



Birmingham Egyptology Journal

The High Priests of Amun at the End of the Twentieth Dynasty

Jennifer Palmer

Abstract

In 1992, Jansen-Winkel proposed that the traditional reconstruction of the succession of the High Priests of Amun at the end of the Twentieth Dynasty be reversed, arguing that Piankh preceded Herihor. Since its publication, this theory has received support, modification, and derision. This article takes the second line and proposes that, with some alterations, Jansen-Winkel's thesis is the most probable reconstruction of the succession. To argue this point, the article is divided into three sections. The first explores the nature of Herihor's kingship and provides an alternative to the low dates associated with him. The second section provides some historical context by accounting for the 'suppression' of the earlier High Priest Amenhotep and rejects the notion of a power struggle between Ramesses XI and the High Priests of Amun. It also elucidates the association between Piankh and the Viceroy of Kush Panehsy. The final section outlines the fragmentary genealogical information and argues that there is no remaining evidence that contradicts the theory that Herihor was Piankh's successor.

Introduction

One of the most divisive issues relating to the transition between the Twentieth and Twenty-first Dynasties is the sequence of the High Priests of Amun Herihor and Piankh. For many years, Piankh was considered a son of Herihor, and hence his successor, due to his apparent inclusion in a procession of Herihor's children carved upon a wall in the First Court of the Khonsu Temple.¹ This is now known not to be the case.² Piankh was, therefore, *not* a son of Herihor, as one would have expected him to have been depicted in the procession of Herihor's children even if he was not physically present when the scene was carved.³ This

¹ Epigraphic Survey 1979: pl. 26.

² The original mistake was due to an error in copying the original relief. Wentz (1979: x-xi) restores the name Ankh-ef, an abbreviated form of Ankhefenmut, the Fourth Priest of Amun, who was depicted in a procession in a neighbouring scene (Epigraphic Survey 1979: pl. 44).

³ Kitchen 1986: 536, 539.

has removed a key reason for chronologically placing Piankh after Herihor but it does not preclude the possibility that he did succeed Herihor as High Priest.⁴ In recent years some scholars, most notably Jansen-Winkel, have argued that Piankh served as High Priest *before* Herihor, which has led to many re-appraisals of the evidence as well as to fierce debate. Here, I argue that the reversal of the traditional succession model is consistent with the remaining evidence.

The first section of this article introduces Herihor and discusses the instigation of a new system of dating that appeared in Thebes in year 19 of the reign of Ramesses XI. This era was called the *wḥm-msw.t* ('the-Repeating-of-Births'), commonly referred to as the 'Renaissance'.⁵ This era ran concurrently with that of Ramesses XI for at least ten years; there is no evidence that it lasted beyond Ramesses XI's reign, whose death would have provided the era with a natural ending.⁶ Herihor has been frequently linked with the beginning of this period and some have argued that he was responsible for its instigation, despite the fact that there are no sources conclusively linking him with the early years of this era, as will be demonstrated. The second section explores the relationship between Ramesses XI and two other significant High Priests, Amenhotep and Piankh, and rejects the notion that a power struggle existed between the institutions of High Priest and Pharaoh. The third section considers the genealogical relationships between Herihor, Piankh, and the women Nodjmet and Hreret.

Herihor

The exact chronological placement of Herihor's career is hampered by the total lack of explicit dates associated with him. The discussion must thus start with the earliest and latest attestations of Piankh in order to provide a *terminus ante* or *post quem* for Herihor's career. It is important to note that Herihor never relinquished his High Priestly titles, even when he became king. This is indicated by the fact that his *prenomen* when attested was always 'High Priest of Amun'.⁷ This strongly counts against the theory recently proposed by James and Morkot that Piankh, Pinudjem I, and Masaharta all served as High Priests under King Herihor.⁸ Here, I operate on the principle that if another man appears with the title of High Priest during the period in question he can be assumed to have either pre- or post-dated Herihor. The idea that there was a power struggle for the office of High Priest is rejected below.

The earliest known reference to Piankh is provided by the Oracle of Nesamun, dated to 'year 7 (in) the *wḥm-msw.t*', which names him as 'Fan-bearer on the right of the King, Viceroy of Kush, First Prophet of Amun-Re... General'.⁹ This indicates that by year 7 of the

⁴ Kitchen 1986: 536.

⁵ Page 8A, line 1 of the Abbott Dockets provides the correspondence with Ramesses XI's regnal years: 'Year 1, first month of *3ḥt*, day 2, corresponding to year 19' (Černý 1929: 194-5).

⁶ Its highest securely attested year appears in the late Ramesside correspondence: P. BM 10411 is dated to an unspecified day in the second month of *šmw*, 'year 10 of the *wḥm-msw.t*'. It is now likely that the Renaissance extended beyond this point: Kitchen (2009: 193) has re-dated letter 329 (pub. Wentz 1990) to year 12 of the Renaissance due to its reference to West Theban graffito No. 1393.

⁷ E.g. Epigraphic Survey 1979: pls. 3-11; Wentz 1979: xv.

⁸ James and Morkot 2010: 248-257. A more detailed discussion of this theory's flaws is provided by Gregory (2013: 5-15).

⁹ Nims 1948: 157-162.

Renaissance Piankh had gained his full set of titles including that of High Priest.¹⁰ The lack of royal titles and the acknowledgement of Ramesses XI's authority in this text clearly illustrates that Piankh made no claims to kingship, unlike Herihor.¹¹ The latest date associated with Piankh is year 10 of the Renaissance, which is attested in his correspondence.¹² If the Renaissance and Piankh's term as High Priest ended in year 12 (year 30 of Ramesses XI) with that king's death, it would follow that Herihor was High Priest before Piankh came to the post in year 7 of the Renaissance, according to Kitchen.¹³

It is indeed certain that Herihor was High Priest under Ramesses XI, as they are depicted together in the Hypostyle Hall of the Khonsu Temple. In one inscription High Priest Herihor describes how his work was carried out 'in accordance with His Majesty's instructions'.¹⁴ No dates accompany these inscriptions. Significantly, upon the walls of the First Court of the same temple Herihor portrayed himself as king. For reasons summarised by Bonhême the reality of Herihor's kingship has been doubted.¹⁵ The most vocal denier of Herihor's kingship is Kitchen, whose chronological reconstruction necessitates that Herihor predeceased Ramesses XI, with the consequence that he would have named himself as king while the latter was still on the throne.¹⁶ The argument Kitchen uses to support his reconstruction is that Herihor is only attested as king in the Karnak precinct and in the funerary equipment of his wife Nodjmet.¹⁷ However, the Tanite king, Smendes, is himself named on only two monuments: the Dibabieh Stela near Gebelein¹⁸ and the gateway of Tuthmosis I in the precinct of Montu in Karnak.¹⁹ Kitchen states that these two attestations prove that Smendes was 'undisputed Pharaoh of all Egypt'.²⁰ However, both sources are undated and the latter attestation was derived not from an official monument but from a scene of Seti I to which Smendes' name and figure were added.²¹ As Gregory points out, these attestations of Smendes cannot be used to prove that Herihor was not, at some point, ruler of southern Egypt.²² Moreover, if one accepts Smendes as king, there is no sound reason not to accord the same to Herihor, who made use of traditional royal iconography.²³ Herihor's kingship, therefore, must be incorporated into any reconstruction of the end of the Twentieth Dynasty.²⁴

It is important to emphasise that the decoration of the Khonsu Temple clearly

¹⁰ Nims 1948: 161.

¹¹ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 23-24.

¹² *Late Ramesside Letter* (henceforth *LRL*) no. 9, trans. Wente 1967b: 37-42.

¹³ Kitchen 1986: 16, 18.

¹⁴ Epigraphic Survey 1981: pl. 153B, lines 1-2. Ramesses XI is named in two lines: Epigraphic Survey 1981: pl. 163, line 13; pl. 200A, line 10.

¹⁵ Bonhême 1979: 267-283.

¹⁶ Kitchen 1986: 20-21.

¹⁷ Kitchen 1986: 20-21. Herihor is also given the title 'Lord of the Two Lands' on a faience vase of unknown provenance (Gauthier 1914: 236, XVII).

¹⁸ Breasted 1906: 308-309.

¹⁹ Gregory 2006: 8; James and Morkot 2010: 244-245. Smendes is also attested in the *Report of Wenamun* and in Manetho's history.

²⁰ Kitchen 1986: 256.

²¹ Varille 1943: 36.

²² Gregory 2006: 7-8.

²³ Wente (1979: xv) tries to demote Herihor's kingship by arguing that Herihor emphasised the 'priestly aspect' of his kingship in the Khonsu Temple's court by wearing the skullcap associated with priests. Gregory (2006: 44, 129) has successfully countered this point by demonstrating that the 'skullcap' is in fact a cap crown. This is a well-established royal headdress and so provides another clear reason for according Herihor a full kingship (Gregory 2006: 44, 129).

