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A SUGGESTION TO THE ROLE OF PANHESI

Antonio J. Morales

The acquisition of new political capacities and the growth of power of the priesthood of Amun at the end of the New Kingdom are still considered as neglected facets of Egyptian history to research. Only few works have given enough attention to the situation of the House of Amun at the end of the second millennium B.C., when social and economic conflicts were outspread to the rest of institutions of Egypt. Such publications have pointed out the weakness of the kingship and the change of the position of the temple of Amun-Re at Karnak as part of the royal administration.

Many scholars have regarded the event of the suppression of the High Priest Amenhotep when the royal authority was suffering such a decadence at the end of the dynasty. The episode is indirectly known from the expression $p\, h\, w\, r\, n\, p\, h\, m\, ntr\, t\, p\, y\, n\, 'n\, m'$ (lit. the war of the first prophet of Amun) and also from the testimony given by a certain Ahautinufe: 'the barbarians came and seized the Temple, while I was in charge of some asses belonging to my father. Peheti, a barbarian, seized hold of me and took me to Ipip, it being for as long as six months that Amenhotep, who used to be high priest of Amun, had been suppressed'.

\[^{1}\text{I would like to thank Dr. Anthony Leahy, Dr. José Manuel Galán and Dr. José Miguel Serrano for their comments and suggestions on this paper. Also in preparing this article I have benefited from the help of Ben Rayner (Birmingham) with details of the tomb-robberies and the social situation in the Late New Kingdom.}\]


\[^{3}\text{Papyrus BM 10052, 13, 24 (T.E. Peet, The Great Tomb-robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty (Oxford, 1930), pl. 33).}\]


\[^{5}\text{The Egyptian word used to describe the event is $\mathcal{\omega}\, w\, h\, m\, ntr\, t\, p\, y\, n\, 'm'$; the two more references are mentioned in this work in relation to the suppression of the high priest Amenhotep. Both the Egyptian word $\mathcal{\omega}\, w\, h\, m\, ntr\, t\, p\, y\, n\, 'm'$ and Peison's words in P. BM 10383, 2, 4 $\mathcal{\omega}\, w\, h\, m\, ntr\, t\, p\, y\, n\, 'm'$ are for the Egyptian word, see R.O. Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian (Oxford, 1996), 300; R. Hanning, Grobes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (Mainz, 1995), 937; Edgerton, JNES 6 (1947), 221, n. 11; Gardiner, JEA 38 (1952), 28; Wörterbuch V, 59-60, VI, 319-20.}\]
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Amenhotep\textsuperscript{,} both references being within the corpus of tomb-robery papyri from this period. These expressions have been understood to describe a violent action against the head of the priesthood of Amun-Re at Karnak at this moment, Amenhotep.

Wente included both references in his work to introduce the main interpretations of these troubles at Thebes at the end of the dynasty. As he recognised, 'some of those who have recently written on the subject have regarded Panehsi as one who removed the high priest from the scene, probably with direct approval on part of Ramses XI, who was desirous of curtailing the growing power of the priest'. Therefore he points out that Von Beckerath thinks 'Panehsi, acting on the king's behalf, restored Amenhotep to his former position after the depression'. Both interpretations establish the figure of Amenhotep as victim, but only one of them recognises Panhesi's culpability. Moreover, Niwinski\textsuperscript{,} assumes that Panhesi, acting under his king's commands, had been sent to Thebes in order to resolve the social revolts and the political loss of authority, although he concludes opting to consider Panhesi as responsible (culpable) for the suppression and other conflicts at Thebes and northern areas.\textsuperscript{10}

In attempting to determine the right order of the episodes, this work will introduce a new suggestion for the role played by Panhesi (Viceroy of Kush), who seems to have been considered solely responsible of the events at Thebes, mainly due to later sources.\textsuperscript{11} Moreover, a suggestion to the revolts which happened under the authority of Ramses XI and whose victim was Amenhotep will be revised. The main proposal here is not the registration of conclusive evidence, but the arrangement of the causes and events at the suppression of the High Priest Amenhotep (see tables 1 and 2), clarifying Panhesi's role within the suppression.

\textsuperscript{6} Papyrus Mayer A, 6, 4-11 (see previous note to check some corrections and ideas in Peet's translation).
\textsuperscript{7} Wente, JNES 25, 74.
\textsuperscript{8} Wente, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{9} Niwinski, BIFAO 95, 333.
\textsuperscript{10} Niwinski, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{11} See the origin of the sources for Panhesi's negative image as enemy of Egypt in some registers from year 1 of Renaissance onwards: Niwinski, BIFAO 95, 334, n. 21; also Papyrus Berlin 10487, rto. 8, vso. 1 (Cerny, LRL, 36). For the specific chronology of the w\textsuperscript{\textit{w}}mswt period see P. Abbott, A1 and 19, vso. (see Peet, The Great Tomb-robberies, V. 1, 128-129, 133ff); also A. Egberts, 'Hard Times: the chronology of "The Report of Wenamun" revised', ZAS 125 (1998), 93-108; K.A. Kitchen, The Third Intermediate Period (1100-650 BC), (Warminster, 1986), 248ff.
The appointment of Amenhotep as High Priest of Amun at Karnak has been dated in year 9 or 10 of Ramses IX, after a short and not well known period of administration of the temple by his brother, Nesamun. It seems that Ramessesnakht, their father and predecessor at the House of Amun, arranged a productive policy of marriages, which allowed the most loyal relatives to maintain, through the highest titles, the supremacy of the family within the priesthood at Thebes.

