



BRILL

Journal of Egyptian History 6 (2013) 217–254

JOURNAL of
EGYPTIAN
HISTORY

brill.com/jeh

Two Studies in 21st Dynasty Chronology*

I: Deconstructing Manetho's 21st Dynasty

II: The Datelines of High Priest Menkheperre

Peter James

Independent Researcher
London, UK

Robert Morkot

Department of Archaeology
University of Exeter, UK

Part I:

Deconstructing Manetho's 21st Dynasty

Abstract

There has never been any consensus on the nature, composition and chronology of the "21st Dynasty". Recent research has produced an ever-increasing multiplicity of rival models, most still relying on the information given in the surviving epitomes of the Hellenistic scholar Manetho. The claim that the regnal years given by "Manetho" for the 21st Dynasty are corroborated by the monuments is completely unjustified and based on circular reasoning. Progress can only be made by completely abandoning reliance on Manetho (a hangover from early 19th century, pre-decipherment, scholarship) once and for all.

Keywords

Manetho; King Lists; Third Intermediate Period chronology; 21st Dynasty; Tanis

* * * *

* Our thanks to Peter van der Veen, Bill Manley, Robert Porter, José Lull and Nikos Kokkinos for reading earlier drafts and providing valuable feedback. Peter James gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the Mainwaring Archive Foundation, whose assistance made the research and preparation of this article possible.

I. Introduction

In a recent publication on Third Intermediate Period chronology Kenneth Kitchen wrote:

Very happily, we now have near-unanimity on the number and reigns of the 21st Dynasty . . . This is a case wherein the surviving (and much battered) text of Manetho's epitome is better preserved to us, and more closely in tune with the data from first-hand evidence available to us from original text sources. Thus we have seven kings in both Manetho and the first-hand textual/archaeological sources . . .¹

He supports this statement with a table giving the figures for reign-lengths from the Africanus recension of Manetho and the highest regnal years from contemporary documents:

<i>Manetho</i>		<i>Contemporary Documents</i>
Smendes:	26	Hedjkheperre Smendes "up to Year 25"
Psusennes	46	Akheperre Psusennes (I) "up to Year 49"
Nepherkheres	04	Neferkare Amenemnisu "up to Year [4?]"
Amenophthis	09	Usimare Amenemope "up to Year 10"
Osochor	06	Akheperre Osorkon "up to Year 2"
Psinaches	09	Neterkheperre Siamun "up to Year 17"
Psusennes	14	Tyetkheperre Psusennes (II) "Years 5, 13"

At first glance this may appear to provide an impressive (though rough) series of matches. A closer look at the monumental evidence reveals a very different picture, far from the optimistic "near-unanimity" claimed by Kitchen:

- Smendes. It has been repeatedly stressed that there are *no dated documents* bearing the name of Smendes.² An anonymous year 25 occurs on the Mau-nier Stelav,³ but its attribution to Smendes is mere guesswork, influenced in the first place by the fact that Manetho accorded him a reign of 26 years.⁴ The same year 25 has been attributed to the Theban king Pinudjem I by

¹ Kitchen, "The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: An Overview of Fact & Fiction," 191.

² Young, "Some Notes on the Chronology and Genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty," 109; James, *et al.*, "Bronze to Iron Age Chronology," 76; James, *et al.*, *Centuries of Darkness*, 232; Hagens, "A Critical Review of Dead-Reckoning," 156–57; Thijs, "In Search of King Herihor," 77–78; James and Morkot, "Herihor's Kingship," 244; Jansen-Winkeln, "Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21," 229.

³ von Beckerath, "Die Stele der Verbannten im Museum des Louvre," 10.

⁴ von Beckerath, "Die Stele der Verbannten im Museum des Louvre," 31–32.

Jansen-Winkeln,⁵ who stresses that there is no evidence for adherence to Tanite dating in the south before the reign of Amenemope.

- Psusennes I. Again, there are *no* certain dated documents bearing the name of this pharaoh. An anonymous series of bandage epigraphs, “up to Year 49”, as Kitchen says, have been assigned to him, but the attribution remains controversial. The Year 49 epigraph is a notorious problem as it actually reads “King Amenemope: Year 49”, liberally restored by Kitchen “as part of a now incomplete legend: [Year *x* of] King Amenemope: Year 49 [of King Psusennes I], or the like.”⁶ Demidoff still supports its attribution to Amenemope.⁷ (For an alternative interpretation see Part II of this paper.)
- Amenemnisu. Again, there are *no* dated documents bearing the name of this pharaoh. Kitchen’s “up to Year [4?]” is based on a complete restoration by von Beckerath of a lacuna on the Maunier stela. NB, von Beckerath judged (from the space) that there was room for the Year number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11 or possibly even 20.⁸ Kitchen’s choice of “up to Year [4?]” is thus highly selective, to say the least, and was clearly made to provide a match with the Manethonian figure. Jansen-Winkeln follows von Beckerath’s restoration of a “low year”, but assigns it, not to Amenemnisu, but to the HPA Menkheperre.⁹ Two translations of the text do not restore a date at all,¹⁰ while it can also be argued that the restoration of a much higher year date (such as 30, to follow the 25 mentioned earlier in the text) is at least equally probable.¹¹
- Amenemope. Kitchen’s “up to Year 10” here comes from a bandage epigraph on linen made by HPA Pinudjem II. There is no reference to Amenemope and, as Kitchen admits, “this may just possibly be year 10 of Siamun”.¹² The problematic Year 49 aside (see above), the highest certain regnal year of Amenemope is 5 (from a copy of the Book of the Dead).¹³
- Akheperre Osorkon. The only known year is 2 (Karnak Priestly Annals Fr. 3Ba).¹⁴

⁵ Jansen-Winkeln, “Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 230–31, n. 73; cf. Krauss, “Ein Modell für die chronologische Einordnung der Maunier-Stele.”

⁶ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 29.

⁷ Demidoff, “Hérihor-Piankhy, Piankhy-Hérihor,” 107–08.

⁸ von Beckerath, “Die Stele der Verbannten im Museum des Louvre,” 33 and n. 2.

⁹ Jansen-Winkeln, “Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 230–31, n. 73.

¹⁰ Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV, 318; Sternberg-el Hotabi, “Die Stele der Verbannten (Louvre C256),” 114.

¹¹ James, “The Date of the Oracle on the Maunier (‘Banishment’) Stela.”

¹² Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 421.

¹³ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 421.

¹⁴ Kruchten, *Les Annales des Prêtres de Karnak*, 45–46.