²⁴ Gregory 2006: 132; also Lull 2006: 336; James and Morkot 2010: 245.

demonstrates that Herihor's career consisted of two phases: the first was that in which he was High Priest in the last years of Ramesses XI, which is attested in the Hypostyle Hall,²⁵ the second phase was the kingship displayed in the court, where he retained the title of High Priest as his *prenomén*. This pattern of decoration suggests that Herihor only became king after the death of Ramesses XI.²⁶ Crucially, the exact length of Ramesses XI's reign is unknown. The year 12 of the Renaissance indicates that he reigned for at least thirty years²⁷ and there is a strong possibility that his reign may have lasted as long as thirty-four years.²⁸ It is, therefore, possible that Herihor served as High Priest under Ramesses XI for the final two to four years of the latter's reign after Piankh's term as High Priest had ended in year 10 or 11 of the Renaissance.²⁹

In order to assess this theory it is necessary to discuss the two dates specifically associated with Herihor. Both of these are lower than year 7 (Piankh's first attested year), leading to assumptions in the past that they refer to the Renaissance.³⁰ It will be demonstrated below that in both cases there is a more viable alternative that accords with the reconstruction proposed in the previous paragraph.

The first source is the *Report of Wenamun*. This is dated to a year 5 and describes how, in his capacity as High Priest,³¹ Herihor sent the protagonist to Byblos to acquire wood for a new barque of Amun. It is important to emphasise that the *Report* was almost certainly a work of fiction, as has been convincingly demonstrated by Egberts, who notes its intricate and suspiciously symmetrical plot.³² It is true that inscriptions in the Khonsu Temple suggest that Herihor did indeed order the creation of a new barque 'out of cedar of Lebanon',³³ but Egberts persuasively argues that this expedition (or the inscription proclaiming it) was merely the inspiration for the fictional *Report*.³⁴ Its author was probably drawing upon his experience of political reality to create the setting for his work,³⁵ which justifies its inclusion in the present discussion. The second key piece of chronological information is provided by two hieratic dockets from the coffin lids of Seti I and Ramesses II that date to year 6 and name Herihor as High Priest. It is important to emphasise that neither these dockets nor the *Report* specifically mention the Renaissance, or name Ramesses XI.³⁶

It was argued above that Herihor only became High Priest after year 10 of the Renaissance. It is, therefore, necessary to propose an alternative dating for the dockets and *Report of Wenamun*, which will allow Herihor to have been king independently of Ramesses XI.

The most attractive theory thus far proposed is that the years 5 and 6 belong to the

²⁵ James and Morkot 2010: 245.

²⁶ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 25. The theory of a power struggle between the offices of king and High Priest is rejected in the second section of this article.

²⁷ Kitchen 2009: 193.

²⁸ Von Beckerath 1994: 107-108; Egberts 1998: 96.

²⁹ Egberts 1998: 96; Jansen-Winkel 2006: 232 n. 78.

³⁰ Wente 1979: xii; Kitchen 1986: 17, 417; Goelet 1996: 126.

³¹ Kitchen 1986: 17.

³² Wenamun's arrivals in Byblos and then in Cyprus both took place after the five epagomenal days, for example (Egberts 1998: 94, 107, *pace* Kitchen 1986: 17; Goelet 1996: 126).

³³ Epigraphic Survey 1981: pl. 143C, line 2; c.f. Epigraphic Survey 1979: pl. 21.

³⁴ Egberts 1998: 102.

³⁵ Egberts 1998: 94, 108.

³⁶ Wenamun lists his only superiors as Amun, Smendes, and Herihor. Egberts' (1998: 102) identification of the individual named Khaemwase, who is described in the text as having once sent envoys to Byblos, as Ramesses XI is not convincing. As Thijs (2005: 80) points out, viziers also had the authority to send envoys and a vizier named Khaemwase is attested in the reign of Ramesses IX (in P. Abbott 2, 4; P. Abbott 7, 3; P. Amherst 7, 7).

reign of Smendes.³⁷ Kitchen rejects this on the grounds that in the *Report* Smendes was not given kingly titles or a cartouche for his name.³⁸ However, the aim of the *Report's* (fictional) narrative was to show that Amun alone was king; the lack of correct acknowledgement of the living Pharaoh is, therefore, to be expected.³⁹ Potentially more damaging to the theory that the aforementioned dates relate to the reign of Smendes is that Pinudjem I, who would have been Herihor's immediate successor if Herihor succeeded Piankh, is associated with a year 1 on the mummy of Nodjmet. It is likely that dates associated with the High Priests of the early Twenty-first Dynasty refer to the Tanite Pharaohs; therefore, the year 1 could belong to Smendes,⁴⁰ which is lower than Herihor's years on the docket. However, the latter had a very long career, which included portraying himself as king on the pylon of the Khonsu Temple⁴¹ and transferring the title of High Priest to his son Masaharta.⁴² The dateline from the bandage does not state whether Pinudjem I was in the priestly or royal phase of his career. This latter part probably encompassed the reign of Smendes' immediate successor Amenemnisut and then continued into the early years of Psusennes I.⁴³ The year 1, therefore, could have referred to either Amenemnisut or Psusennes I, removing the overlap between Herihor and Pinudjem I's careers.⁴⁴

Pinudjem I's next lowest date is 'year 6, third month of *pṛt*, day 7' on a docket marking the renewal of Tuthmosis II's burial by 'High Priest' Pinudjem I. The fact that he is named as such prevents the dating of the docket to the reign of Psusennes I as by this time Menkheperre was High Priest. The date must therefore refer to Smendes; however, crucially, it is earlier than Herihor's latest date (day 15 of the same month on the docket on Ramesses II's coffin), again meaning that the careers of the two men would have overlapped.⁴⁵ However, Daressy read the season on Herihor's last docket as *3ḥt*,⁴⁶ rendering the date earlier than Pinudjem I's first appearance. If this reading were correct, it would allow Herihor's renewal of the burials of Ramesses II and Seti I to have occurred in the reign of Smendes.⁴⁷ Pinudjem I would consequently have succeeded him as High Priest between day 7 of the second month of *pṛt* (on Seti I's docket) and day 7 of the third month of *pṛt* (Pinudjem I's first attestation on the coffin of Tuthmosis II). Like his predecessor, Pinudjem I served as High Priest before becoming king himself, this time surrendering his title of High Priest, which is not attested in his surviving texts or cartouche.⁴⁸

A final possible flaw in the dating of Herihor's dockets to the reign of Smendes is that they would belong to the last years of Herihor's career, by which point he was surely king. This therefore raises the question of why he is named as only High Priest. However, the renewal of royal burials in Thebes was at this time primarily a responsibility of High Priests,

³⁷ Demidoff 2008: 103-105.

³⁸ Kitchen 1986: 17.

³⁹ Egberts 1998: 102.

⁴⁰ Breasted 1906: 295-296; Wente 1967a: 155; Kitchen 1986: 22-23.

⁴¹ Epigraphic Survey 1981: pls. 113-114B.

⁴² Kitchen 1986: 78. It is useful to re-emphasise the point that, unlike Pinudjem I, Herihor never relinquished the title of High Priest.

⁴³ Kitchen 1986: 8-9, 26; Jansen-Winkel 2006: 227. Amenemnisut probably reigned for four years, as indicated by the regnal year in the Banishment Stela (Jansen-Winkel 2006: 227-228).

⁴⁴ Niwiński 1988: 43.

⁴⁵ Demidoff 2008: 103.

⁴⁶ Daressy 1909: 32.

⁴⁷ Demidoff 2008: 111.

⁴⁸ Kitchen 1986: 78.

not of kings. It is likely, therefore, that Herihor undertook the two renewals in year 6 in his capacity as High Priest, which was a title that he always retained. Moreover, in the funerary papyri of his wife Nodjmet, Herihor was portrayed as High Priest in the *text* of the Louvre portion but as king in the vignette and in P. BM 10541. This demonstrates that the use of only one title in a document cannot be employed to prove that he did not hold the other, therefore allowing both the docketts and the representations of Herihor as king to date to the reign of Smendes.