One of the first conflicts which is related to Amenhotep must be dated in year 3 of Ramses X. In the third and fourth months of prt the group of craftsmen and workers at Deir el Medina had suffered an irregular situation. After two months of pause, they resumed their work, although Amenhotep commanded not to continue with it. It seems evident from the source that Amenhotep’s decision was not the most productive for some Theban officials, because one week later two scribes and a guardian had to intervene in the trouble.

Given the fact, it would be possible to confer a new significance to the event. The workers, downhearted by the sequence of lack of payments and social protests (including the pressure of foreigners) had been paused for a time as long as two months. It is known that Thebes and its surroundings at this moment were precarious.

Amenhotep, as religious head of the House of Amun, could have intervened on these matters where not only he but also other high officials had responsibilities. The administrative responsible for Deir el Medina, as centre of craftsmen working on behalf of the pharaoh’s tomb, was normally the vizier. Amenhotep’s intervention would be anomalous if contrary to other officials (i.e. the vizier), and that case similarly seems to show certain negative connections among the main institutions at Thebes. In other words, the intervention

---

12 The main source to learn about the appointment of the new high priest Amenhotep is a wall scene close to pylon III on the east side of the wall, connecting to pylons VII and VIII at Karnak (see Lefèbvre, Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon Rôni-Roy et Amenhotep (Paris, 1929), 63; also Kees, Das Priesterturn im ägyptischen Staat vom Neuen Reich bis zur Spatzeit (Leiden, 1953), 126-7; Helck, JARCE 6, 139; Bell, Serapis 6, 17; BARP IV, §492-8).

13 The only inscription as opposed to references in papyri that we know is on the front of the statue base inscribed for his father (Cairo 42162). For the description of this statue and the inscriptions, L. Bell, Serapis 6, 16-27; PM II, 146 (a); Legrain, Catalogue Générale, Statues et Statuettes (Cairo, 1906-1925), vol. II, 29, II., 3-4. For variants of his name and titles, see Lefèbvre, Histoire des grands prêtres, 267.

14 P. Turin cat. 1898; see G. Botti and T. E. Peet, Il giornale della necropoli di Tebe (Turin, 1928), 49, pl. 53, 3.

of Amenhotep in the case—probably not only in this one which has arrived to us but also in other situations of weakness or lack of decisions by the institutions—could have been seen by the institutions at Thebes as a problem for the distribution of power and authority.

Such a perspective has not been pointed out by those who have worked on Amenhotep's problem, focussing the discussion on the intervention—logically a more important point—of Panhesi from the south. This interference has taken the most fruitful comments because scholars have focused their discussions on whether Panhesi was culpable or not. Nevertheless, the attitude of the main authorities at Thebes toward Amenhotep must be considered. The rank of possibilities for the origin of Amenhotep's trouble would be wider, including the internal enemies of the high priest at Thebes, the centre of corruption and crisis at the moment.

One of the key points in Amenhotep's suppression is its date. The difficulty for establishing a chronology is clear, and there is an open debate about the order of the events at the end of the dynasty.\(^6\) The discussion has shown that our knowledge of the last high priests of Amun at Thebes is scanty, as M.L. Bierbrier has pointed out.\(^7\) Bierbrier issues a graffito studied previously by Cerny and Sadek\(^8\) which 'presents an interesting historical problem'.\(^9\)

The problem concerns to the sequence of high priests who were appointed at the temple of Amun at Thebes. The importance of this graffito is interesting. Bierbrier's interpretation is based on the study of the titles and individuals who are mentioned, and also on an analysis of the inheritances and appointments at the offices. The interpretation of the information allows him to establish that "The existence of Ramessesnakht II would certainly force the modification of certain theories about the Twentieth Dynasty, but is not contradicted by any firm evidence. The high priest Amenhotep is last attested in year 17 of Ramesses IX,\(^{10}\)


\(^{17}\) Bierbrier, JEA 58, 195-9.

\(^{18}\) J. Cerny and A.A. Sadek, Graffiti de la montagne thébaine (Cairo, 1970), IV, 21 for the graffito number 1860a.

\(^{19}\) Bierbrier, JEA 58, 195.
and the problem of the dating of his suppression has never been resolved although the existence of a High Priest Ramessesnakht II would of necessity date it before year 8 of Ramesses XI at the latest.  

