen to fill a ‘fatherly’ position with regard to the young prince (i.e. Akhenaton) would be someone advanced in years, training and experience.” (Schaden 1977, 97). It seems that this scholar was unaware that he had thus outlined the indicators of eligibility for this office, for this is a virtual statement of the person’s specifications for the job of fathering that was based not on blood but on the ability to deliver a

quality mentoring service. In the eyes of the ancient Egyptians, it is an office that was best represented by a father's roles and therefore by the terminology in their language which best indicates that distinctive collection of roles. Here, the failure of Schaden is identical to that of Janssen and Janssen and some other scholars of Egyptology, as pointed out in Part I of this study. It is a failure to locate an Afrikan phenomenon within the Afrikan cultural context to which such phenomenon logically belongs. Once again, the logic and significance of Afrikology must be noted.

Ay's career progression is unusual in many respects. He was a commoner who became king. Before then he was a father of the god who became a god. His political trajectory inverted the more normal progression from god to father of the god, if and when the old pharaoh, or someone who acted as such, retreated from office in favor of pharaoh's biological son. This was normally through the institution of regency or co-regency. Its primary purpose was to secure an orderly transition of the office of pharaoh.

Ay is the only known example of a god's father who himself became a son to the god of whom he was previously the Father, before becoming a god himself. If this preceding sentence appears confusing, it is only because the kinship terms employed describe a reality that is viewed from the perspective of blood relations and not from the perspectives of the political and social roles such terms actually convey in the cultural context of Kemet. The same individual inhabited those socially constructed roles at different stages in his life and career. Here again, in each instance, it was not a biologically determined relationship but a socially constructed one that is conveyed by the terms "father" and "son." Here the social roles of both father and son are separated from their archetypical biological roots, although the terminology remains instructed by the latter.

Perhaps one should not leave the example of Ay without pointing out how the roles of father and son both invoked mutual rights and expectations for each party in the relationship and how these rights and expectations were socially understood and accepted throughout the society of Kemet. When Ay was Tut's father, he played the roles of chief advisor and mentor, and we must believe that Tut was responsive in the way he should have been — with respect, consideration and appreciation. When Ay became Tut's son later on, he also performed the role of son. This is partly visible in his performance at the funerary rituals for Tut. That was Ay's right and duty as Tut's son. Since a son must also inherit from his father, Ay inherited the kingship from Tut. It was the highest prize in the land. Such were the rules in Kemet. They were rigorously followed by both Tut and Ay.

This example of Ay also permits us to recognize how, certainly in these specific instances of the performance of the roles of father and son, the royalty in Kemet functioned on principles that were rooted in the culture of the general population. These rules were widespread among the people of Kemet but were perhaps modified to suit the purposes of the state, which was erected upon a concentration of military, economic and political power in the hands of the royal elite.

Many other kinship terms in Kemet privileged sociology over biology (Allen, 2009, 53-55; Allen, 1998), a convention that is shared with other Afrikan societies. Consider the example of Ahmose-Nefertari, who held the title daughter of the king during the reign of her biological son, Amenhotep I, (Troy 1986, 107; Tyldesley 1995, 198). Here we see notions of kinship in both their restricted or blood (biological) sense and the expanded or non-blood (sociological) sense. The notion of fatherhood indicated here is clearly that of her son the king in his role of father or leader of the nation. Because she was one of his subjects, a citizen of the nation he led, Ahmose-Nefertari was her blood son's daughter in this civic sense. This is not a relationship, far less terminology, that makes any sense from a European cultural standpoint. The only way in which this information makes any sense is when it is restored to the Afrikan cultural context to which

it always belonged. The paradox of the same person being simultaneously both servant and father of the same god, pointed out by Gardiner and discussed above, falls into the same category and could also be resolved only by relocation of the information into its natural and historical and cultural context of Afrika.

## Joseph

We may detain ourselves with one further example of the father of the god as a wise adviser or mentor to Pharaoh. The bible is a non-Egyptian source that is usually very hostile to ancient Egypt. Further, there is a multitude of very well-founded exposures of inaccuracies, anti-Afrikan racism and other objections to this document and traditional interpretations of it. Objections have arisen from within both Afrikology and the currently dominant western narrative (Assmann, 1997; Freud, 1990, 239-386), including extensive textual borrowings and other influences (Browder, 1992, 86-98; Ben-Jochannan, 1988; Greenburg, 1999) that are usually unacknowledged in the epistemology of the western world. The story of Joseph in the Bible occupies Genesis chapters 37-50 and has been the subject of much interest to scholars of Egyptology and aligned fields of inquiry. (Examples include Binder, 2011, 44-64; Zuhdi, 1997, 69-78 and Redford, 1992, 422-29). Redford has declared that there is no reason to believe in a factual basis of this story (1992, 29); however, a significant number of details in the text virtually assures the opposite.

The text deploys references to the term father in both its biological and its extended or non-biological or social meanings. At Genesis 37:26–28, 30-year-old Joseph, the Hebrew, is sold by his own blood brothers to the Ishmaelites or Midianites for 20 pieces of silver, to the grief of his blood father. He is taken to Egypt by the Ishmaelites. Genesis 37: 36 claims that Joseph was sold to Potiphar, the captain of pharaoh's guard. At Genesis 41:39–44 Joseph, through good luck and reputed wisdom, is made second in command over Egypt: Vizier to Pharaoh.