The theory that the year 6 referred to the reign of Smendes, is therefore, viable. It is, however, necessary to explore briefly the two alternative theories in order to exclude them. Jansen-Winkeln suggests that the year 6 referred to Herihor's own independent reign as High Priest, which began after Ramesses XI's death and which was in parallel with that of Smendes.⁴⁹ However, there is no convincing evidence that any High Priests of the Twenty-first Dynasty counted their own year dates.⁵⁰ This is exemplified by the fact that Pinudjem I appears in a year 15 as 'High Priest' but in a year 16 as 'King Pinudjem I', father of High Priest Masaharta, demonstrating that between these dates Pinudjem I became king but continued to date by the reign of, presumably, the Tanite ruler.⁵¹ This renders it very unlikely that Herihor counted his own regnal years.⁵²

A second alternative was proposed by Thijs, who somewhat implausibly postulates that Ramesses XI was succeeded by 'King Pinudjem', who was a separate individual from the 'High Priest Pinudjem I'.⁵³ He argues that Herihor officiated as High Priest under 'King Pinudjem' for at least six years before becoming king himself.⁵⁴ He notes that Herihor's oracle stela in the Khonsu Temple refers to two periods of time allotted to Herihor: 'thirty years' and 'twenty years'.⁵⁵ Thijs posits that Herihor's career as High Priest lasted approximately ten years and that Herihor then ruled as an independent king for another twenty, rendering thirty years in total.⁵⁶ However, the numbers in the oracle stela should not be interpreted as a literal record of the lengths of Herihor's years as High Priest and his reign; Thijs himself admits that they are suspiciously round.⁵⁷ Gregory is probably correct in alternatively interpreting the stela as a mode of legitimising Herihor's succession to the kingship, by acknowledging Ramesses XI and having his reign confirmed by the gods Amun and Khonsu.⁵⁸ Thijs' theory additionally falls down on the fact that the existence of 'King Pinudjem' is based solely on the depictions of such a figure on the pylon of the Khonsu Temple.⁵⁹ Thijs argues that these reliefs were altered by the later High Priest Pinudjem I (who never became king) to depict himself.⁶⁰ The evidence for this is unconvincing⁶¹ and would require a complete reappraisal of the early Twenty-first Dynasty. A final serious flaw in Thijs' reconstruction is that Herihor never relinquished the title of High Priest, rendering it

⁴⁹ Jansen-Winkeln 1992: 34-37, followed by James and Morkot 2010: 250-257.

⁵⁰ Kitchen 1986: 78.

⁵¹ There is no reason to believe that these dates were not sequential.

⁵² Kitchen 1986: 78.

⁵³ Thijs 2005: 81-83, 87-91.

⁵⁴ Thijs 2005: 78-91.

⁵⁵ Epigraphic Survey 1981: pl. 132, lines 10-11; Thijs 2005: 85-87.

⁵⁶ Thijs 2005: 85-87.

⁵⁷ Thijs 2005: 86.

⁵⁸ Gregory 2006: 22.

⁵⁹ E.g. Epigraphic Survey 1981: pls. 113-114B.

⁶⁰ Thijs 2007: 52-55.

⁶¹ James and Morkot 2010: 234.

unlikely that another High Priest, Pinudjem I, officiated under him.⁶²

To summarise the conclusions reached so far, the most reasonable dating for the years 5 and 6 associated with Herihor is to the reign of Smendes. Additionally, there is no evidence explicitly linking Herihor with the Renaissance.⁶³ However, this absence is insufficient to prove that Herihor was not present at the instigation of the Renaissance. Some scholars argue that the Renaissance was introduced by Herihor in an attempt to oppose or become independent of the rule of Ramesses XI while the latter was still ruling.⁶⁴ In this reconstruction, Herihor's depiction of himself as king marks the climax of a long-running rivalry between the High Priests and Ramesses XI that began under Amenhotep and continued under Piankh. In order for this theory to be conclusively rejected, it is necessary to explore the relationships between Ramesses XI and the High Priests Amenhotep and Piankh, before returning to the instigation of the Renaissance.

Ramesses XI and the High Priests Amenhotep and Piankh

This section focuses on three significant individuals from Ramesses XI's reign: the High Priests Amenhotep and Piankh, and the Viceroy of Kush Panehsy. The latter was involved in an incident commonly referred to in scholarly literature as the 'suppression' of Amenhotep. The first part of this section establishes a reasonable reconstruction of the suppression and determines its likely chronological placement within the reign of Ramesses XI. The argument then moves forward to the late Renaissance and Piankh's campaign against Panehsy in Nubia. The overall aim of this section is to ascertain whether there was a power struggle between the High Priests and Ramesses XI that is consistent with the theory that Herihor himself instigated the Renaissance.

Ramesses XI and Amenhotep

The suppression of Amenhotep is alluded to in two papyri dated to year 1 of the Renaissance. P. BM 10052 13, 24 includes the phrase 'the war of the High Priest'. In P. Mayer A 6, 4-10 a temple worker describes how the 'barbarians came and seized the Temple (Medinet Habu)...six months' after Amenhotep 'who used to be High Priest of Amun' had been suppressed. This worker only returned '(upon) nine whole months of the suppression of Amenhotep' when 'order was restored'.⁶⁵

A further key source is Amenhotep's autobiographical inscription, which was carved on the walls of the Amun Temple at Karnak between the seventh and eighth pylons.⁶⁶ Amenhotep described how an unnamed person spent 'eight whole months in it' and how he (Amenhotep) 'suffered from it exceedingly'.⁶⁷ What 'it' is remains unspecified. Amenhotep described how he then 'appealed to Pharaoh, my lord' and that subsequently 'the one who

⁶² As noted above, this is also the key flaw in James and Morkot's reconstruction.

⁶³ Taylor 1998: 1145.

⁶⁴ Sauneron 1957: 182; Assmann 1996: 288-289.

⁶⁵ P. Mayer A 6, 7-9.

⁶⁶ Trans. Wente 1966: 77-84.

⁶⁷ The exact length of the suppression differs from that given in P. Mayer A 6, 7-8 by one month but both sources undoubtedly referred to the same event. As Wente (1966: 82) points out, it would be most unusual if Amenhotep had been suppressed twice for a very similar length of time.

had suppressed' him was quickly suppressed himself. The inscription does not categorically state that Amenhotep was restored to office after his suppression, although it has been widely assumed that this was the case,⁶⁸ unless he died soon after the suppression.⁶⁹

The sources (especially P. Mayer A 6, 4-10) clearly indicate that stability was only achieved after months of fighting, but several different reasons for the suppression have been offered. Firstly, Kees suggested that Amenhotep was removed in a Theban uprising triggered by the populace's resentment of his wealth and his involvement in the exacting of taxes.⁷⁰ However, this does not accord with the language used in Amenhotep's autobiographical inscription, which suggests that it was an *individual* who removed him. In line 18 Amenhotep states: '*He* spent eight whole months in it, and I suffered exceedingly under *him*' (my emphasis).

The second proposed force behind the suppression is Ramesses XI himself, who permanently removed Amenhotep in a bid to curtail Amenhotep's power, which had started to rival his own.⁷¹ This notion lends support to the theory that Herihor claimed to be king while Ramesses XI was still on the throne, as he was thereby continuing the struggle for power that had begun under Amenhotep. The origin of this reconstruction of events lies in a scene that depicts Amenhotep being given rewards, in which he appears at equal height to a previous Pharaoh, Ramesses IX. It has been read as an assertion by the High Priest of his power in relation to the king, whom he saw as an equal.⁷² Such an interpretation has now been rejected, most recently by Binder, on the grounds that it was not Ramesses IX himself who was represented but his statue.⁷³ Crucially, the theory that Ramesses XI suppressed Amenhotep is contradicted by the autobiographical inscription, which states in line 24 that the king 'suppressed the one' who suppressed Amenhotep, indicating that he required the king's assistance (and that of Amun) for his suppressor to be removed.⁷⁴ One can thus safely conclude that Amenhotep was not suppressed by Ramesses XI.

The most reasonable reconstruction is that Amenhotep was suppressed by Panehsy, presumably as part of a rivalry for power in Upper Egypt, and that Ramesses XI had to remove him.⁷⁵ This is supported by the text of P. BM 10383 2, 4-5, which dates to an unspecified year 2, in which a *w^cb*-priest named Peison states: 'I left the House of Pharaoh when Panehsy came and suppressed my superior, though there was no fault in him'. This year 2 certainly referred to the Renaissance as Panehsy also appears in P. BM 10052 10, 18, which, as seen above, dates to year 1 of the Renaissance.⁷⁶ The close temporal relationship between P. BM 10383, P. BM 10052 and P. Mayer A discussed above, which all date to the first two years of the Renaissance, suggests that they all referred to the same incident.⁷⁷

There is further persuasive evidence that Panehsy was a cause of disruption in Thebes. P. Mayer A 13 and P. Mayer B 2-3, which date to the early Renaissance, state that fifteen thieves died in the 'war in the northern district' and that three more were killed by Panehsy. Jansen-Winkel argues that this was linked with the suppression and that Panehsy was

⁶⁸ Von Beckerath 1951: 93; Wentz 1966: 85; Thijs 2003: 294.

⁶⁹ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 31.

⁷⁰ Kees 1964: 2-6.

⁷¹ Sauneron 1957: 182; Gardiner 1961: 301.

⁷² Breasted 1924: 189-190; Černý 1965: 628-629.