Bierbrier's interpretation seems to mark two ideas for us. One, based on the lack of information for this period, establishes that the high priest Ramessesnakht II could have been appointed to the office under the reigns of Ramses VI, VII or VIII. The second one opts for considering that Ramessesnakht II would have been appointed to the office after Amenhotep. It is still difficult to determine the right interpretation of these dates, but it seems unlikely to suppose a new High Priest Ramessesnakht in the office under Ramses XI, when Amenhotep's problem was suffered. The sources appear to indicate a change in the authority of the area around years 17 and 18 of Ramses XI with the arrival of Menmaatenakht (royal Treasurer and Granary Overseer), Ounnefer (Vizier) and Ines (who led tribunals in year 1 of Renaissance), but no mention of a heir for the appointment in the temple of Amun is found. The only reference to a priestly appointment appears within the Renaissance period, in year 2, when the Pharaoh appointed Hori as sem priest at Medinet Habu. The appearance of new sources and later discussions will allow us to improve our knowledge of a possible High Priest Ramessesnakht II at Thebes.

Another element to be mentioned in this review of events that happened under the last years of the dynasty is the arrival of foreign populations around the area. It seems worth it to distinguish those populations which were around Thebes when the crisis was started and opened from others, who are mentioned in the sources and have been considered as 'Nubians troops commanded by the Viceroy of Kush Panhesi'.

The main sources for the knowledge of everyday life at Thebes (mainly in relation to the village of Deir el-Medineh and its inhabitants) have shown the situation of weakness and lack of control by the authorities concerning the problem of foreign populations. In this way, some authors have tried to mark out the origin of these populations and their situation during this period at Thebes. Yoyotte pointed out that these foreigners who seized the areas around Thebes were Meshuesh and Libu. And, although the real origin of such groups is uncertain,

---

20 Bierbrier, loc. cit., 199.
21 P. BM 10383, 1, 2-3 (see Peet, The Great Tomb-robberies, 124, pl. XXII).
22 P. BM 10383, 1, 10 (see Peet, The Great Tomb-robberies, 125, pl. XXII).
23 Wente, JNES 25, 84.
it seems probable to see in the north - Middle Egypt and the Delta- the areas of provenance. The consideration of these areas as the locations of foreign population centres could explain the movements of Panhesi's troops to the north in the pursuit of order through military force and seeking a political balance after Amenhotep's suppression. Therefore, the τφω mentioned in the sources could refer to Nubian troops, not related to such groups of foreigners who seem to have been attacking some Theban locations, and a suggestion on the role of these groups and their actions at Thebes will be made below.

**THE SUPPRESSION AND OTHER EVENTS AT THEBES**

As has been already noted, papyrus BM 10052 and papyrus Mayer A are the main sources to learn about the suppression of the high priest, Amenhotep, at Thebes. In particular, the papyrus Mayer A, the translation of which appears in Wente's article,\(^{25}\) seems to submit us an information which should be taken into consideration. The porter Ahautinufe (see above) is reported as saying that a barbarian called Peheti took him to Ipip when Amenhotep had already been suppressed for as long as six months. Below in the document, it is mentioned that he returned after nine whole months of the suppression of Amenhotep. It seems to me important to concentrate on the date of the testimony. If Ahautinufe was presenting his justification before the tribunals on year 1 of the Renaissance, then he could not be referring to acts which had happened in the last two or three years, because he would have referred to these events with a different time expression. Therefore, one of the witnesses, the priest Nesamun, refers to the event saying that he was a child when happening.\(^{26}\) Obviously, the priest must have reached a medium age to develop his career.

In this way, the interpretation that Niwinski noted, 'en l'an 18 de Ramsés XI [...] une guerre civile éclate qui est appelée dans la littérature - à tort - 'la guerre contre Amenhotep'\(^{27}\) points a date which seems not to coincide with other testimonies, such as the royal command to Panhesi in year 17 of Ramses XI\(^{28}\) or the presence of Panhesi at Thebes starting from year 9 or 10 of the same king. The first source, a royal letter, informed Panhesi about the arrival of a royal comission to Thebes to take the control of the institutions, establishing a reinforced

---

\(^{25}\) Wente, JNES 25, 73.

\(^{26}\) P. Mayer A, 2, 10f.

\(^{27}\) Niwinski, BIFAO 95, 336.

\(^{28}\) P. Turin cat. 1986, Kitchen, Ramesside Inscriptions VI, 734-5; see Niwinski, supra, 335.
administration and political system in the area. After reviewing these events, I cannot recognised the sources to confirm a later date as Niwinski does. A fundamental change took place around years 18 or 19 of Ramses XI, since the arrival to Thebes of new royal agents must be seen as the result of a renovated strategy from the Palace. Nevertheless, this criterion does not allow us to consider –as Niwinski does- this stage of the final period in the dynasty as the crucial moment for the suppression of the high priest.

A different chronology for the suppression could be considered under the suspicion of an early arrival of Panhesi from the south. As mentioned previously, the second source to reconsider Niwinski’s ideas is the presence of Panhesi at Thebes since year 9 or 10. How could one explain the presence of the Viceroy of Nubia at Thebes for a period as long as ten years, between the years 9 or 10 and year 18 of Ramses XI? It seems more conceivable to understand that the dangerous situation at Thebes around the first years of such a period forced Panhesi to intervene and maintain his authority in the area for a long period. In this way, Ahautionife’s testimony in year 19 (year 1 of Renaissance) could refer to the previous decade. As Helck pointed out, Ramses XI commanded Panhesi to take the central office of the Granary, imy-r-šĀwy. Such a decision could be considered as a first step to eliminate the crisis at Thebes.