- Siamun. The highest certain year is 17, as stated by Kitchen (Karnak Priestly Annals Fr. 3Bb and an Abydos graffito).¹⁵
- Psusennes II. The year 5 referred to by Kitchen is from a bandage epigraph mentioning HPA Psusennes ‘III’, but lacking a king’s name, while the reading of the figure is uncertain.¹⁶ The year 13 is from the Karnak priestly annals in a fragment (3Bc) which must be later than Siamun.¹⁷ On the basis on Manetho’s order of kings, Kitchen concludes that this “can only be Psusennes II or possibly Shoshenq I”,¹⁸ leaving it far from certain. Nevertheless a probable year 11 (reading slightly uncertain) of Psusennes II has been identified by Payraudeau on a fragment of priestly annals from Karnak.¹⁹ There is also a good case for assigning the Year 19 of a “Pharaoh Psusennes” on the Dakhleh Stela to the second, rather than first king of this name.²⁰

Now, let us compare the figures again:

<i>Manetho</i>		<i>Monuments (highest certainly attested year)</i>	
Smendes	26	Hedjkheperre Smendes	00
Psusennes	46	Akheperre Psusennes (I)	00
Nepherkheres	04	Neferkare Amenemnisu	00
Amenophthis	09	Usimare Amenemope	05
Osochor	06	Akheperre Osorkon	02
Psinaches	09	Neterkheperre Siamun	17
Psusennes	14	Tyetskheperre Psusennes (II)	11?, 19?

With this, the alleged series of matches melts away completely. Manetho’s figures are not confirmed by the monuments, *even in one instance*. Some figures *similar* to those in Manetho, such as the 26 for Smendes and the 46 for Psusennes can be drawn from the monuments and associated with those rulers—as in the case of the 25th year on the Maunier stela and the year 49 bandage. But their assignment to these kings remains entirely hypothetical. To follow Manetho in assigning figures that match his regnal years and then to present the result as a confirmation of Manetho is merely circular.

¹⁵ Kruchten, *Les Annales des Prêtres de Karnak*, 47–48; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 423.

¹⁶ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 423.

¹⁷ Kruchten, *Les Annales des Prêtres de Karnak*, 48.

¹⁸ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 423.

¹⁹ Payraudeau, “De nouvelles annales sacerdotales,” 294–96.

²⁰ Krauss, “Das wrš-Datum aus Jahr 5 von Sheshonq [I],” 44–45; “An Egyptian Chronology for Dynasties XIII to XXV,” 179. See further below, in Part II of this paper.

II. Inconsistent Methodology

Almost all reconstructions of the 21st Dynasty still rely on Manetho, not only to supplement ambiguous inscriptional evidence, fill in blanks or decide between alternative interpretations of the inscriptional evidence, but to provide the *very structure* of this dynasty. Kitchen, whose model for the 21st Dynasty is that most widely followed, relies heavily on Manetho.

While it should have been barely needed, we have long cautioned against the use of Manetho.²¹ All that survives from this Hellenistic writer are fragments and often contradictory summaries, preserved largely in the works of early ecclesiastical historians. Though some of the extant narrative fragments (as relayed, e.g. by Josephus) may well be genuine, the bulk of the original work compiled by Manetho is hidden from us. Even if an original (or early) manuscript was discovered, we would only be better informed about how Egyptian history was being presented to the Hellenistic world in the early Ptolemaic period—but still none the wiser about the actual chronology of the Old, Middle and New Kingdoms and the Third Intermediate Period.

The use of Manetho and Herodotus, supplemented with scraps from other Graeco-Roman writers and Late Antique epitomisers, as a basis for Egyptian chronology, is perfectly understandable in an early 19th century world that had no ability to read original sources, and little access to Egypt or its remains. Equally, the desire to link the ‘hieroglyphic record’ with those ancient sources is typical of a mentality that thought that ancient writers were essentially recording ‘facts’ and an ultimate truth. But this was a world that still largely believed the veracity of the Biblical sources and chronologies, a society that still believed that God had created the world about 4004 BC. It is astounding that any academic discipline can still, nearly two centuries after the decipherment of hieroglyphic, give such authority to such a poor survival as ‘Manetho.’ It is unfortunate for Egyptology as an academic discipline that it did not totally abandon Manetho in the middle of the 19th century. Despite trenchant comments from some Egyptologists, and some serious text criticism of ‘Manetho’ as a Hellenistic text whose chronological presentation was specifically tailored for a Greek-speaking audience,²² there are still attempts to hammer ancient Egypt into a Manethonian shape—rather than a serious attempt to deal with the material solely from an archaeological, documentary, art-historical and material culture perspective.

²¹ James, *et al.*, *Centuries of Darkness*, 222–24; James and Morkot, Letter [reply to Kitchen].

²² See Dillery, “The First Egyptian Narrative History”; Kokkinos, “Ancient Chronography, Eratosthenes and the Dating of the Fall of Troy,” esp. 245–46.

Manetho's figures, as transmitted, may often prove to be correct. But that does not permit us to use the summaries of his writings as if they were a primary source. Compared with the reign-lengths from the monumental evidence, the figures given by both Manetho and Herodotus are reasonably accurate for the 26th Dynasty (7th–6th centuries BC). Not surprisingly. As Herodotus (2.154) explained, from the time that Psammetichus I began settling Ionian and Carian mercenaries, the Greeks began to know Egypt and recent Egyptian history intimately.²³ Yet we only have to step back one generation, to the preceding 25th Dynasty (early 7th century BC), and both Herodotus and Manetho already begin to fail. As Kitchen stresses:

The surviving Manethonian versions of the 25th Dynasty are . . . absolutely riddled with errors from end to end . . . NOT ONE FIGURE IS CORRECT. They are WRONG.²⁴

Kitchen's opinion of the Manethonian 23rd Dynasty is (quite rightly) equally poor: ". . . the names for the 23rd Dynasty in our extant versions of Manetho . . . are practically worthless . . ."²⁵ Yet Kitchen blithely uses Manetho in order to reconstruct the 21st Dynasty, usually thought to have terminated some three hundred years before the beginning of the 26th Dynasty. There is no excuse, in methodological terms, for arguing that the surviving Manethonian figures are totally inaccurate for the 25th Dynasty, or the names "practically worthless" for the 23rd, but miraculously reliable for the 21st—this is just selective use of data. As shown above, the claim that this portion of Manetho's work is "better preserved" relies on entirely circular arguments. Reign-lengths aside, the very order and composition of Manetho's 21st Dynasty should be held in the *gravest* doubt. Kitchen himself accepts that while Manetho has the order Psusennes—Amenemnisu, the little controlling evidence available (from the Berlin genealogy of the Memphite priests) would suggest that Amenemnisu reigned first.²⁶

III. The Need for a Paradigm Shift

Since we first offered a general critique of Third Intermediate Period chronology in 1987,²⁷ its fundamental problems have attracted the interest of many

²³ On Greek familiarity with the 26th Dynasty see James, "Naukratis Revisited," esp. 245–46.