⁷³ Binder 2008: 83. Moreover, Amenhotep received the 'gold of honour' in the scene, which Binder (2008: 250, 251 n. 943) has shown was an important symbol of royal trust.

⁷⁴ Wentz 1966: 84.

⁷⁵ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 28-32; Thijs 2003: 289-306.

⁷⁶ Peet 1930: 123.

⁷⁷ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 27.

certainly the aggressor.⁷⁸ That Panehsy was considered an enemy in Thebes is shown by the fact that each time his name appeared in papyri from years 1 and 2 of the Renaissance it was followed by the *nds* ('bad') bird as its determinative.⁷⁹ This does not preclude the possibility that there was already unrest in Thebes before Panehsy took action; Panehsy probably used disorder in the city to his advantage in order to oust his rival, Amenhotep.⁸⁰

Furthermore, Wenté argues that the 'barbarians' who seized Medinet Habu six months after the suppression were the Nubian troops of Panehsy, as they were sufficiently organised to have 'troop-captains'.⁸¹ Importantly, the *wꜥb*-priest Peison's place of work was situated in the Medinet Habu complex.⁸² Peison states that his superior was suppressed by Panehsy⁸³ and this surely occurred in the same seizure of the temple mentioned in P. Mayer A 6, 4-10, indicating that Panehsy was responsible.⁸⁴ Wenté is probably correct to argue that Peison's superior was an official of Medinet Habu and not Amenhotep himself.⁸⁵

It is thus most likely that Amenhotep was suppressed by Panehsy and that he required Ramesses XI's help in restoring order. The discussion now turns to the chronological placement of this suppression. As Panehsy was certainly involved in the incident, dated documents featuring him are an important resource. Crucially, Panehsy was the recipient of a royal dispatch from the Chancellery of Pharaoh in year 17 of Ramesses XI.⁸⁶ Accepting that Panehsy was involved in a civil war with Amenhotep in Thebes, it becomes very unlikely that Panehsy would have been in the royal favour, as indicated by the dispatch, if he had already been involved in the suppression.⁸⁷ The same reasoning holds for the Turin Taxation Papyrus of Ramesses XI's year 12, which lists the viceroy Panehsy as a supervisor in the collection of taxes in the Theban area.⁸⁸ It is perhaps not impossible that Panehsy earlier suppressed Amenhotep but that he was able afterwards to regain the royal favour prior to the dispatch of year 17, or perhaps even before the tax collection in year 12. However, Panehsy was clearly considered an enemy in Thebes at the beginning of the Renaissance,⁸⁹ which was probably connected with his conflict with Amenhotep.

The most probable reconstruction is, therefore, that Panehsy suppressed Amenhotep between the dispatch of year 17 and the first year of the Renaissance, when references to the suppression and resentment towards Panehsy first appeared.⁹⁰ Crucially, *all* the documents that undoubtedly refer to the suppression (P. BM 10052, P. Mayer A, and P. BM 10383) are

⁷⁸ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 27-28.

⁷⁹ P. BM 10052 10, 18; P. Mayer A 13; P. Mayer B 3; P. BM 10383 2, 5; Černý 1965: 634.

⁸⁰ Wenté (1966: 84-85) argues that Panehsy cannot have been the suppressor who was removed by Ramesses XI as the viceroy received a royal dispatch in year 17 of Ramesses XI, indicating that he was in the royal favour. This objection is rendered redundant, however, if the suppression occurred *after* year 17, as is argued below.

⁸¹ P. Mayer A 6, 4-10; P. Mayer A 2, 20; Wenté 1966: 84. A possible reason for the delay in the occupation is that it may have only become necessary (or possible) six months after the initial suppression for the troops to seize the temple.

⁸² Wenté 1966: 84.

⁸³ P. BM 10383 2, 4.

⁸⁴ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 27.

⁸⁵ Wenté 1966: 84, *contra* Černý 1965: 630.

⁸⁶ P. Turin 1896.

⁸⁷ Wenté 1966: 85; Jansen-Winkel 1992: 27-31.

⁸⁸ P. Turin 1895+2006, ro. 1, 5. For the date see Wenté 1966: 85; Aldred 1979: 94; Kitchen 1986: 247. Thijs (1999: 186-188) dates the Turin Taxation Papyrus to the Renaissance, contesting that Panehsy, after his conflict with Piankh, regained his previous authority. This theory is intriguing but is not necessary for the purposes of the argument here.

⁸⁹ Černý 1965: 634.

⁹⁰ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 27-37; Niwiński 1992: 241-247; Thijs 2003: 289-306.

dated to years 1 and 2 of the Renaissance, suggesting that it was a relatively recent event at that time. The hypothesis that Panehsy suppressed Amenhotep and that he was suppressed in turn accords with Panehsy's apparent disappearance at the beginning of the Renaissance.

Ramesses XI and Piankh

Having explored the relationship between Ramesses XI and Amenhotep, the relationship between this king and Piankh will now be assessed. This is achieved through the analysis of the letters relating to Piankh's Nubian campaign against Panehsy in year 10 of the Renaissance. Panehsy is named once in these letters, in which Dhutmose describes how Piankh 'keeps saying "I shall go up (to Nubia) to attack Panehsy in the place where he is"'.⁹¹ This demonstrates that the principal aim of the campaign was to defeat this man. Panehsy was not given any titles but it is certain that he was the former viceroy for two reasons. Firstly, this Panehsy clearly had a military force at his disposal, with which he fought against Piankh.⁹² Secondly, the fact that Panehsy was based in Nubia suggests that he had strong links with the country, as would be expected of a former viceroy.⁹³

An obvious explanation for Piankh's campaign is that he was continuing the High Priesthood's rivalry with Panehsy that had earlier resulted in Amenhotep's suppression and the expulsion of Panehsy from Egypt.⁹⁴ The role of Ramesses XI in the campaign is less clear. The fact that Piankh always refers to himself as the 'General of Pharaoh'⁹⁵ does not indicate that he was acting under the king's orders as this was a broad, informal description of Piankh's role, not a statement of loyalty.⁹⁶ Wentz argues that Panehsy, not Piankh, was loyal to the king.⁹⁷ This conclusion is based on a statement made by Piankh to Dhutmose concerning the unspecified charges of two Medjay: Piankh ordered that these men be thrown into the river if their charges were found to be true. He warned Dhutmose not to 'let anybody in this land find out'.⁹⁸ The secrecy involved suggests that these actions were not legal; perhaps the charges in question were damaging to Piankh.⁹⁹ Apparently pre-empting Dhutmose's concerns,¹⁰⁰ Piankh states: 'as for Pharaoh, I.p.h., how will he ever reach this land? And of whom is Pharaoh, I.p.h., superior still?'¹⁰¹ 'This land' surely refers to Nubia and the statement indicates that Ramesses XI was not the one who had ordered the campaign against Panehsy.¹⁰² Piankh's declaration has been interpreted as an indication of his contempt for the rule of Ramesses XI and the latter's ineffectiveness.¹⁰³ This notion that Piankh actively opposed Ramesses XI would lend support to the theory that Herihor too had been a rival of that king, as Wentz argues.¹⁰⁴

⁹¹ *LRL* no. 4, trans. Wentz 1967b: 24-27.

⁹² Thijs 2003: 299.

⁹³ Thijs 2003: 299.

⁹⁴ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 26-28.

⁹⁵ E.g. *LRL* nos. 18-22, trans. Wentz 1967b: 52-55.

⁹⁶ Pace Aldred 1979: 95.

⁹⁷ Wentz 1990: 171.

⁹⁸ *LRL* no. 21, trans. Wentz 1967b: 53-54.

⁹⁹ Thijs 2003: 301.

¹⁰⁰ McDowell 1990: 242.

¹⁰¹ *LRL* no. 21, trans. Wentz 1967b: 53-54.

¹⁰² Wentz 1966: 85.

¹⁰³ Gardiner 1961: 313-314; Wentz 1966: 85.

¹⁰⁴ Wentz 1966: 85.

However, the ‘rebellious’ nature of Piankh’s comments should not be over-emphasised. The fact that Ramesses XI had not ordered the campaign against Panehsy does not prove that this campaign was intended to harm the king by removing his loyal supporter. It must be stressed that Piankh’s statement was made in a private letter and so was not a public declaration of his opposition to Ramesses XI, for whom he may have avowed his support in public. That Piankh specifically told Dhutmose to ensure that no one anywhere found out about his actions regarding the Medjay in Thebes suggests that there was a possibility of retribution from the king or from one of his agents.¹⁰⁵ It is likely that, due to Piankh’s authority and number of titles, his only true superior would have been the king.¹⁰⁶ The most likely reconstruction of events is that Piankh’s campaign was, much like Panehsy’s suppression of Amenhotep ten years earlier, part of a struggle between the High Priests and the viceroy for power in Upper Egypt.¹⁰⁷ Ramesses XI had been able to expel Panehsy from Thebes and restore order at the beginning of the Renaissance, but Nubia (as Piankh himself stated) was beyond his reach. Piankh was consequently able to continue his rivalry with Panehsy without fear of interference from Ramesses XI.