The event could have happened around years 10-12 of Ramses XI. There is no source to know with accuracy the specific date of the suppression but the evidence of an early date could confirm the presence of the Viceroy of Nubia in year 8 or 9. The disturbance and the scandals suffered by the villagers at Thebes around this date would have forced the king to

---

29 In order to consider the date for Panhesi’s establishment at Thebes, see the viceroy of Kush heading a judgment at Thebes in year 9 of Ramses XI, P. BM 10053, vso. (see Peet, The Great Tomb-robberies, 112-22, Kitchen, Ramesside Inscriptions VI, 755-63) and references in the journal of the necropolis to Nubian (called šawah) at Thebes, P. Turin cat. 2018, vso.; see Kitchen Ramesside Inscriptions VI, 856.

30 Such a view seems not to be shared by those who think that Panhesi did not stay as long as the whole period of ten years. See LA II, 1131 (Entry: Turin Taxation Papyrus) where it is mentioned that ‘The text neither states nor implies that Panhesi was in Thebes when it was drawn up’ in reference to Panhesi as responsible of the events at Thebes from the south.

31 W. Helck, Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reich (Leiden, 1958), 395 (n. 6).

32 See J.J. Janssen, Commodity Prices from the Ramesside Period: an Economic Study of the Village of Necropolis Workmen at Thebes (Leiden, 1973) to consider the importance of the food supplies at Deir el Medina.

take the decision of intervention before the definitive weakness of the administration, including the head of the House of Amun, Amenhotep.

The reference to the ḫṣṭw in the Necropolis Journal\textsuperscript{34} has been interpreted by Niwinski as the result of the presence of Nubians at Thebes under the authority of Panhesi. Two ideas could be inferred from this statement: on the one hand, such Nubians could be considered the responsible for the suppression, but this option has been refused previously when considering his superior, Panhesi, as main responsible to establish order in the area (see above).\textsuperscript{35} On the other hand, such a disturbing presence could be understood as isolated actions from some Nubians. These actions are not strange among foreign troops beyond the control of their superiors. Rebellious or insubordinate Nubians could have been those individuals who organised pillage at Thebes. As Niwinski says, ‘L’armée de Panehsy a été installée à Thebes pour assurer la sécurité de la ville contre l’activité des bandes du désert: les ḫṣṭw évoqués à plusieurs reprises par le Journal de la nécropole […] les étrangers ḫṣṭw sont forts à Thebes; c’est plutôt étrange […] ils en sont plus les “habitants du désert” ni “ennemis”’.\textsuperscript{36} As Niwinski points out correctly, the reference to the ḫṣṭw seems to be usual among the Egyptians for these populations around Thebes. On the other hand, the term ḫṣṭw has been understood by the author as a reference to foreign organised troops, evidently, the Nubians troops at Thebes. Although Wente\textsuperscript{37} points out that the ḫṣṭw are only common in the sources since year 12 onwards, it seems probable that they would have appeared at Thebes before, moreover if they are considered the Nubians of Panhesi’s troops, which arrived at Thebes around year 8 or 9.

From this period we have at our disposal the P. Louvre 3169,\textsuperscript{38} dated in year 15 of Ramses XI, where it seems that the authorities at Thebes are agitated by Meshuesh. If the date is correct, and the content is applied to disturbances not originated by Nubians at Thebes, we can consider that not only specific groups of Nubians but also other ḫṣṭw were seen as problematic for the rest of population in the area. Certainly we know about successive

\textsuperscript{34} P. Turin cat. 2018, vso.; see Kichen, \textit{Ramesside Inscriptions} VI, 856.
\textsuperscript{35} The Nubian groups under Panhesi’s control should be distinguished from other populations around Thebes which are worsening the situation of disorder. Later a consideration of isolated actions will be mentioned.
\textsuperscript{36} Niwinski, \textit{BIFAO} 95, 333.
\textsuperscript{37} Wente, \textit{JNES} 25, 83.
\textsuperscript{38} Edited by Maspero, \textit{Mémoires sur quelques papyrus du Louvre} (Paris, 1875), 110-1; Cerný, \textit{A Community of Workmen at Thebes in the Ramesside Period}, BdE 50 (1973) and also Cerný, \textit{CAH} II, 2nd part, chap. 35, 619.
attempts by the Libyans to settle in Egypt. In years 8 and 10 of Ramses IX the advance of Meshuesh is known some days ahead, and in the following five years there is a common recurrence to the problem of these populations around Thebes in the necropolis journal.

The call for a northern troop of mbhy (P. Louvre 3169, see above) make us to suppose that problems at Thebes in year 15 of Ramses XI would be the result of Meshuesh’s attacks. The centres of these foreign populations have been located by Haring not only in the western desert –known locations since first kings of the Ramesside period- but also in Lower Egypt. That situation could have forced Panhesi to go north to maintain order in the area in year 15 of Ramses XI, just when the beginning of Panhesi’s revolt in Cynopolis is located by Niwinski.