²⁴ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 554–5 (his capital letters).

²⁵ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 126, n. 199.

²⁶ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 8–9; "The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: An Overview of Fact & Fiction," 191.

²⁷ James, *et al.*, "Bronze to Iron Age Chronology in the Old World," esp. 75–83; *Centuries of Darkness*, esp. 235–246.

other scholars. Dodson argued that Psusennes “II”, usually thought to be the last king of the 21st Dynasty, was a Theban “shadow king” rather than a ruler of Tanis, whose reign should be viewed as wholly contemporary with that of Shoshenq I.²⁸ This would make Psusennes II a chronological irrelevance and reduce the length of the TIP by 14 years.²⁹ Dodson has been persuaded by new evidence to withdraw his suggestion,³⁰ but the status of Psusennes II as alleged sole ruler of Egypt for 14 or 24 years³¹ when he is so meagrely attested by contemporary monuments remains a moot point.

Following our general suggestions, Hagens argued for an internal compression of the 21st Dynasty by assigning regnal years to Pinudjem I, and a greater overlap between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties—with a shortening of chronology by some 75 years.³² In a series of detailed articles, Thijs has argued for a shortening of 20th Dynasty chronology by some 12 years,³³ developing into more radical suggestions such as the separation of HPA Pinudjem I and King Pinudjem and the idea that kings Pinudjem and Herihor were the last rulers of the 20th Dynasty.³⁴ His work was partly inspired by another radical suggestion, by Jansen-Winkeln, that the order of Herihor and Piankh as High Priests under Ramesses XI should be reversed.³⁵

One of the most important developments in recent 21st Dynasty studies has been the realisation (contra Young, Wente, Černý and Kitchen) that the Theban kings from this period really could have ruled in their own right, counting

²⁸ Dodson, “Psusennes II”; “An Enigmatic Cartouche”; “Psusennes II and Sheshonq I”; “Towards a Minimum Chronology.”

²⁹ Cf. Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, xix–xx.

³⁰ Dodson, “The Transition Between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties Revisited.”

³¹ Respectively Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 13; Krauss, “Das wrš-Datum aus Jahr 5 von Sheshonq [I].” Neither of these figures is based on the monuments. Kitchen’s 14 years is taken from Manetho (Africanus recension). That of Krauss is based on the Year 19 of the Dakhleh Stela, rounded up by “correcting” the figure in Africanus from 14 to 24.

³² Hagens, “A Critical Review of Dead-Reckoning from the 21st Dynasty.”

³³ See the following by Thijs: “Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, Part I”; “Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, Part II”; “Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, Part III”; “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part IV”; “‘Please tell Amon to bring me back from Yar’, Dhutmose’s visits to Nubia”; “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part V”; “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part VI”; “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part VII”; “The troubled careers of Amenhotep and Panehsy”; “Pap. Turin 2018, the journeys of the scribe Dhutmose and the career of the Chief Workman Bekenmut”; “‘My father was buried during your reign.’” See also Gasse, “Panakhemipet et ses complices,” 91.

³⁴ Thijs, “In Search of King Herihor”; “King or High Priest?”

³⁵ Jansen-Winkeln, “Das Ende des Neuen Reiches,” “Die thebanischen Gründer der 21. Dynastie” and “Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 225–26. See, however, James and Morkot, “Herihor’s Kingship,” for less radical alternatives to the suggestions of both Jansen-Winkeln and Thijs.

their own regnal years. Dogmatic assertions aside,³⁶ the axiom that the priests and kings of Thebes only dated according to the reign of Tanite rulers has been successfully challenged. It actually makes little sense to assume that Tanite dating was used at Thebes *throughout* the Dynasty, for as Jansen-Winkeln observes during the first half of the dynasty Tanite rulers are barely attested in the south. In contrast, as he stresses, there are numerous monuments and inscriptions in Upper Egypt from three high priests of this period (Herihor, Pinudjem I and Menkheperre) who have “royal attributes and titles to differing extents.”³⁷ Why, Jansen-Winkeln asks, should they not have had their own regnal years?

Kitchen’s response to Jansen-Winkeln stated:

The hard fact remains that, for 1000 years before the 21st Dynasty, *nobody* since some Middle-Egyptian nomarchs had ever used personal regnal years unless they were King of Egypt, in reality or by claim (with all the trappings) as in the 2nd Intermediate Period. . . . there is no scrap of real evidence so far, to assign wholly independent year-dates to the Theban high priests.”³⁸

Kitchen is right to a degree, but overlooks an important point. Many of the 21st Dynasty HPAs did *not* claim any royal titles—namely Masaharta, Djed-Khons-ef-ankh, Smendes II and Pinudjem II. So there is no question of them having had any regnal years. Jansen-Winkeln’s argument works with respect to those that *did* claim royal titles, sometimes “with all the trappings,” *i.e.* Herihor, Pinudjem I and possibly Menkheperre. The latter’s adoption of royal titulary is the least certain, but the first two cases are clear enough, at least with respect to their *claims* to kingship, however limited this may have been in practice (to Thebes or Upper Egypt). Both Herihor and Pinudjem I claimed full royal titles, even though Herihor’s choice of prenomen was “High Priest of Amun.” In agreement with Jansen-Winkeln, Thijs has argued persuasively that both

³⁶ Kitchen (*Third Intermediate Period*, 533) wrote with respect to the 21st Dynasty: “It is, by now, a well attested fact that no Theban governor (not even ‘King’ Pinudjem I!) had independent regnal years.” Similarly Niwinski (*21st Dynasty Coffins*, 47, his emphasis) refers to the “*unquestionable rule* that the high priests [of Dynasty 21] conformed to the practise of dating to the regnal years of the Tanite kings.” Again he refers to the “fact that [King] Pinudjem did not have his own regnal years” (Niwinski, *21st Dynasty Coffins*, 43). Even so Niwinski had to make an exception in the case of the Year 48 of Menkheperre epigraph (see below, Part II of this paper).

³⁷ Jansen Winkeln, “Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 229. Matters are different during the latter part of the dynasty, when Tanite kings are very well attested at Thebes. Amenemope occurs on a number of bandage epigraphs from the Second Cache at Deir el-Bahri, the first Tanite ruler (indisputably) to be so. His close successor Siamun is attested on a number of documents from Thebes.

³⁸ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, xvii, xviii.