To summarise, the evidence suggests that Panehsy suppressed Amenhotep at a time between the former’s royal dispatch in year 17 and the beginning of the Renaissance in year 19. Ramesses XI was able to remove Panehsy but only after months of fighting and disruption, after which Amenhotep may have been restored, if he lived beyond the suppression. By the later Renaissance Ramesses XI had lost some of his power and Piankh, having at some point succeeded Amenhotep as High Priest in Thebes, was able to wage a war against Panehsy for power in Upper Egypt and parts of Lower Nubia. Yet the case of the Medjay suggests that Piankh feared some interference (directly or indirectly) from Ramesses XI in his Theban affairs, if he were to become aware of his actions. This indicates that Piankh was not untouchable and that Ramesses XI did possess some remnants of power. The overall impression one gains from the sources is that the High Priests were to some extent still answerable to Ramesses XI in the latter part of his reign. This does not accord with the theory that, between the terms of Amenhotep and Piankh, Herihor claimed to be king in defiance of Ramesses XI, especially so soon after Amenhotep had required Ramesses XI’s aid to remove his suppressor.

It is thus necessary to find an alternative reason behind the instigation of the Renaissance that does not require the involvement of a rebellious Herihor.

The Instigation of the Renaissance

To understand the context of the Renaissance and the reasons behind its instigation, the years immediately prior to year 19 of Ramesses XI must be further outlined. As has already been noted in relation to the suppression of Amenhotep, this was a period of great disorder, which is especially noticeable in Thebes, from where most of our evidence derives. The *corpus* of Tomb Robbery Papyri (most of which date to the early Renaissance) testifies to the high levels of theft from tombs in the Theban necropolis¹⁰⁸ as well as from Ramesses III’s mortuary temple at Medinet Habu.¹⁰⁹ P. Rochester MAG 51.346.1 dates to year 1 of the

¹⁰⁵ Thijs 2003: 302.

¹⁰⁶ Thijs 2003: 301-302.

¹⁰⁷ This possibility is noted by Thijs (2003: 300).

¹⁰⁸ Abbott Dockets 8 A, 1-2; P. BM 10052 1, 2.

¹⁰⁹ Detailed in P. BM 10383.

Renaissance and concerns thefts made by the ‘Chief Doorkeeper of the Amun Temple’. The possibility that one of the most important temples in Egypt was a victim of theft indicates the level of disorder and corruption present in Thebes.¹¹⁰ The necessity for the many trials described in the *corpus* was probably a symptom of a broader economic crisis that included food shortages: one unspecified year was described in a document of the early Renaissance as the ‘year of Hyenas when there was a famine’.¹¹¹

The middle years of the reign of Ramesses XI were, therefore, a time of crisis, when a return to order may have been necessary. However, it is nowhere explicitly stated who brought about this renewal. Goelet cogently argues that because Ramesses XI’s reign was acknowledged in the Renaissance (as indicated by the Abbott Dockets)¹¹² that his authority was likewise recognised in this period.¹¹³ The simplest explanation is that it was Ramesses XI himself who instigated the Renaissance and that Herihor was not involved, as he was not active in this period.¹¹⁴ Aldred and Niwiński counter that the new era was brought about by Herihor as a southern regent under the authority of Ramesses XI.¹¹⁵ This can be rejected, as Herihor had been content to portray himself as High Priest under Ramesses XI; if he had been made a southern regent he surely would have depicted himself as such, rather than as king.

That Ramesses XI was responsible for the instigation of Renaissance is supported by two accounts of the Pharaoh visiting Thebes at approximately this time. In P. BM 10383 1, 8-10, which dates to year 2 of the Renaissance, a witness in a trial refers to the time ‘when Pharaoh, our lord, came to Thebes’. The context suggests that it was a relatively recent event.¹¹⁶ Lines 3, 1-7 of the same papyrus describe a dispute regarding the ownership of a mast. One of the men involved ‘told the affairs to Pharaoh, and Pharaoh sent a chief fan-bearer’ telling him to surrender the mast. On this basis, McDowell argues that Ramesses XI ‘supervised every aspect’ of the tomb robbery trials, even in the Renaissance.¹¹⁷ The evidence therefore indicates that at this time Ramesses XI had not lost control of Thebes and that he was still actively involved in its legal system. The Pharaoh, therefore, was the most likely the architect of the new dating system. This Renaissance was accomplished through the establishment of trials to bring those guilty of theft to justice, as described in the Tomb Robbery Papyri.

Conclusions

The lack of extant sources explicitly linking Herihor with the Renaissance renders it less likely that he was heavily involved in its creation. The instigation of the Renaissance was preceded by the suppression of Amenhotep, who subsequently required the aid of Ramesses XI. In the later years of the Renaissance Piankh was to some extent still answerable to Ramesses XI’s authority, at least in Thebes. On the basis of these two facts, the theory that the Renaissance was introduced by Herihor in the context of a power struggle between the

¹¹⁰ Goelet 1996: 107.

¹¹¹ P. BM 10052 11, 7-8.

¹¹² They twice contain the formula ‘year 1’ (of the Renaissance) ‘corresponding to year 19’ of Ramesses XI’s reign (8 A, 1 and 8 A, 19).

¹¹³ Goelet 1996: 126.

¹¹⁴ Jansen-Winkel 1992: 22-37; Egberts 1998: 93-108; Taylor 1998: 1143-1156; Thijs 2003: 303-304 and 2005: 73-91.

¹¹⁵ Aldred 1979: 95; Niwiński 1988: 38-39.

¹¹⁶ Aldred 1979: 95; Thijs 2003: 303 n. 92.

¹¹⁷ McDowell 1990: 243.

High Priests and Ramesses XI can now be rejected. On the contrary, the Renaissance was brought about by Ramesses XI to signal a return to order after the disruption of the middle years of his reign, achieved through the tomb robbery trials. His Renaissance not only signalled the beginning of the tomb robbery trials but also the re-imposition of order after the conflict between Panehsy and Amenhotep, and possibly the appointment of a new High Priest, Piankh.¹¹⁸

The Genealogical Evidence

This final section assesses whether the extant genealogical data can be incorporated into the proposed reconstruction of the transition between the Twentieth and Twenty-first Dynasties. The debate here focuses on women named Hhere and Nodjmet and analyses their relationship to both Piankh and Herihor.

Relevant genealogical data is provided by a range of sources, including inscriptions in the Khonsu Temple, the Late Ramesside Letters, graffiti, and funerary equipment. These sources reveal two facts of which we can be certain. The first is that Herihor was married to Nodjmet, who was entitled ‘Lady of the Two Lands’ in her funerary papyrus P. BM 10541, in which she appeared with King Herihor. Moreover, in the court of the Khonsu Temple she was entitled ‘Great King’s Wife’,¹¹⁹ firmly establishing her relationship with him. No other wife of Herihor is known; however, the fact that *nineteen* sons of Herihor were depicted in the procession of his children¹²⁰ strongly suggests that she was not his only wife. Secondly, it is certain that Piankh was the father of Pinudjem I. Like Herihor, Pinudjem I decorated parts of the Khonsu Temple as High Priest and as king and in almost every scene he was named ‘the son of the High Priest of Amun, Piankh’.¹²¹

Nodjmet was also closely linked with Piankh. The ‘Chief of the Harem of Amun, King of the Gods, the noble lady Nodjmet’ was the addressee of *LRL* no. 35, which was sent by ‘the General’, Piankh.¹²² Nodjmet was also mentioned in nos. 21 and 34, in which Piankh told Dhutmose and Payshuben respectively to ‘join up’ with her in the secret murder of the two Medjay discussed above. This indicates that she was a person in whom Piankh placed his confidence.¹²³

The close connection with Piankh is emphasised by the fact that she was also depicted with his four sons (including the High Priest Pinudjem I) in an undated graffito in a forecourt of Luxor Temple. That she was predeceased by Piankh is indicated by the words following his titles, which read: ‘made by his son who perpetuates his name’, Pinudjem I.¹²⁴ Nodjmet, on the other hand, did not die until year 1 of either Amenemnisut or Psusennes I, which is the date on her mummy bandage.¹²⁵ She thus would have lived to see Pinudjem I become king, which had happened by year 16 of Smendes, indicated by the docket of renewal of that year on Amenhotep I’s coffin referring to ‘King Pinudjem I’. By this time, whatever their order of

¹¹⁸ Jansen-Winkeln 1992: 31.

¹¹⁹ Epigraphic Survey 1979: pl. 26, pl. 28B.