The interference of some groups of Nubians at Thebes seems to be clarified with the judgement of some of them under a tribunal presided over by Panhesi in year 9 of Ramses XI. From this we know that the scribe of a funerary temple, with the help of others (among them, some Nubian soldiers), robbed gold and silver from his temple.

Another intervention of the Nubians at Thebes around this date seems not to have produced the same commotion, but surprise among the staff of the referred institution: the seizure of Medinet Habu. According to Wente’s point of view, the wab-priest and guardian of Medinet Habu, Peison, left the temple in the sixth month of Amenhotep’s suppression, when his superior was suppressed. Wente’s ideas about the superior of this priest and guardian seems to me valuable. A ‘second suppression’ could have been determined by Panhesi as responsible of Thebes, looking for some order in the west of Thebes. Peison’s superior would not be the High Priest of Amon-Re (theoretically the main

---

40 Botti and Peet, Il giornale della necropoli di Tebe, pls. 4-5, where it is mentioned a long period of inactivity of the necropolis workmen due to the presence of ḫnsw around western Thebes. Also see pls. 50-51 for a similar problem in year 3 of Ramses X, when work was again suspended.
41 B. Haring in Village Voices (Leiden, 1992), 79. Haring has pointed out that Libyans, Meshuesh and Libu were described in the sources as ḫnty, but no reference to Nubians as ḫnty is mentioned.
42 Niwinski, BIFAO 95, 339, establishes that ‘l’armée nubienne, à la poursuite du grand-prêtre réfugié, atteignit la région de la ville Hardai (Cynopolis grecque) en Moyenne-Egypte’. His interpretation of the event in relation to Amenhotep is not clear, since we do not have specific sources to know the origin of the conflict in the north and the cause of Panhesi’s attack. The only reference which can light more about the problem is the P. Mliyer A, 13, B, 2-3 where is pointed out that Panhesi has attack a group of men in the north (mbhy) For the Egyptian concept, see discussion in Sethe, ZAS 44 (1907), 7. For the situation at Thebes, see C. Aldred, ‘More light on the Ramesside Tomb Robberies’ in J. Ruffle, G.A. Gaballa and K.A. Kitchen (eds.), Glimpses of Ancient Egypt: Studies in Honor of H.W. Fairman (Warminster, 1979), 95-6.
43 P. BM 10053, vso.; see Peet, The Great Tomb Robberies, 112-22, pl. XIX-XXI.
44 P. BM 10383, 2, 5; see Peet, The Great Tomb Robberies, 122-7, pl. XXII.
superior at this institution) but another rank within the high clergy and authority at Medinet Habu. What is clear is that these troops of Ṝˁw must be linked to the same groups that previously we have seen to have produced scandals and conflicts at Thebes.

But the seizure of Medinet Habu could have been part of Panhesi’s new plan for the administration and organisation of the area. Peison, the priest and guardian at Medinet Habu, describes the wrongful action against his superior saying that ‘I left the House of Pharaoh when Panhesi came and suppressed my superior, although there was no fault in him’. It seems strange to see that Peison pointed out that his superior did not commit any fault to be suppressed. I think that Peison’s testimony gives us the idea of Panhesi as the main authority, taking decisions and renovating the hierarchy of the institutions at Thebes. Panhesi could have appointed some high-rank agents to the main offices of eastern and western Thebes. If Peison is referring to an aggressive attack against the religious institution of Medinet Habu, there is no reason to give an explanation about causes for the suppression. Only one can understand that Peison is not describing a violent action but a forced appointment by a new superior (Panhesi) who could not have been considered as official. For this reason, I understand that Peison is describing how his superior was suppressed (by other high official as Panhesi) even without fault: it had been logical to be forcibly suppressed by a rebellious enemy without a reason!

The ordered and slow action of the Nubian troops at Thebes under the responsibility of Panhesi cannot be understood without another source for this period: the Turin Taxation Papyrus. In this document of year 12 of Ramses XI, Panhesi is mentioned supervising the collection of taxes, as his role of ḫm-ḥḥ-nṯy. The indication of his role as supervisor for the area of the south seems to refute any harmful action by his agents and troops against the institutions at Thebes, but rather the reinforcement of them. Moreover, these details show that the balance between the society and the administration is treated carefully for the renovation of capacities and responsibilities of such institutions at Thebes. Although it is not possible to specify for the whole group of Nubians at Thebes, it seems that Panhesi’s behaviour cannot be interpreted neither against the institution of Amon-Re at Karnak and its high priest

---

45 Wente, JNES 25, 84.
46 Since we do not have any specific reference to his superior’s titles, it is not possible to establish the rank of the suppressed official, although it could be the highest authority of Medinet Habu at the moment, a sem priest under the supervision of the high priest Amenhotep?
47 P. BM 10383, 2, 4; see Peet, The Great Tomb Robberies, V. I, 125, pl. XXII.
48 Turin Taxation Papyrus, recto 1, 4-5; see Gardiner, Ramesside Administrative Documents (Oxford, 1995), 36.
Amenhotep nor against the other temples and buildings (see above the case of Peison’s testimony and its possible interpretation).