It is significant that Joseph was pharaoh's deputy or Vizier. This office was simultaneously occupied by a number of fathers of the god. In Joseph's own words, he had become "father to pharaoh" (Genesis 45:8). As noted by Zuhdi: "This is a faithful translation of the Egyptian *it ntr*: 'father of the god,'" though this scholar's characterization of the title as one "often accorded to trusted royal ministers" (Zuhdi, 1997, 73) is much too imprecise for what is now known. In fact, in the context of this story, "father to pharaoh" is an exact rendition of the ancient Egyptian term father of the god in terminology, in qualification (here Joseph's wisdom, even though he is comparatively young chronologically speaking), in roles (Mentor and Vizier) and in the recipient of the fatherly duties: the pharaoh.

Despite the substantial difficulties presented in accepting the Bible as an authentic source of history, the evidence suggests that aspects of the Joseph story seem to possess some historical validity. It appears that this is effectively an independent eyewitness attestation of the existence of the office, a verification of the standard terminology employed to describe it, and a verification of its roles. This is a testament by an outsider who, in unusual circumstances, became an appointee to the office and a participant in its roles. Joseph was an outsider who gained insider knowledge and experience of the office and its functioning. He may therefore be regarded as an expert eyewitness, a very knowledgeable participant observer in this matter.

## Conclusion

These examples repeatedly demonstrate the basic qualifications for the roles of the *It Neter*. These are the fundamental importance of age, with its assumptions of experience, knowledge and wisdom; the widely acknowledged duty of passing wisdom on to the next generation and the duty of inheritors (traditionally available in the practice of family in Kemet

and most publicly articulated in the role of father on the occasion of the *Sebayat*), as well as proximity to the royal circle, which implies trustworthiness. We see here also the roles of this official as tutor, adviser, guide, counselor, and motivator to the pharaoh. In the view of the western-dominated world, these are the basic qualifications of mentor and mentors. In the Afrikan world view, these roles are best described by the term father — whether or not this indicates a blood relationship. Even though blood was important as the primary basis or beginning of such a relationship, it was neither the only one nor the most important consideration. Rather, it was the quality of the relationship, which was itself reinforced by the mutually binding and widely understood rights and obligations implied by such an arrangement, articulated by this term, and operationalized in its practice. This is demonstrated above.

It is therefore of the greatest significance that within Egyptology this term father of the god is not normally interpreted even in the limited context of the Afrikan family. None of the scholars of Egyptology studied this office in the context of the family and/or the notion of fatherhood elaborated by the people of Kemet in the literature of Kemet, i. e., of themselves. Conversely, in Egyptology, none of the studies of the family mentioned this office or focused upon it or arrived at anything approaching a viable conclusion based upon the meanings conveyed by it. Eurocentric scholarship on the father of the god has therefore so far deprived the people of Kemet of cultural agency in their own affairs. Irrespective of whether or not this consequence is intentional, it contributes to the western European project of colonial domination over large sections of humanity and their spiritual and material inheritances and other possessions.

There can be no doubt that the term  always defined a relationship with the pharaoh that was close and therefore influential, at times even critical. This was the central fact of the office. The single factor that unites all these apparently disparate origins, roles and functions of the office described by the term is the concept and practice of fatherhood in its extended — that is, its non-biological or sociological meaning, which is Afrikan. This realization illustrates the great importance of locating phenomena on Kemet within Afrikan history and the Afrikan cultural universe.

The academic and intellectual investigation reflected in parts I and II of this study illustrates some of the weaknesses of Eurocentrism and demonstrates the correctness of Afrocentrism. It shows that unless the study of Afrikan phenomena is conducted from Afrocentric perspectives and center Afrikan people as knowing agents in their own stories and in their own history, culture and environment, the study of humanity (art and human sciences) will continue to be distorted because of the deep flaws in the dominant narrative about the very first humans and the very first civilizations: the very foundation of humanity.