¹²⁰ Epigraphic Survey 1979: pl. 26.

¹²¹ E.g. Epigraphic Survey 1981: pl. 113, lines 19-20; pl. 114A, lines 18-23.

¹²² Trans. Wentz 1967b: 69. It can be assumed that this title always refers to Piankh (who is specifically named as ‘the General’ in no. 28) as all the letters are roughly contemporary (Wentz 1967b: 5-17).

¹²³ Taylor 1998: 1151.

¹²⁴ Kitchen 1986: 41-42.

¹²⁵ Niwiński 1988: 43. Above, I accepted the premise that the High Priests dated by the reigns of the Tanite kings.

succession, both Piankh and Herihor were surely dead. Nodjmet's close relationship to Pinudjem I is further indicated by the similarity of her coffin to that of Pinudjem I and of his wife Henttawy.¹²⁶ These coffins are the only known examples of entirely gilded coffins dating to the Twenty-first Dynasty, suggesting that they originated in the same workshop at a similar time.¹²⁷ Nodjmet, therefore, was closely linked with Herihor, Piankh, and Pinudjem I, but only in the case of Herihor is the exact nature of the relationship known.

It is important to emphasise that it is assumed that there was only one woman named Nodjmet. The name Nodjmet was relatively common, yet its frequent association with the high-status title Chief of the Harem of Amun¹²⁸ is very significant. There are no firm grounds for postulating the existence of two virtually contemporary women named Nodjmet, both of whom had identical titles.¹²⁹

One fact that must be taken into account in either succession model is that Nodjmet was the mother of a king. In her funerary papyri P. BM 10541 and P. BM 10490 she was, respectively, given the title King's Mother and the epithet *mst k3 nht*, 'who has borne the strong bull' (i.e. a king). This second epithet clearly shows that she had given birth to a king, as 'mother' alone also had the meaning 'mother-in-law' and 'grandmother'.¹³⁰ The identity of this king must now be ascertained.

In both succession models Piankh can be ruled out as he never claimed kingly titles.¹³¹ In the reconstruction proposed by Kitchen (see below), the only candidates for Nodjmet's royal son are Smendes and Amenemnisut.¹³² The former was earlier suggested by Wente,¹³³ whereas Amenemnisut was preferred by Niwiński.¹³⁴ However, both are absent from the procession of Herihor's children in the Khonsu Temple.¹³⁵ Wente argues that Smendes was absent from the procession because he was already residing in Tanis at the time the scene was carved.¹³⁶ However, the fact that nineteen sons were depicted suggests that one of the purposes of the depiction of the procession was to comprehensively list Herihor's children.¹³⁷ It is, therefore, illogical that his most prominent son and heir would have been left out simply because he was not physically present in Thebes at the time the scene was carved.¹³⁸ The only way to rescue the theory is to counter that either Smendes or Amenemnisut was a son of Nodjmet from another marriage, which would explain their exclusion from the procession. However, no evidence has yet been identified linking Nodjmet with Tanis or Smendes, so he can probably be ruled out as Nodjmet's royal son.¹³⁹ Similarly, there is no clear reason as to why Amenemnisut would have been chosen over Piankh's sons,

¹²⁶ Wente 1967a: 159; Niwiński 1988: 62.

¹²⁷ Niwiński 1988: 42, 62.

¹²⁸ In *LRL* no. 35 and in the graffito in the Luxor Temple (both with Piankh), and in the Khonsu Temple, on the Leiden Stela V65, and in the Louvre portion of her funerary papyri, this time with Herihor.

¹²⁹ *Pace* Thijs (2013: 54-69), who unconvincingly and unnecessarily argues that there were indeed two Nodjmet, Nodjmet B being the daughter-in-law of Nodjmet A.

¹³⁰ Wente 1967a: 174.

¹³¹ Wente 1967a: 174.

¹³² Kitchen 1986: 536, 538.

¹³³ Wente 1967a: 174.

¹³⁴ Niwiński 1988: 43-44.

¹³⁵ Taylor 1998: 1147-1148. Niwiński (1988: 44) argues that Amenemnisut was depicted as an infant in another scene on the same wall. However, this child was not named and so this is pure speculation (Taylor 1998: 1148; James and Morkot 2010: 239 n. 34).

¹³⁶ Wente 1967a: 174.

¹³⁷ Taylor 1998: 1147-1148.

¹³⁸ Kitchen 1986: 539; Taylor 1998: 1148.

¹³⁹ Niwiński 1988: 43.

or Piankh himself, to be made king in Tanis, assuming that the High Priests had the authority to do so. Moreover, this king is only attested three times,¹⁴⁰ so no conclusions can be made regarding his parentage. Kitchen's theory that Herihor was Piankh's father-in-law is, therefore, flawed as it does not adequately account for the fact that Nodjmet gave birth to a king.¹⁴¹ We shall return to this issue after a brief discussion of Hreere.

A woman named Hreere (with no titles) was described by Dhutmose as residing in Elephantine while Piankh prepared for his campaign against Panehsy.¹⁴² Hreere was the author of letter no. 38 in which she instructed the troop commander Peseg to give the necropolis personnel their rations, which had not been provided.¹⁴³ This clearly demonstrates her authority, which, in addition to her high-status title Chief of the Harem of Amun (in nos. 38 and 39), led Bierbrier to suggest that she was the wife of Piankh.¹⁴⁴ This has been followed by Niwiński and Jansen-Winkel,¹⁴⁵ but, as will be seen below, this is not the only possible solution.

Hreere's relationship to Nodjmet, fortunately, is clearer: Nodjmet is identified as the daughter of 'King's Mother Hreere'.¹⁴⁶ Nodjmet was the wife of Herihor, which would make Hreere his mother-in-law. This forced the scholars who supported a Herihor-Piankh succession to postulate the existence of two ladies named Hreere: Hreere 'A', the mother of Nodjmet who was significantly older than Piankh, and Hreere 'B', Piankh's wife, who featured in his correspondence.¹⁴⁷ An advantage of the Piankh-Herihor succession model is that it can dispense with the theory of two Hreeres, which depended upon the somewhat unlikely coincidence of two individuals with names that were not particularly common being nearly contemporary.¹⁴⁸

A serious flaw in this reconstruction, however, is that the High Priestly succession is required to have skipped all four of Piankh's sons in favour of his 'son-in-law' Herihor.¹⁴⁹ This would be explained if Piankh's sons were not of sufficient age to succeed him upon his death. It is true that in the Luxor graffito all four of his sons bore priestly titles,¹⁵⁰ but as Piankh was already dead when this scene was carved it would be reasonable to posit that they only attained these titles after his death.¹⁵¹ More difficult to explain, however, is why the succession then ignored all nineteen of Herihor's sons, three of whom bore minor priestly and administrative titles in the Khonsu Temple,¹⁵² in order to revert to Piankh's family.¹⁵³ The

¹⁴⁰ On two gold bow-caps from the tomb of Psusennes I, on stela Berlin 23673, and in Manetho's history (frs. 58-59b).

¹⁴¹ Kitchen 1986: 536, 538. Morkot (2007: 145) has tentatively suggested that Osorkon, the seventeenth in the list of Herihor's children, was Osorkon 'the Elder', who was perhaps a son-in-law of Herihor.

¹⁴² *LRL* no. 2, trans. Wente 1967b: 20-21.

¹⁴³ *LRL* no. 38, trans. Wente 1967b: 74.

¹⁴⁴ Bierbrier 1973: 311.

¹⁴⁵ Niwiński 1988: 43; Jansen-Winkel 1992: 25.

¹⁴⁶ P. BM 10490.

¹⁴⁷ Bierbrier 1973: 311; Kitchen 1986: 45, 538.

¹⁴⁸ Černý 1965: 636.

¹⁴⁹ Von Beckerath 1995: 51; Kitchen 1996: xvi.

¹⁵⁰ Pinudjem I was depicted as High Priest (another indication that Piankh was certainly dead), while Heqanefer was Second Prophet of Amun, Heqamaat was the *sm*-priest of Medinet Habu, and, finally, Ankhefenmut was Chief Steward of Amun and Prophet of Mut.

¹⁵¹ Taylor 1998: 1153.

¹⁵² Ankhefenmut bore the titles Chief Steward of Amun, Prophet of Mut, Prophet of Amun, Overseer of the Horses of the Two Lands, and Leader; Ankhefenamun those of Third Prophet of Amun, Prophet of Onuris, Prophet of Horus of Edfu, and Overseer of the Cattle of Pre; and, finally, Panefer was called Overseer and Companion (Epigraphic Survey 1979: pl. 26, lines 3-10).

passing over of Herihor's sons is a dilemma that also exists in the Herihor-Piankh model. However, the advantage of the latter reconstruction is that it then posits a straight father-son succession between Piankh and Pinudjem I.