Among the sources for the clarification of the topic, there is one very important: an inscription at Karnak which relates the suppression of a high priest. The inscription is located on the traverse axis of the Karnak temple, carved on the exterior of the alabaster shrine ‘Amon, Enduring of Monuments’, erected by Thutmose III. Most scholars think that the inscription is related to the events suffered by that High Priest Amenhotep. If one understands the document to be related to Amenhotep, the inscription offers us the chance to consider the supposed version of the victim within the event: Amenhotep. While the main objective in Wente’s work was that of conceiving the specific inscription’s individual, here the analysis of the information given in the inscription will be reviewed in order to define Panhesi’s relation to the case.

The hypothesis that the inscription refers to the suppression would suggest that our high priest could have been reappointed as head of the temple after the episode. Wente, in relation to the seizure of Medinet Habu and the options for Amenhotep at this stage of the scandal, points out that Panhesi was responsible for the seizure of the temple, but this military intervention did not allow Nubian troops to establish order until two months later. It seems, as Wente considers, that Amenhotep, under these circumstances, must have returned to his position as high priest at Karnak.

The inscription, although fragmented, seems to support that idea. The High Priest Amenhotep relates his benefactions for the temple of Amun-Re and his faultless behaviour. The recital of ‘the many benefactions and arduous tasks’ (\(\text{nJ Jw gnw nJ gw} \)) is common within the context of this kind of texts. However, the next column of the inscription is uncommon for its specific meaning and nature. Although the beginning of our column is deleted, it seems that the content would break in the context, as a way to point out this part of the inscription. The first sentence after the deleted beginning is very interesting for our knowledge:

\(\ldots\)seized it. He spent eight whole months in it, and I suffered exceedingly under him.\)

---

49 See plates, figures and translations in Wente, JNES 25, 73-87.
50 See P. Barguet, Le Temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak (Cairo, 1962), 266-7, PM II, 174 (516), pl. XIV.
51 Wente, JNES 25, 85.
52 Inscription of Amenhotep, 17; see Wente’s translation in JNES 25, 78.
53 Inscription of Amenhotep, 18, supra.
The phrase seems to indicate that an individual prepared the seizure of Amenhotep's temple and that he spent eight months there. The length of the suppression in the inscription, eight months, does not coincide with Ahautinufe's testimony (see above), who claimed to have returned after nine months of the suppression. This difference of statement about the number of months of suppression is one of the keys to consider that a period of several years passed between the moment of the suppression lived by Ahautinufe (around year 10-12 of Ramses XI) and his own testimony in year 1 of the Renaissance.

Moreover, any responsibility from the Palace in the suppression of our High Priest must be indicated, since the appealed Pharaoh is the one who caused Amenhotep to return his office. Lines 22-24 show that Amenhotep, suffering the scandal of his suppression, appealed to Pharaoh, and all seems to indicate that Ramses XI took an urgent decision, suppressing 'the one who suppressed me quickly, without his ever having permitted delay'.

The evidence for considering Panhesi as an agent from the Palace has already been mentioned, although it is not possible to determine the behaviour of his troops at Thebes. Panhesi, Viceroy of Kush, should be considered as executing king's commands for intervention. The end of the inscription seems to confirm that Amenhotep returned to his office. Although fragmented, the inscription allows us to recognise the expression \textit{rd.f btm (J)}(\textit{\textit{w}wy})\textit{J} which makes Amenhotep responsible for the control of the Two Lands as head of the important old House of Amun. If Panhesy had been responsible for the suppression, how could one consider the presence of the Viceroy of Kush at Thebes with Amenhotep again in office? Besides, Niwinski offers a very suggestive interpretation of the end of the episode, although such an interpretation seems to me not justified by specific references.

In relation to the so-called Moscow Literary Letter, the link of the document to Amenhotep—according to Niwinski—seems to be focused on one of his titles, that of \textit{wr mB n R\textit{\textit{I}}tmw m Wist}, which has been marked to be similar to the pseudonym in the document.

\footnote{Inscription of Amenhotep, 24; supra.}
\footnote{Wente, \textit{JNES} 25, 85, (n. 45). As Wente notes, 'this is not implying that Panehsi's Nubian troops were themselves innocent of illicit depredations upon the monuments...'.}
\footnote{Wente has read the first signs of the next line (26). However, I could not recognise the presence of these signs for the term \textit{\textit{w}wy} in my review of the original inscription. Perhaps these signs have worn out after years.}
\footnote{See Niwinski, \textit{BIFAO} 95, 341, where the author points out that 'En revanche, après la mort d'Amenhotep, Herihor fit venir le corps de ce héros persécuté pendant la guerre, et il l'honora de funérailles solennelles, dont les traces sont conservées dans une inscription biographique à Karnak'. Although we know the protocols (year 6 of Herihor) for the renovation of some mummies and coffins (Sethi I and Ramses II), such an attitude from Herihor to Amenhotep is not specifically attested; therefore, the reasons for Panhesi's negative image have already been noted (n. 11).}
\footnote{P. Pushkin Museum, 127; M.A. Korostovzeff, \textit{Ieraticheskij Papyrus 127} (Moscow, 1961) and R. Caminos, \textit{The Tale of Woe} (Papyrus Pushkin 127) (Oxford, 1977).}
Ourmai, and which seems to be a key to understand the origin and purpose of the text. There is no mention to Panhesi within the text, although it is said that the enemy arrived from the south. That the enemy from the south is Panhesi is doubtly pointed out by Niwinski. Nevertheless, it seems there is no clear evidence to maintain this point. The unfortunate lack of date in the narrative does not allow us to determine the chronology for the event, although I think that its interpretation cannot be considered as a historical reference to Panhesi and his responsibility in Amenhotep’s suppression. The later sources and data for the conflicts between Herihor, Piankhi and Panhesi do not confirm Panhesi’s responsibility in the suppression, but his confrontation to the new power appeared at Thebes after the last years of his authority in the north. Jansen-Winkeln considered that ‘Offenbar ist Panhesi mit Nachdruck gegen die königliche Macht vorgegangen und bis Unterägypten vorgedrungen’ and moreover the author thinks that Panhesi’s troops could have arrived north of Cynopolis so as to attack Pi-Rameses. However, no mentions of such a military conflict around the capital have reached us.