Herihor and King Pinudjem counted their own regnal years, the most certain instance being Pinudjem's Year 8.³⁹

To paraphrase Kitchen, and turn his argument on its head, there is “no scrap of real evidence so far” to ascribe any Theban year-dates in the first half of the dynasty to Tanite kings. There is thus every reason to re-evaluate the old idea that the year-dates we have from bandage epigraphs, *etc.*, from the earlier part refer to the regnal years of *Theban kings*. Effectively we are seeing a return to the idea of earlier Egyptologists that the 21st Dynasty should be seen as two lines of kings, a northern one at Tanis and a southern one of “priest-kings” based at Thebes. Petrie described the period as one where “two dynasties went on contemporaneously, the XXIst of Tanis and the XXIst of Thebes.”⁴⁰

As Dodson writes (with specific reference to the 21st Dynasty), the “golden (or perhaps silver!) age” of consensus established by Kitchen's *Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (1973; 1986) began to end in the late 1980s “as a number of studies began to appear that questioned some of its key conclusions” and “we are now solidly back in chaos as far as certain elements of the period are concerned”.⁴¹ The problems and questions raised since 1987 have rendered complacency about the old view of the 21st Dynasty, based largely on Manetho, untenable. The study of Manetho's “History of Egypt” is of great interest, but properly belongs to the field of Hellenistic chronography; it is not a tool for some Egyptologists, apparently unaware that we live in an age with far more rigorous attitudes towards source criticism, to use selectively in reconstructions of Egyptian history.

³⁹ Thijs, “In Search of King Herihor”; “King or High Priest?” See also James and Morkot, “Herihor's Kingship” and below, Part II of this paper.

⁴⁰ Petrie, *A History of Egypt III*, 188.

⁴¹ Dodson, “The Transition Between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties Revisited,” 103.

Part II: The Datelines of High Priest Menkheperre

Abstract

This section of the article follows up a model we proposed for the early 21st Dynasty in *JEGH* (2010),⁴² which suggested that Piankh held the pontificate while Herihor was king. Such a model could resolve the recent debate regarding the order of HPAs Herihor and Piankh. Here the next major controversy of 21st Dynasty chronology is addressed—the question of whether the high year dates from the time of HPA Menkheperre belonged to King Psusennes or Amenemope of Tanis. It is argued that they belonged to neither, but to the *wꜥm-mswt* or “Renaissance” era which started late in the reign of Ramesses XI. Allocating the high datelines from the pontificate of Menkheperre to the *wꜥm-mswt* would resolve a number of otherwise intractable problems, and results in a shortening of 21st Dynasty chronology by some four decades, in step with both archaeological and genealogical evidence.

Keywords

Menkheperre; High Priests of Amun; 21st Dynasty chronology; Thebes; “Renaissance” era; Psusennes I; Amenemope

* * * *

I. Introduction

The chronology of the 21st Dynasty continues to be one of the most controversial topics in Egyptology. Much of the debate focusses on a historical figure who dominates the central period of the Dynasty and whose documents offer a welcome amount of both chronological and historical information—Menkheperre, High Priest of Amun at Thebes.

If (with good reason) we eschew the use of Manetho’s kinglist for this dynasty and work from primary sources alone (see Part I of this paper), the genealogy of Menkheperre’s family provides the only firm backbone for its reconstruction—the reason being that there is no certain genealogy for the Tanite royal line of this period.⁴³ The genealogical succession of the HPAs Piankh—Pinudjem I—Menkheperre—Pinudjem II *is* well attested, but the chronological relationships of this line to the Tanite rulers of the 21st Dynasty are still a matter of controversy. Documents naming these HPAs contain numerous datelines, a large number of which are frustratingly anonymous in that no king’s name is attached to the regnal year. While the traditional reconstruction of the 21st Dynasty—as typified by Kenneth Kitchen’s *The Third Intermediate Period*—

⁴² James and Morkot, “Herihor’s Kingship and the High Priest of Amun Piankh.”

⁴³ See James, *et al.*, “Mediterranean Chronology in Crisis”, 32–33.

would attribute all these year-dates to the kings of Tanis (Smendes, Amenemnisu, Psusennes I, Amenemope and Siamun), Jansen-Winkeln has challenged this, pointing out that there is no evidence of Tanite political control in Upper Egypt (UE) earlier than the reign of Amenemope:

In the first half of Dyn. 21, HP Herihor, Pinudjem I and Menkheperre have royal attributes and titles to differing extents. On the other hand, the LE kings of that time are virtually not recorded at all in UE: there is a graffito mentioning Smendes and a rock-stela, and nothing for Amenemnisu and Psusennes I, even though the latter reigned for a long time. Subsequently, however, Amenemope and Siamun are well documented in Thebes, and Osochor at least once, whereas Pinudjem II (who held office parallel to them) does not adopt any royal attributes or titles. It is, therefore, likely that the HP who called themselves kings counted their own years of reign whereas during the second half of the dynasty the dates refer to the LE kings.⁴⁴

Essentially this is a return to the old Egyptological opinion that, in parallel with the Tanite 21st Dynasty there was a line of Theban ‘priest-kings’ who counted their own regnal years.⁴⁵ James and Morkot offered further arguments for recognising both Herihor and Pinudjem I as kings with full royal powers, including the ability to appoint their nominees to the pontificate. As a resolution to the recent controversy over their order, we argued that when he took the throne Herihor appointed Piankh as HPA. On the death of Piankh his son Pinudjem inherited the pontificate, again under King Herihor, until his elevation to kingship as Pinudjem I.⁴⁶

An experimental model for the Upper Egyptian rulers of the early 21st Dynasty was developed, assigning the Theban regnal years from this period to kings Herihor and Pinudjem I (see Table 1 below). The considerable monumental work of Herihor suggests a fairly long reign, matching the 20 years promised him in an oracle. The datelines 6, 10, 11, 13, and 15 associated with Pinudjem as HPA could thus belong to Herihor. Pinudjem’s son Masaharta is associated with years 16 and 18, which would also belong to Herihor, but a change is noticeable. In the year 16 Masaharta is called “son of King Pinudjem”; by that year Pinudjem I must have assumed kingship—presumably as a junior co-regent of Herihor.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Jansen-Winkeln, “Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 229.

⁴⁵ For example, Budge (*A History of Egypt*, 13, 22, 29), who assigned regnal years to Herihor, Menkheperre and Pinudjem I and Hall (“Eclipse of Egypt,” 254), who thought that Pinudjem I, at least, had his own regnal years.

⁴⁶ James and Morkot, “Herihor’s Kingship.”

⁴⁷ Kitchen (*Third Intermediate Period*, 258–59) likewise argues that Pinudjem I assumed kingship in the Year 16 of another ruler—though he considers this to have been the Tanite pharaoh Smendes. This understanding is commonplace—see e.g. Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 112.

Table 1 R = “Renaissance” era. Synchronisms indicated by *italics*.