This dilemma can be solved with the realisation that there is no firm evidence that Hrere was Piankh's wife; this is simply an assumption made on the basis of the Late Ramesside Letters. Taylor points to a hieratic graffito carved upon a column in the court of Amenhotep III in Luxor Temple that refers to 'the High Priest of Amun-Re, Pinudjem I...whose mother is the Chief of the Harem of Amun'.¹⁵⁴ The only trace of her name is a damaged first hieroglyph, which Daressy tentatively transcribed as *h*, adding a question mark.¹⁵⁵ This led to the widely accepted reading of the name as 'Hrere',¹⁵⁶ which would, therefore, prove that she was the wife of Piankh, Pinudjem I's father.¹⁵⁷ Taylor, however, persuasively argues that the damaged first hieroglyph was *ndm* rather than *h* and so he restores the name 'Nodjmet'.¹⁵⁸ This woman was given the title 'Chief of the Harem of Amun', which is attested for Nodjmet in *LRL* no. 35. Taylor, therefore, suggests that Nodjmet was married to Piankh before she married Herihor, which explains the trust placed in Nodjmet by Piankh, especially in the case of the Medjay.¹⁵⁹ Her involvement in this affair also counts against Niwiński and Jansen-Winkeln's theory that Nodjmet was the daughter of Piankh by Hrere,¹⁶⁰ as she would have been too young to have been given such a weighty responsibility as murder.¹⁶¹

The two most prominent women in Piankh's correspondence, Hrere and Nodjmet, were, therefore, his mother-in-law and wife respectively. The identity of Hrere's husband is unknown but Hrere was clearly a woman of importance. In order to explain the High Priestly succession from Piankh to Herihor, Taylor speculates that the former died when his sons were too young to succeed him.¹⁶² The succession then passed to Herihor, who was presumably already an important figure in Thebes.¹⁶³ Nodjmet married Herihor, thereby avoiding a potential power struggle for the position of High Priest and securing the succession for her son with Piankh, Pinudjem I.¹⁶⁴ A further key strength of this reconstruction is that it provides a reasonable candidate for Nodjmet's royal son: Pinudjem I. As was noted above, Nodjmet certainly lived to see Pinudjem I become king. Hrere's non-literal title of 'King's Mother' in P. BM 10490 in turn probably referred to Herihor¹⁶⁵ (her son-in-law), or perhaps to her grandson Pinudjem I.

One theory yet to be addressed in this article is that Herihor and Piankh were involved in a power struggle for the position of High Priest. This is discounted by the fact that Nodjmet, Herihor's wife, was clearly respected by Pinudjem I (who I argue was her son), as indicated by her richly decorated coffin and the Luxor graffito in which he petitioned Amun

¹⁵³ Von Beckerath 1995: 51.

¹⁵⁴ Taylor 1998: 1149.

¹⁵⁵ Daressy 1910: 185.

¹⁵⁶ Černý (1965: 650 n. 5) suggested that the name should be read 'Henttawy'. However, the lacuna in the inscription is too small to allow such an interpretation (Wente 1967a: 160 n. 44).

¹⁵⁷ Bierbrier 1973: 311; Kitchen 1986: 536; Niwiński 1988: 43; Jansen-Winkeln 1992: 22-37.

¹⁵⁸ Taylor 1998: 1149.

¹⁵⁹ Taylor 1998: 1151.

¹⁶⁰ Niwiński 1988: 43; Jansen-Winkeln 1992: 25.

¹⁶¹ Taylor 1998: 1151.

¹⁶² Taylor 1998: 1153.

¹⁶³ Taylor 1998: 1153.

¹⁶⁴ Taylor 1998: 1153.

¹⁶⁵ Bierbrier 1973: 311; Kitchen 1996: 44.

to grant her a long life.¹⁶⁶ The reverence shown to Nodjmet in the Twenty-first Dynasty counts against the notion that a power struggle existed between Herihor and Piankh. The fact that Pinudjem I had Nodjmet buried with P. BM 10541, which bore depictions of Herihor as king, suggests that Pinudjem I never considered Herihor to be his father's rival.¹⁶⁷

Conclusions

This section has shown that the evidence, in its extant state, does not discount the theory that Herihor succeeded Piankh. Moreover, the hypothesis that Nodjmet was married to Piankh and then to Herihor provides a reasonable explanation as to why all of Herihor's sons were excluded from the succession, a problem that exists in either succession theory. This theory also neatly accounts for Nodjmet's close relationship with Herihor, Piankh, and Pinudjem I, with only one generation separating her from the latter. Herihor's non-literal title of King's Mother could then have referred to her son-in-law Herihor or to her grandson Pinudjem I.

Conclusions

The extant evidence regarding the succession of the High Priests of Amun at the end of the Twentieth Dynasty is open to many different interpretations. It appears likely that prior to the Renaissance the High Priest Amenhotep was suppressed for nine months by the viceroy Panehsy, who was in turn driven out of Thebes on the orders of Ramesses XI. The remaining sources suggest that the suppression occurred between year 17 of Ramesses XI, when Panehsy was in royal favour, and year 19, when resentment towards Panehsy first appeared. Year 19 became the first year of the Renaissance. The first firm attestation of a High Priest in this era comes from Piankh's oracle stela in year 7. Piankh was also certainly High Priest in year 10 of the Renaissance when he campaigned against the former viceroy Panehsy. Piankh's comments made in *LRL* no. 21 indicate that by this time the power of the Pharaoh had declined, but provide insufficient information to show that Piankh actively opposed Ramesses XI.

Herihor was also High Priest under this king, indicated by the decoration of the Hypostyle Hall of the Khonsu Temple, in which they appeared together. He is attested as High Priest in a year 5 (which derives from a largely fictional work) and a year 6 from two dockets of renewal. In the court of the Khonsu Temple and elsewhere he depicted himself as king. Dating all these sources to the Renaissance denies Herihor a kingship that was independent of Ramesses XI. Herihor's kingship should not be discounted; King Herihor is, after all, more frequently attested than Smendes and Amenemnisut. His kingship must, therefore, be incorporated into any chronological reconstruction. The most reasonable interpretation of the evidence is that Herihor was High Priest in the final years of Ramesses XI's reign, the exact length of which is unknown. After Ramesses XI's death he depicted himself as king in the Khonsu Temple. I argue that in Smendes' year 6 Herihor renewed two burials in his capacity as High Priest. If correct, this would place the dockets at the very end of his career, when he was king, suggesting that he dated by the Tanite kings' regnal years. Herihor was soon after succeeded by Pinudjem I, the son of his wife Nodjmet by her previous

¹⁶⁶ Niwiński 1988: 40.

¹⁶⁷ Taylor 1998: 1153.

husband, Piankh.

There is no firm evidence linking Herihor with the early Renaissance, only supposition. There is no need, therefore, to assign Herihor a significant role in the instigation of this era. I argue that the Renaissance was brought about by Ramesses XI himself in order to coincide with the imposition of tomb robbery trials in Thebes. Moreover, it signalled a general return to order after Amenhotep's suppression as well as either the appointment of a new High Priest (Piankh) or the reinstatement of Amenhotep.

The third section has shown that a Piankh-Herihor succession is not contradicted by the genealogical evidence. As the parentage of both Piankh and Herihor is unknown, a wide number of different hypothetical relations between the two men can and have been posited. The theory that Nodjmet was the wife of both Piankh and Herihor fashions the confusing mass of genealogical data into a coherent reconstruction that makes sense of all the facts. It accounts for her close relationship with both of these men and with Pinudjem I, whilst removing the need to postulate the existence of two ladies named Hrere. Pinudjem I was Nodjmet's royal son, for whom she was able to secure the office of High Priest over her second husband's sons due to her position as Chief of the Harem of Amun and her marriage to the two previous High Priests. Like his step-father Herihor, Pinudjem I served first as High Priest and then as king.

In conclusion, the theory that Herihor was preceded by Piankh finds significant support in the surviving evidence. However, due to the fragmentary nature of the sources regarding the succession of the High Priests of Amun at the transition between the Twentieth and Twenty-first Dynasties, this theory will likely continue as a subject of lively debate.