The lack of archaeological information in the north is actually being completed by the governmental interest in projects directed to this area, so the acquisition of new data might allow the researchers to determine the existence of military conflicts at Pi-Rameses at the end of the New Kingdom. Many details are still opened to discussion on the origins and appointment of Herihor at Thebes. He seems to have been appointed under a situation of crisis in years 17-19 of Ramses XI, Panhesi being still under the king’s authority, and Thebes controlled by the new commissioners from the Palace, Ines, Ounnefer and Menmaatrenakht. The importance of that specific period of two or three years is essential to resolve the appearance of Herihor, who was maybe sent from the Palace. He would later develop a personal policy of independent authority from the Pharaoh Ramses XI in the north. The knowledge of Herihor’s origin and cursus honorum will illuminate more largely our understanding of the suppression of the high priest Amenhotep, uncovering the real image of the Viceroy of Kush, Panhesi, who was considered enemy of Egypt, in spite of his service to Ramses XI.

---

59 Niwinski, *BIFAO* 95, 337.
CONCLUSION

At the end of the New Kingdom, under Ramses XI in the north, Herihor was recognised, as sources show, not only as the High Priest of the temple of Amun-Re at Karnak and head of the religious domain, but also the head of the authority in Upper Egypt. The controversial debate about the real capacities of both regencies and their relationship within the internal policy has opened some discussions in the last years. And it is important to mention that, although Herihor’s superiority was evident in the south, there is no link between his attitude to the Pharaoh in the north and the previous high priests. The circumstances for such an independence seems not to have appeared under the last high priests before Herihor. Ramessesnakht, Nesamun and Amenhotep had accumulated titles and political responsibilities under their families, but no reaction as independent political institution was produced. It is the suppression of Amenhotep and the situation of crisis from years 8 or 9 of Ramses XI onwards what produced a new lay out of the situation at Thebes and the south of Egypt.

Panhesi, as pointed out previously, has been considered differently in recent studies of the topic. The sources for the suppression of Amenhotep show that the well-commented confrontation between Amenhotep and Ramses XI must not have been as strong and ideological as we thought, because the inscription of Amenhotep recognised the king as the unique authority and responsible for the solution of Amenhotep’s suppression.

However, these mentions in the inscription of the high priest do not establish the nature of Panhesi’s intervention in the episode. Some scholars preferred to see Panhesi as the main responsible for the attacks on Thebes around years 9-12 and for the scandals up north in years 17-18 (Cynopolis and northern lands, see reference to Jansen-Winkeln’s interpretation above). Other scholars have interpreted Panhesi’s intervention as a royal decision whose agent and responsible was the Viceroy of Kush, being the best military option in the south.

However a new suggestion has been mentioned here. Panhesi, as Beckerath pointed out (see above), could be certainly consider as commissioner from the Palace whose main

61 See interpretation of such an authority by Bonhême BIFAO 79, 267-83.
62 It has been pointed out that Usimarenakht, Chief Steward of Amun, was possibly one of the Ramessesnakht’s sons (Gardiner, Wilbour II, table III (see Helck, JARCE 6, 138) and Bierbrier, The Late New Kingdom (Warminster, 1975), 11, note 63). Also Meribast (II), Overseer of the Prophets, has been considered as one of his sons (reference to Meribast (II) in tomb of his father-in-law First Prophet of Nekhbet Setau from El-Kab, PM V, 181). We assumes Bierbrier’s idea of a second Ramessesnakht (II), JEA 58, 95-99.
command would be to establish order again at Thebes. His intervention up north of Nubia should be considered an attempt by the Palace to renovate the administration of the centre, being Panhesi’s military forces the best option. Panhesi would act under king’s commands, controlling the area with his troops and renovating any weak institution at Thebes. On the other hand, the presence of his troops could have been negatively considered by those who worked and lived at Thebes. It has been suggested some attacks which could have been committed by Nubians, although the main problem at the moment—as sources mention—would be related to other foreign populations. Such groups would be an obstacle to establish order, and so it seems to indicate Panhesi’s attacks up north of Thebes. Finally, Panhesi would not be culpable of Amenhotep’s suppression, since its date has been established in years 8-12 and, at this moment, Panhesi is clearly recognised as royal commissioner to finish with the open crisis at Thebes. Moreover, it seems to me that Panhesi continues playing a royal role until new circumstances forced him to leave Thebes and to become an enemy for Herihor’s authority in the south. There is no clear evidence of the events in the previous two years to the Renaissance period, but the Herihor’s presence at Thebes would change completely the disposition of the authorities in the south.