R	20th Dynasty	HPAs/Kings (Theban)
01	(Ramesses XI)	19 Herihor?
02		20 Herihor
03		21 Herihor
04		22 Herihor
05		23 <i>Herihor ~ Wenamun's voyage</i>
06		24 <i>Herihor</i> → (Herihor) 1?
07		25 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 2
08		26 (Herihor) 3
09		27 (Herihor) 4
10		28 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 5
11		29 <i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 6
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 7
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 8
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 9
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 10
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 11
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 12
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 13
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 14
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 15
		<i>Masaharta</i> (Herihor) 16/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 1
		<i>Masaharta</i> (Herihor) 17/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 2
		<i>Masaharta</i> (Herihor) 18/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 3
		(Herihor) 19/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 4
		(Herihor) 20/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 5
		(Herihor) 21/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 6
		(<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 7
		(<i>Pinudjem</i>) I 8

Here we examine further the case for Pinudjem I's regnal years, and develop the model further for the next phase of history in Upper Egypt: the period when Menkheperre was HPA.

II. The Year 6

There are a number of datelines associated with Menkheperre in bandage epigraphs and inscriptions: 6, (7), 25, (27), (30), 40, 48 and (49)—dates in parentheses do not mention Menkheperre and are deduced to belong to the time of his pontificate. The high regnal years, referred to here as the “high year count” for convenience, will be turned to after discussion of the Year 6.

The Year 6 comes from a bandage epigraph on the mummy of Seti I (Deir el-Bahri cache), which states that the linen was made by HPA Menkheperre.⁴⁸ Another epigraph records the reinterment of Seti in a Year 7.⁴⁹ As it comes from the same mummy this too almost certainly relates to the pontificate of Menkheperre.

These epigraphs are usually linked with another set referring to Years 7 and 8 which can be associated with the period when Menkheperre's father Pinudjem was a king. The Year 7 records the reburial of Queen Ahmose-Sitkamose.⁵⁰ In "probably the same hand,"⁵¹ the Year 8 epigraph concerns the reburial of Ahmose I and, conspicuously, names Pinudjem as king. A further Year 8 epigraph, again with apparently the same handwriting, is for the reburial of the 18th Dynasty Prince Siamun.⁵²

We thus have two groups of datelines which may be related:

- A. Years 6 and 7, from the pontificate of Menkheperre.
- B. Years 7 and 8 (twice), during the reign of Pinudjem I.

Young claimed that the two groups could be associated "because of the handwriting."⁵³ Wente took exception to this, noting that the Year 6 epigraph from the mummy of Seti I was "certainly a hieroglyphic ink inscription" and hence cannot be compared to the other epigraphs, which are all in hieratic. As he notes:

The inscription of the Year 7 recording the restoration of Sethos I's mummy . . . is the only one of the three documents cited by Young that can legitimately used as a basis for comparison of the handwriting. I do not see any close similarity between the handwriting of this docket and the one on the mummy of Ahmose I.⁵⁴

Wente's caution is borne out by a comparison of the two epigraphs.⁵⁵ Yet while identity of handwriting cannot be used to prove the association of groups A and B, neither can the lack of identity demonstrate the converse.

⁴⁸ Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV, 321; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 420, No. 37; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 216.

⁴⁹ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 420, No. 38; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 219, doc. 37.

⁵⁰ Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV, 314; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 219, doc. 38.

⁵¹ Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV, 314.

⁵² Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 159, doc. 20, 164.

⁵³ Young, "Some Notes on the Chronology and Genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty," 102.

⁵⁴ Wente, "On the Chronology of the Twenty-First Dynasty," 169, n. 115.

⁵⁵ For illustrations see conveniently Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 363, doc. 37 and 356, doc. 20.

The majority opinion remains that the two groups are connected.⁵⁶ After all, they *should* be close in time: Menkheperre was the son of Pinudjem I and certainly served under him as High Priest, making the recurrence of a Year 7 in both groups probably more than a coincidence. In fact deduction can rule out other out candidates—on any chronology. There were only two other pontiffs under Pinudjem I: Masaharta and Djed-khons-ef-ankh, both apparently older brothers of Menkheperre. Masaharta's documents do not appear to be dated by the years of Pinudjem I, but either by those of Smendes, Psusennes I or Herihor.⁵⁷ Only two year-dates are known: 16 and 18, the first of which names Masaharta as son of Pinudjem as King. In documents from earlier in this sequence (e.g. Years 13 and 15) Pinudjem appears only as HPA, so it is generally assumed that his assumption of kingship was in Year 16 (see above and n. 44). This would rule out Group B (with Years 7 and 8 of King Pinudjem) falling earlier in that sequence. The same logic would apply to the ephemeral Djed-khons-ef-ankh, who is usually thought to have held the highpriesthood briefly between Masaharta and Menkheperre, i.e. after the Year 18 in this count.⁵⁸ It follows that it was Menkheperre who HPA in the Years 7 and 8, the latter of which was associated with Pinudjem as king.

In agreement with Kitchen, the Years 6–8 with Pinudjem as king must belong to a different reign from the earlier sequence of 6–15 where he is described as HPA (and here assumed to be regnal years of Herihor).⁵⁹ To which king, then, do the Years 6–8 refer? The natural choice Pinudjem I himself was assumed by earlier Egyptologists and the idea was revived by Hagens.⁶⁰ It is strongly supported by the wording of the epigraph on the mummy of Seti I:

Year 8, third month of the second season, day 29. The majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the two lands, Khakheperre Pinudjem-Meriamun, L.P.H., commanded to osirify King Nebpehtire (Ahmose I).⁶¹

⁵⁶ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 262, 420; Niwinski, *21st Dynasty Coffins*, 208, Table VI; Hagens, "A Critical Review of Dead-Reckoning," 157; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 219.

⁵⁷ See respectively Kitchen (Smendes); Hagens, "A Critical Review of Dead-Reckoning," 157 (Psusennes); Thijs, "In Search of King Herihor"; James and Morkot, "Herihor's Kingship" (Herihor).

⁵⁸ As Jansen-Winkel ("Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21," 225) notes: "We cannot totally exclude the possibility that he was a predecessor of Masaharta's who was in office for only a short period." This possibility does not affect the argument here.

⁵⁹ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 420.

⁶⁰ E.g. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt IV*, 297, 314; Hagens, "A Critical Review of Dead-Reckoning," 156–57.

⁶¹ Trans. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt IV*, 314; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 159; Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 116.