Reconstruction

<i>Ramesses XI</i>	<i>Renaissance</i>	
Year 17		Panehsy received a royal dispatch (P. Turin 1896)
17-18		Amenhotep suppressed by Panehsy
		Panehsy removed from Thebes
19	1	Renaissance inaugurated by Ramesses XI
Between years 19-25	Between years 1-7	Piankh appointed High Priest
25	7	Piankh's oracle stela
28	10	Piankh campaigned against Panehsy
		Latest attestation of Piankh (<i>LRL</i> no. 9)
29	11	Death of Piankh
		Herihor appointed High Priest
29-[31]	11-[13]	HP Herihor decorated the Hypostyle Hall of the Khonsu Temple
[31]	[13]	Death of Ramesses XI

<i>Smendes</i>	
1-6	Herihor decorated the First Court of the Khonsu Temple as king
5	Setting of the fictional <i>Report of Wenamun</i>
6	Burial of Ramesses II renewed by HP/King Herihor (3 rd month of <i>3ht</i> , day 15)
	Burial of Seti I renewed by HP/King Herihor (2 nd month of <i>pri</i> , day 7)
	Death of Herihor
	Pinudjem I appointed High Priest
6-15	Pinudjem I decorated part of the pylon of the Khonsu Temple as High Priest
6	Burials of Tuthmosis II and Amenhotep I renewed by HP Pinudjem I (<i>pri</i>)
9-10	Bandages on mummies of Ramesses III and Seti I made by HP Pinudjem I
13	HP Pinudjem I ordered the osirification of Ramesses III
15	Ramesses III 'brought' by HP Pinudjem I
16	Pinudjem I became king and transferred the title of High Priest to Masaharta
16 onwards	Pinudjem I decorated part of the pylon of the Khonsu Temple as king
16	Burial of Amenhotep I renewed by HP Masaharta, son of King Pinudjem I
25	Menkheperre inducted as High Priest (Banishment Stela, Louvre C. 256)
	Death of Smendes

<i>Amenemnisut</i>	
1	[Possible death and burial of Nodjmet]
4	Menkheperre still serving as High Priest (Banishment Stela)

<i>Psusennes I</i>	
1	[Possible death and burial of Nodjmet]
8	King Pinudjem I ordered the osirification of Ahmose I
	Death of King Pinudjem I

Bibliography

Aldred, C. 1979. 'More Light on the Ramesside Tomb Robberies', in J. Ruffle, G. A. Gaballa and K. A. Kitchen (eds.), *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt*, 92-99. Aris and Phillips: Warminster.

Assmann, J. 1996. *The Mind of Egypt* (trans. A. Jenkins). Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Beckerath, J. von. 1951. *Tanis und Theben: Historische Grundlagen der Ramessidenzeit in Ägypten*. J. J. Augustin: Glückstadt.

Beckerath, J. von. 1994. *Chronologie des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.

Beckerath, J. von. 1995. 'Zur Chronologie der 21. Dynastie', in D. Kessler and R. Schulz (eds.), *Gedenkschrift für Winfried Barta: htp dj n hzj*, 49-55. Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main.

Bierbrier, M. L. 1973. 'Hrere, Wife of the High Priest Paiankh', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32 (3): 311.

Binder, S. 2008. *The Gold of Honour in New Kingdom Egypt*. Aris and Phillips: Oxford.

Bonhême, M. 1979. 'Hérihor fut-il effectivement roi', *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 79: 267-283.

Breasted, J. H. 1906. *Ancient Records of Egypt, Vol. IV: The Twentieth Through the Twenty-sixth Dynasties*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Breasted, J. H. 1924. 'The Decline and Fall of the Egyptian Empire', in J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook and F. E. Alcock (eds.), *Cambridge Ancient History* Vol. II, 164-195. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Černý, J. 1929. 'A Note on the "Repeating of Births"', *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 15: 194-198.

Černý, J. 1965 (reprinted 1975). 'Egypt: From the Death of Ramesses III to the End of the Twenty-first Dynasty', in I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, N. G. L. Hammond and E. Sollberger (eds.), *Cambridge Ancient History* Vol. II, Pt. 2, 606-643. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Daressy, G. E. J. 1909. *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Nos. 61001-61044: Cercueils des cachettes royales*. Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale: Cairo.

Daressy, G. E. J. 1910. 'Le décret d'Amon en faveur du Grand prêtre Pinozem', *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriens* 32: 175-186.

Demidoff, G. 2008. 'Hérihor-Piankhy, Piankhy-Hérihor. Retour sur une controverse', in C. Gallois, P. Grandet and L. Pantalacci (eds.), *Mélanges offerts à François Neveu*, 99-111. Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale: Cairo.

Egberts, A. 1998. 'Hard Times: The Chronology of "The Report of Wenamun" Revised', *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 125: 93-108.

Epigraphic Survey, The. 1979. *The Temple of Khonsu, Vol. 1: Scenes of King Herihor in the Court*. Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: Chicago.

Epigraphic Survey, The. 1981. *The Temple of Khonsu*, Vol. 2: *Scenes and Inscriptions in the Court and the First Hypostyle Hall*. Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: Chicago.

Gardiner, A. H. 1961. *Egypt of the Pharaohs – An Introduction*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.

Gauthier, H. 1914. *Le livre des rois d'Égypte, recueil de titres et protocoles royaux*, Vol. III: *De la IX à la XIV dynastie*. Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale: Cairo.

Golet, O. 1996. 'A New "Robbery" Papyrus: Rochester MAG 51.346.1', *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 82: 107-127.

Gregory, S. R. W. 2006. *High Priest or King: A Study of Elements of Theban Temple Iconography to Determine the Role of Herihor*. University of Birmingham MPhil Thesis.

Gregory, S. R. W. 2013. 'Piankh and Herihor: art, ostraca, and accession in perspective', *Birmingham Egyptology Journal* 1: 5-18.

James, P. and Morkot, R. 2010. 'Herihor's Kingship and the High Priest of Amun Piankh', *Journal of Egyptian History* 3 (2): 231-260.

Jansen-Winkeln, K. 1992. 'Das Ende des Neuen Reiches', *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 119: 22-37.

Jansen-Winkeln, K. 2006. 'Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21', in E. Hornung, R. Krauss and D.A. Warburton (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, 218-233. Brill: Leiden.

Kees, H. 1964. *Die Hohenpriester des Amun von Karnak von Herihor bis zum Ende der A thiopenzeit*. Brill: Leiden.

Kitchen, K. A. 1986. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.)* (2nd Ed.). Aris and Phillips: Warminster.

Kitchen, K. A. 1996. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.)* (3rd Ed.). Aris and Phillips: Warminster.

Kitchen, K. A. 2009. 'An Overview of Fact and Fiction', in G. Broekman, R. Demaree, and O. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st-24th Dynasties, Proceedings of a conference at Leiden University*, 161-201. Peeters: Leiden.

McDowell, A. G. 1990. *Jurisdiction in the Workmen's Community of Deir el-Med na*. Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten: Leiden.

Morkot, R. 2007. 'Tradition, Innovation and Researching the Past in Libyan, Kushite and Saïte Egypt', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 136: 141-164.

Nims, C. F. 1948. 'An Oracle Dated in "The Repeating of Births"', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 7 (3): 157-162.

Niwiński, A. 1988. *Twenty-first Dynasty Coffins from Thebes*. Von Zabern: Mainz am Rhein.

- Niwiński, A. 1992. 'Bürgerkrieg, militärischer Staatsstreich und Ausnahmezustand in Ägypten unter Ramses XI', in I. Gamer-Wallert and W. Helck (eds.), *Festschrift für Emma Brunner-Traut*, 235-262. Attempto Verlag: Tübingen,.
- Peet, T. E. 1930. *The Great Tomb-Robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty*. Clarendon Press: New York.
- Sauneron, S. 2000. *The Priests of Ancient Egypt* (Revised 1957) (trans. D. Lorton). Cornell University Press: London.
- Taylor, J. H. 1998. 'Nodjmet, Payankh and Herihor', in C. J. Eyre (ed.), *Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists*, 1143-1156. Peeters: Leuven.
- Thijs, A. 1999. 'Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, Part III', *Göttinger Miszellen* 173: 175-191.
- Thijs, A. 2003. 'The Troubled Careers of Amenhotep and Panehsy: The High Priest of Amun and the Viceroy of Kush Under the Last Ramessides', *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 31: 289-306.
- Thijs, A. 2005. 'In Search of King Herihor and the Penultimate Ruler of the Twentieth Dynasty', *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 132: 73-91.
- Thijs, A. 2007. 'Pinuzem in the Temple of Khonsu', *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 134: 50-63.
- Thijs, A. 2013. 'Nodjmet A, Daughter of Amenhotep, Wife of Piankh and Mother of Herihor', *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 140: 54-69.
- Varille, A. 1943. *Karnak (-Nord) I*. Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale: Cairo.
- Wente, E. F. 1966. 'The Suppression of the High Priest Amenhotep', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 25 (2): 73-87.
- Wente, E. F. 1967a. 'On the Chronology of the Twenty-first Dynasty', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 26 (3): 155-176.
- Wente, E. F. 1967b. *Late Ramesside Letters*. Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: Chicago.
- Wente, E. F. 1979. 'Preface', in The Epigraphic Survey, *The Temple of Khonsu*, Vol. 1: *Scenes of King Herihor in the Court*, ix-xvii. Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: Chicago.
- Wente, E. F. 1990. *Letters From Ancient Egypt*. Scholars Press: Atlanta, GA.