While the discussion about Panhesi’s real purposes for the intervention in the north is open needing new discoveries and data, the evidence of confrontation between Panhesi and the new High Priest Herihor is well documented. Such a disposition of confronted individuals at the end of that period seems to me relevant, being one of the keys to understand not only the origin and achievements of Herihor, but also to determine the nature of Panhesi’s intervention, its purpose and the situation registered in the first years of the Renaissance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HISTORICAL EVENT</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2, R IX</td>
<td>Ramessesnakht (Amenhotep’s father) is last attested in his office at Karnak</td>
<td>See W. Helck, <em>JARCE</em> 6 (1967), 138-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9, R IX</td>
<td>Supplies to Deir el Medina fell into arrears</td>
<td>P. Turin Cat. 2083/178 rto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10, R IX</td>
<td>Amenhotep’s first attestation as high priest of Amun at Karnak</td>
<td>Karnak temple, wall scene by pylon III on east side of wall, in connection to pylons VII y VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Breasted, <em>Ancient Records</em>, §492-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3, R X</td>
<td>Necropolis workmen have been paused for two months</td>
<td>P. Turin Cat. 1898 + 1937 + 2094/244 rto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3, R X</td>
<td>Amenhotep’s intervention on protests by workers from Deir el Medina</td>
<td>P. Turin Cat. 1898; see Botti and Peet, <em>Il giornale della necropoli di Tebe</em>, 49, pl. 53, n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 8-10, R XI</td>
<td>Nubians’ arrival to Thebes</td>
<td>P. Mayer A, 6, 3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. BM 10383, 2, 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See T.E. Peet, <em>The Great Tomb-robberies</em>, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(P. Mayer A) and 122-6 (P. BM 10383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9, R XI</td>
<td>Panhesi examines a case as head of the tribunal</td>
<td>P. BM 10053 vso., 3 (fragmented line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12, R XI</td>
<td>Some Nubians are allotted with land</td>
<td>See Gardiner, <em>Ramesside Administrative Documents</em>, 37, 13; 38, 1; 41, 7; 42, 6; 43, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 12-14, R XI</td>
<td>Some Nubians are requested for payments</td>
<td>P. Turin Cat. 1985 and 2006 vso., 1, 1-2, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Gardiner, <em>JEA</em> 27 (1941), 35-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The main episodes related to the high priest Amenhotep, his suppression and the Viceroy of Kush Panhesi (I).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HISTORICAL EVENT</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years 12-14, R XI</td>
<td>Panhesi as General and Overseer of Granaries of Pharaoh Panhesi controls payments to the necropolis workmen and officials</td>
<td>P. Turin Cat. 1895 and 2006 no. 1, 1-6 Also P. Turin Cat. 2018 (Panhesi's payments to workmen and officials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The vizier appeals to medjay troops to the Delta (problems with Meshuesh in the north likewise)</td>
<td>P. Louvre 3169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 17, R XI</td>
<td>Panhesi is required to co-operate with the Royal Butler in sending offerings north</td>
<td>P. Turin Cat. 1896. See Kitchen, <em>Ramesside Inscriptions</em> VI, 734-5; BAR §595-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panhesi’s attack up north; later he left Thebes</td>
<td>P. Mayer A, 13B, 2 P. BM 10052, 10, 11ff. See T.E. Peet, <em>The Mayer Papyri A and B</em> (P. Mayer A) and The Great Tomb-robberies, 155 (P. BM 10052), 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New officials are appointed at Thebes from the Palace</td>
<td>P. BM 10383, 1, 2-3 See Peet (above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herihor appears as the highest authority at Thebes</td>
<td>Building Inscription in the temple of Khonsu LO III, 238 d, Text III, 65; BAR §601-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 19, R XI</td>
<td>Panhesi is considered enemy of Egypt (negative determinatives in the composition of his name)</td>
<td>P. Mayer A, 13B, 3 P. BM 10383, 2, 5 P. BM 10052, 10, 18 See Peet (above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 19, R XI</td>
<td>Ahautinufe’s testimony about a seized temple</td>
<td>P. Mayer A, 6, 4-11 See Peet (above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2, wft mswt</td>
<td>Peison’s testimony about his superior’s suppression</td>
<td>P. BM 10383, 2, 4 See Peet (above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2, wft mswt</td>
<td>Hori’s appointment as sem priest at Medinet Habu by the Pharaoh (Herihor or R XI?)</td>
<td>P. BM 10383, 1, 10 See Niwinski, <em>BIFAO</em> 95 (1995), 329-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The main episodes related to the high priest Amenhotep, his suppression and the Viceroy of Kush Panhesi (II).