## References

- Asante, M. (1987, 1998). *The Afrocentric Idea*. Temple University Press.
- Asante, M. & Ama M. (Es.) (2002). *Egypt vs. Greece and the American academy: the debate over the birth of civilization*. African American Images.
- Allen, T. (1998). *Ancient Egyptian kinship: An Afrocentric case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.
- Allen, T.. (2009). *The Ancient Egyptian Family: Kinship and Social Structure*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Assmann, J. (1997). *Moses the Egyptian: the memory of Egypt in western monotheism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barb, A. (1988). Mystery, Myth, and Magic. In Harris, J. (Eds.). *The Legacy of Egypt*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ben-Jochannan, Y., Oduyoye, M. & Finch, C. (1988). *The African origins of the major world religions*. Karnak House.
- Binder, S. (2011). Joseph's rewarding and investiture (Genesis 41: 41-43) and the gold of honour in New Kingdom Egypt" in Bar, S., Khan, D., and Shirley, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Egypt, Canaan and Israel: history, imperialism, ideology and literature*. Proceedings of a conference at the University of Haifa, 3-7 May, 2009. Brill.
- Browder, A. (1992). *Nile Valley contributions to civilization*. The Institute of Karmic Guidance.
- Brown, K. (2021). Western museums are finally reconsidering their African collections." *Art Net*. [news.artnet.com/art-world/benin-bronzes-roundtable](https://news.artnet.com/art-world/benin-bronzes-roundtable).
- Clayton, P. (1994). *Chronicle of the Pharaohs*. Thames and Hudson.
- Davies, B. (1994). *Egyptian historical records of the later eighteenth dynasty: Fascicle V*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, Ltd.
- Diallo, Y. & Hall, M. (1989). *The healing drum: African wisdom teachings*. Destiny Books.
- Diop, C.. (1974). *The African origin of civilization: myth or reality*. Lawrence Hill Books.
- Elkins, C. (2022). *Legacy of violence: A history of the British empire*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Elkins, C. (2005). *Britain's gulag: the brutal end of empire in Kenya*. Pimlico
- Erman, A. & Grapow, H. (1982). *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen sprache*. 5 Vols. Leisig, 1926-31, Reprinted Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Freud, S. (1990). Moses and monotheism. *The origins of religion: totem and taboo, moses and monotheism and other works*. Penguin Books.

- Gardiner, A. (1947). *Ancient Egyptian onomastica* Vol. I. Oxford University Press.
- Gardiner, A. (1988). *Egyptian grammar*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum.
- Golden, C. (2015). Role of elders. In Shujaa, M. & Shujaa, K. (Eds.) *The SAGE encyclopedia of African American heritage in North America*. SAGE.
- Greenberg, G. (1999). *101 myths of the Bible: how ancient scribes invented biblical history*. Carol Publishing Group.
- Hickley, C. (2021). Smithsonian museum of African art removes Benin bronzes from display and plans to repatriate them. <https://www.cnn.com/style/article/Smithsonian>.
- Hicks, D. (2020). *The brutish museums: the Benin bronzes, colonial violence and cultural restitution*. Pluto Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1998). *King Leopold's ghost: a story of greed, terror, and heroism in colonial Africa*. Pan Macmillan.
- Janssen, R.. and Janssen, J. (1990). *Growing up in ancient Egypt*. The Rubicon Press
- Janssen, R.. and Janssen, J. (1996). *Getting old in ancient Egypt*. The Rubicon Press.
- Karenga, M. (1999). *Odù Ifá: the ethical teachings*. University of Sankore Press.
- Keita, S.O.Y. (2022). Ideas about ‘race’ in Nile Valley histories: a consideration of ‘racial’ paradigms in recent presentations on Nile Valley Africa, from ‘black pharaohs’ to mummy genomes. *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections*. Vol. 35. September. EgyptianExpedition.org.
- Mazama, A. (Ed.) (2003). *The Afrocentric paradigm*. Africa World Press, Inc.
- Nehusi, K. (2019). Forty-seven years after: understanding and updating Walter Rodney. In Agozino, B. (Ed.) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa: A Tribute to Walter Rodney*. *Africa Update*. Vol. XXVI, Issue 3 [www2.ccsu.edu/africaupdate/?article=44](http://www2.ccsu.edu/africaupdate/?article=44)
- Newberry, P. (1932). King Ay, the successor of Tutankhamun” *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*. XVIII.
- Nobles, W. (2009) Elders. In Asante, M. & Mazama, A. (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of African Religion*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Ogbaa, K. (1992). *Gods, oracles and divination: folkways in Chinua Achebe’s novels*. Africa World Press Inc.
- Redford, D. (1992). *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in ancient times*. Princetown University Press.
- Schaden, O. (1977). The God’s Father Ay. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Minnesota.

Somé, M. (1999). *The healing wisdom of Africa: finding life purpose through nature, ritual, and community*. Jeremy P. Tracher/Putman.

Tharoor, S. (2016). *An era of darkness: the British Empire in India*. Aleph Book Co.

Tillotson, M. (2011). *Invisible Jim Crow: contemporary ideological threats to the internal security of African Americans*. Africa World Press.

Troy, L. (1986). *Patterns of queenship in ancient Egyptian myth and history*. Acta Universitatis Upaliensis.

Tyldesley, J. (1995). *Daughters of Isis: women of ancient Egypt*. London: Penguin.

Tyldesley, J. (2006). *Chronicle of the queens of Egypt: from early dynastic times to the death of Cleopatra*. Thames and Hudson.

Wiredu, K. (1996). *Cultural universals and particulars: an African perspective*. Indiana University Press.

Zuhdi, O. (1997). Joseph: The Career of an Egyptian Official. *KMT*. Vol. 7, No. 4.

**Kimani Nehusi** currently teaches in the Department of Afrikology at Temple University. His scholarship is distinguished by strong interests in the holistic study of the Afrikan world from ancient times to the future, the Caribbean and Guyana. His perspective is an Afrocentric one in which Afrikan phenomena are simultaneously accessible from approaches that are usually termed language and linguistics, history and culture through a robust research methodology.