While the most obvious reading is that this refers to a Year 8 of King Pinudjem, Kitchen assigns it to Psusennes I, as: “It is, by now, a well-attested fact that no Theban governor (not even “King” Pinudjem!) had independent regnal years of his own”; again, “*not a single year-date* is ever expressly attributed to any high priest of Amun of this period.”⁶² This is missing the point somewhat. In the epigraph in question Pinudjem I *is a king, not high-priest*. An increasing number of scholars would now agree that those HPAs who adopted full royal titles could well have accorded themselves regnal years. For example, Thijs fairly described the attribution of the Year 8 epigraph to Psusennes I as a “glaring anomaly”:

On the present hypothesis one would at least expect an explicit reference to “year 8 of king Psusennes I” to avoid any misunderstanding concerning the actual eponymy. Its absence presupposes a remarkably casual approach from the side of both kings and scribes alike (“let’s freely connect the regnal year of one king with another, who cares?”) to what must have been quite a sensitive issue, especially given that in Kitchen’s scenario Pinuzem was actively kept from exercising eponymy by no less than three subsequent kings. Its explicit date was taken by Breasted to refer to the reign of Pinuzem himself, which is of course the most natural, if not the only possible interpretation of the evidence.⁶³

Psusennes I is generally thought to have been a son of Pinudjem, by Henttawy daughter of the first 21st Dynasty Tanite ruler Smendes and Tentamun.⁶⁴ Given that, the ascription of datelines associated with Pinudjem to Psusennes I becomes even more curious: we would have to accept that a king with full titles (Pinudjem I) *used the regnal years of his son!* It barely needs stating that such a practice is totally unprecedented in Egyptian history. Further, Pinudjem’s kingship seems to have been recognised (to some extent) at Tanis, where two reused blocks bearing his name were found.⁶⁵ The converse cannot be said for Psusennes I. The only monument from Upper Egypt that has been ascribed to him is the Dakhleh Stela, referring to a Year 19 of “Pharaoh Psusennes,” but this

⁶² Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 533; xvii.

⁶³ Thijs, “King or High Priest?” See Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV, 297, 314.

⁶⁴ Wente, “On the Chronology of the 21st Dynasty,” 175; Niwinski, “Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy,” 66; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 534, 537–39, cf. 47–52; Broekman, “The Founders of the Twenty-First Dynasty,” 17; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 215; Jansen-Winkel, “Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 224.

⁶⁵ Wente, “On the Chronology of the 21st Dynasty,” 156–57, n. 129; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period* 1986, 262; Lull *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 181) Montet, *La Nécropole Royale de Tanis, II*, 30: “. . . le fils de Râ, qui a pris [la couronne rouge] et la couronne blanche, le maître des diadèmes Painodjem [Aimé d’Har]akhte.” Unfortunately the blocks have never been properly published, leaving their relationship to others mentioned by Montet as bearing the name of Psusennes I, unclear.

most likely belongs to Psusennes II rather than I.⁶⁶ “Pharaoh” is known as a title of Har-Psusennes (II) from the Abydos graffito,⁶⁷ but is not known from documents relating to Psusennes I.

It seems inescapable that the epigraph on the mummy of Ahmose refers to a Year 8 of King Pinudjem. Given this, and granted that we can link this inscription with Group A as above, then the Years 6 and 7 (when Menkheperre supervised the reburial of Seti I) would also belong to his reign.

III. Dating the Start of Menkheperre’s Pontificate

This conclusion can be used to test the model developed by James and Morkot⁶⁸ for the earlier part of the Dynasty, as the Years 6 and 7 allow us to place Menkheperre relative to Pinudjem I as follows:

Table 2 R = “Renaissance” era. Synchronisms indicated by *italics*.

R	20th DYNASTY	HPAs/KINGS (Theban)
01	(Ramesses XI)	19 Herihor?
02		20 Herihor
03		21 Herihor
04		22 Herihor
05		23 <i>Herihor ~ Wenamun’s voyage</i>
06		24 <i>Herihor</i> → (Herihor) 1?
07		25 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 2
08		26 (Herihor) 3
09		27 (Herihor) 4
10		28 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 5
11		29 <i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 6
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 7
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 8
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 9
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 10
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 11
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 12
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 13
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 14
		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 15

⁶⁶ Krauss, “Das wrš-Datum aus Jahr 5 von Sheshonq [I],” 44–45; “An Egyptian Chronology for Dynasties XIII to XXV,” 179. This is not to accept the lunar dates which Krauss employs in his arguments, which are entirely hypothetical—for criticism see Leahy, “The Date of the ‘Larger’ Dakhleh Stela.”

⁶⁷ Dodson, “The Transition Between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties Revisited,” 106.

⁶⁸ James and Morkot, “Herihor’s Kingship.”

Table 2 (*cont.*)

R	20th DYNASTY	HPAs/KINGS (Theban)
	<i>Masaharta</i>	(Herihor) 16/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 1
	Masaharta	(Herihor) 17/ (Pinudjem) 2
	<i>Masaharta</i>	(Herihor) 18/ (Pinudjem) 3
	<i>Djed-Khons-ef-ankh?</i>	(Herihor) 19/ (Pinudjem) 4
	<i>Menkheperre?</i>	(Herihor) 20/ (Pinudjem) 5
	<i>Menkheperre</i>	(Herihor) 21/ (Pinudjem) 6
	Menkheperre	(Pinudjem) 7
	Menkheperre	(<i>Pinudjem</i>) 8

Encouragingly, the Years 6 and 7 fit neatly into sequence as regnal years of Pinudjem I. As already noted, Menkheperre's older brother Masaharta was HPA until at least the Year 18 (assumed to be of Herihor), the equivalent of Year 3 of King Pinudjem. It is generally agreed that the pontificate of the next brother, Djed-Khons-ef-ankh (attested by one inscription only⁶⁹) was ephemeral, perhaps not even lasting a year. These facts fit with the suggestion that Menkheperre had assumed the high priesthood at least by Year 6 of King Pinudjem—and hence perhaps already by his Year 5.

Yet while this model is internally consistent it would seem to be contradicted by the record of the Maunier Stela, which dates Menkheperre's triumphal entry into Thebes and his appointment as HPA in a Year 25:

Regnal year 25, first month of Inundation, [day] 2 [+x... There occurred the processional appearance of the Majesty of this noble god, the Lord of the Gods, Amon-Re, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, in [...], (8) while he (Amon) charged him firmly as he established him in the position of his father as the First Prophet of Amon-Re, King of the Gods, and great general of Upper and Lower Egypt...⁷⁰

To understand whether this is genuinely a contradiction with the proposed dating of Menkheperre's accession to a Year 5, we need to examine the evidence for the whole series of high year dates associated with Menkheperre.

IV. The "High Year Count"

The following years, known from various inscriptions, are either directly associated with, or ascribed to the HPA Menkheperre:

⁶⁹ See conveniently Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 202–04, 338.

⁷⁰ ll. 4 & 7–8, trans. Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 126–127.

- 25 The Maunier Stela (Louvre C 256), which recounts the take-over of Thebes by Menkheperre son of King Pinudjem. A year 25 is mentioned twice in the text.⁷¹
- (27) An inscription in a Theban tomb refers to a Year 27. While it is anonymous, Dodson and Janssen have shown that it is from the 21st Dynasty and almost certainly belongs to the “high year count” series associated with the time of Menkheperre.⁷²
- (30) A fragmentary docket from a mummy in the Bab el-Gasus cache, with the name of a king missing (only the end of the cartouche being preserved). Generally agreed to belong to this period and tentatively restored by Kitchen as “Year 30; [linen by ?Menkheperre son of Pinudjem], (end of cartouche) for Amun.”⁷³
- (30) It is argued that the third year date on the Maunier Stela was incorrectly restored by von Beckerath as the low year number of a new Pharaoh (see Part I of this paper), and might be restored as a further year of the “high year count,” possibly “30”.⁷⁴
- 40 From the Karnak Priestly Annals, a record of the inspection of various temples ordered by Menkheperre son of King Pinudjem.⁷⁵ The inspector was Tjanefer 4PA, son of Nesipaherenmut 4PA.⁷⁶
- 48 Docket on Mummy 105 from the Bab el-Gasus cache.⁷⁷ As this appears to ascribe the year to Menkheperre as HPA, it has caused considerable controversy (see below).
- 48 Karnak Restoration Stela describing renovation and new building at the Temple of Amun by Menkheperre son of King Pinudjem.⁷⁸
- (49) A possibly incomplete bandage epigraph from the second cache at Deir el-Bahri reads “King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Amenemope; Regnal Year 49.”⁷⁹ As the name of Amenemope is otherwise associated on burials with HPAs Smendes II (once) and Pinudjem II (nine mummies), both sons of

⁷¹ ll. 1 & 4; for edition and translations see von Beckerath, “Die Stele der Verbannten im Museum des Louvre”; Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV, 316–20; Sternberg-el Hotabi, “Die Stele der Verbannten (Louvre C256)”; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 227–28; Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 124–29.

⁷² Dodson and Janssen, “A Theban Tomb and its Tenants.”

⁷³ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón tebanos*, 220; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 420.

⁷⁴ James, “The Date of the Oracle on the Maunier (‘Banishment’) Stela”.

⁷⁵ Trans. Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 217; Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 50.

⁷⁶ This Tjanefer (later 3PA, bracelets of Pinudjem II) married Gautsoshen i daughter of Menkheperre and was father of 3PA Menkheperre B and 4PA Pinudjem (Bierbrier, *The Late New Kingdom in Egypt*, 40–50).

⁷⁷ Daressy, “Les Cercueils des Prêtres d’Ammon,” 30; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 220.

⁷⁸ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón tebanos*, 217–18, Fig. 51; trans. Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 136–37.

⁷⁹ Daressy, “Contribution à l’étude de la XXI^e dynastie égyptienne,” 78.

Menkheperre,⁸⁰ as well as the burial of his daughter Gautsoshen i,⁸¹ there can be no doubt that this year 49 followed the preceding Year 48.

- (49) A year 49, with no king or HPA's name is known from Papyrus Brooklyn 16.205. Once ascribed to Shoshenq III, it is now thought to date to the 21st Dynasty.⁸² The text, which is from Upper Egypt, refers to the year as a "bad time" (*h3w bjn*), presumably referring to some critical situation, possibly a change in governance.⁸³ Conceivably it refers to the death of some dignitary, perhaps Menkheperre himself.

Noticeably, throughout most of the period spanned by these documents (up to the Year 48), where Menkheperre is mentioned by name he is described as "son of King Pinudjem." Could this mean that the "high year count" belongs to King Pinudjem and that we should extend his reign from his highest attested year 8 to a generous 48? It is a scenario that would create some difficulties. To judge from his mummy, Masaharta son of King Pinudjem was between 40 and 50 when he died,⁸⁴ no later than the Year 6 of Pinudjem I. This would make Pinudjem at least 55–65 by that year. Granting him a further 42 years of reign (after the demise of Masaharta) would make him 97–107 by the time of his death. While not impossible, we should remember we are dealing with minimum estimates here.

If the high regnal years did not relate to Pinudjem I, might they have actually belonged to Psusennes I, as in the conventional (Kitchen) model for this period? Again, this seems unlikely. Ascribing the "high year count" up to 49 to Psusennes I has also led to similar problems with age factors. These are Kitchen's estimates for the age at death for the main figures of this period:

<u>Tanis</u>	<u>Thebes</u>
Smendes 82	Pinudjem I 79
Amenemnisu 66+	Menkheperre 88
Psusennes 87	Smendes II 50
Amenemope 69–74	Pinudjem II 66
Osochor 50/60	

⁸⁰ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 421. Lull ("Sobre la cronologia de Menkheperre"; "Beginning and End of the High Priest Menkheperre") has argued persuasively that the ephemeral Smendes II was appointed as Menkheperre's successor as HPA during the lifetime of the latter—while it would be anomalous to have two pontiffs at the same time, the situation may be explained by Menkheperre's quasi-royal status.

⁸¹ Daressy "Les Cercueils des Prêtres d'Ammon," 14, 38, No. 152.

⁸² von Beckerath, "Zur Datierung des Papyrus Brooklyn 16.205"; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, xxvi.

⁸³ Jansen-Winkeln, "Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21," 229, n. 68, 231, n. 77.

⁸⁴ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 78.

Siamun 54/59

Psusennes II

= ?

Psusennes III 70⁸⁵

Of course there is no reason, for example, why Psusennes could not have reigned for 49 years and died at the age of 87. Indeed his remains show he was an old man at death.⁸⁶ But the fallout from this assumption is that this half-century reign has to be paralleled by an equally long pontificate for Menkheperre, of 53 years and equally high ages for all the rulers of the early- to mid-21st Dynasty. Assigning the “high year count” to Amenemope changes the picture only slightly, with Menkheperre requiring a slightly shorter pontificate of 49 years.⁸⁷ On any chronology the assumption that the “high year count” belongs to a Tanite ruler produces a curious rash of near septuagenarians and octogenarians.

The half-century pontificate allowed for Menkheperre has also given rise to problems with dating coffin-styles. Niwinski’s carefully researched typology of 21st Dynasty coffin-types leaves some puzzling gaps.⁸⁸ For example lid and mummy-cover type II-a is attested in the time of Pinudjem I and his son HPA Masaharta, but not again until the end of the pontificate of Menkheperre and that of Pinudjem II, nearly 35 years later on the standard chronology. The same “gap” applies to case interior types 2-b and 2-c. In fact of Niwinski’s twenty-eight typological groups only one (case exterior A) is presented as having been continuous before, during and after the time of Menkheperre. Something is clearly wrong here: coffin types were surely not discontinued and then resurrected some three decades later. Niwinski does not think so, and in many cases extends the currency of various types on his Table VII with dotted lines. Yet with the number of burials known from the 21st Dynasty one wonders why such “gaps” should be posited in the first place.

With respect to the 21st Dynasty as a whole there are also suspicious “gaps” in a wide range of other archaeological evidence: Apis bulls, ostraca, donation stelae, genealogies (in the sense of “missing” generations), administrative documents and even statuary.⁸⁹ Leahy noted “the remarkable dearth of statuary, even recycled pieces, datable to the Twenty-First Dynasty,” and concluded that “there does seem to have been a hiatus in [statue] production in the Twenty-

⁸⁵ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 79–81.

⁸⁶ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 80 and n. 392.

⁸⁷ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 466.

⁸⁸ See Niwinski, *21st Dynasty Coffins*, Table VII.

⁸⁹ See briefly James, *et al.*, *Centuries of Darkness*, 234–47; James, *et al.*, “Mediterranean Chronology in Crisis,” 32–33; in more detail James and Morkot, “A Genealogical Approach to the Chronology of the 21st Dynasty”.

first Dynasty” lasting “nearly 150 years.”⁹⁰ To focus more closely on the period which most concerns this article, Broekman referred to “the nearly 50-year long pontificate of Menkheperre A—from which we hardly know one official.”⁹¹ Because of this and other gaps in the records of 21st Dynasty officials, Niwinski “is convinced that a ‘third cachette’ somewhere at Deir el-Bahari can furnish us one day [with] several dozens of these, including perhaps one or more Second Prophets of Amun, at present unknown to us.”⁹² There is indeed the likelihood of at least another cache near Deir el-Bahari, but while (hypothetically) it might provide the names of some of the ‘missing’ officials, such a find alone cannot solve the wider documentary and archaeological problems of the Dynasty.

V. A Long Reign for Psusennes I or Amenemope?

Niwinski also ventured a small shortening of the length of the 21st Dynasty by about a decade, but did not challenge the length of Menkheperre’s pontificate (see further below).⁹³ The question is inextricably linked with the extremely vexed issue of which Tanite ruler the “high year count” should be attributed. So Niwinski:

... the main problem of the chronology of the XXIst Dynasty is the dilemma: to which of the two Tanite rulers, Psusennes I or Amenemope, should we confer the long reign?⁹⁴

There is no need to rehearse all the arguments for and against these two candidates.⁹⁵ While Kitchen’s conclusion was that the case for Psusennes I was the stronger (reversing his earlier position), it should be remembered that there is no certain evidence that Psusennes I was recognised as a ruler at Thebes.⁹⁶ Yet all the documents in question are Theban. In this respect the case for Amenemope is actually much stronger, as his name *does* appear on a number of

⁹⁰ Leahy, “A Battered Statue of Shedsunefertem”, 181, 184.

⁹¹ Broekman, “On the Chronology and Genealogy of the Second, Third and Fourth Prophets of Amon,” 35, n. 66.

⁹² Pers. comm. 1999, cited in Broekman, “On the Chronology and Genealogy of the Second, Third and Fourth Prophets of Amon,” 25, n. 36.

⁹³ Niwinski, *21st Dynasty Coffins*, 49.

⁹⁴ Niwinski, “Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy”, 56 and *21st Dynasty Coffins*, 46.

⁹⁵ The lengthy analysis by Kitchen (*Third Intermediate Period*, 24–39) is thorough and exemplary; see now Lull (*Los sumos sacerdotes*, 220–23) for a more up-to-date summary of differing viewpoints.

⁹⁶ See above and Jansen-Winkel, “Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 229.

bandage epigraphs from Thebes. One of these would appear to refer to his Year 49 (see above).

Nevertheless the hypothesis of a long reign for Amenemope suffers from a fatal flaw. The burial goods of Psusennes I at Tanis include bracelets made by an HPA Smendes, son of Menkheperre, and carrying the name of Akheperre Psusennes.⁹⁷ They were either made for him in his lifetime or, more likely, were a burial gift. An HPA Smendes (“II”) is well known as a son of HPA Menkheperre (and grandson of King Pinudjem) from a small number of documents.⁹⁸ He must have succeeded his father in office, or as Lull has suggested (see n. 79 above) was briefly co-opted by Menkheperre as a co-pontiff. The problem, then, for a long reign for Amenemope is that it would interpose a huge gulf of time (half a century) between the burial of Psusennes I and the pontificate of Smendes in Thebes. The alternative is to posit an otherwise unknown Tanite HPA Smendes, the son of an otherwise unknown Menkheperre.⁹⁹ Kitchen rightly pointed out the implausibility of such a solution:

... it makes far better sense to postulate *one* high priest Smendes son of Menkheperre who briefly succeeded his father in Thebes and saw out the reign of Psusennes (hence the bracelets). Particularly if (*on either view*) the Theban Smendes II were the son of Theban Menkheperre: *two* high priests with identical names, corresponding offices, and separate but identically named fathers (a less usual name at that)—all this seems a very improbable assumption within one limited span of years. Assumption of but one such high priest at the time is a far more ‘economical’ hypothesis, and favours that of a long reign for Psusennes.¹⁰⁰

Yet this does not mean that one can lightly grant the long reign to Psusennes by simply reassigning him the Year 49 document. In order to do so some

⁹⁷ See Leclant (“Psousennès,” 411–12), who corrected Montet’s understanding that *ir(w).n* indicated a filiation from Smendes, as opposed to the bracelets being “made” by him. As Leclant noted, the absence of any royal title shows that the Smendes involved could not have been a king.

⁹⁸ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 246–50.

⁹⁹ It is clear that there was a Tanite cult of Amun during the 21st Dynasty, with both Psusennes I and his successor Amenemope claiming the title High Priest of Amun (Kitchen *Third Intermediate Period*, 428–429).

¹⁰⁰ Kitchen *Third Intermediate Period*, 35. The scenario offered by Demidoff (“Hérihor-Piankhy, Piankhy-Hérihor,” 108–09) in defence of a long reign for Amenemope is weak. In this, Smendes son of Menkheperre held the Tanite high priesthood at Tanis very briefly—at the death of Psusennes I, and before Amenemope assumed the title. Demidoff argues that Smendes may have been between 20 and 25 years of age and could have survived another 50 years in order to succeed his father as HPA at Thebes. While this is biologically possible, it leaves a remarkable gap in the career of Smendes II, granting him two ephemeral pontificates (one at Tanis, the other at Thebes), separated by half a century.

elaborate restoration of the epigraph is required. Kitchen suggests this: “It must . . . be understood as part of a now incomplete legend: [Year *x* of] King Amenemope: Year 49 [of King Psusennes I], or the like.”¹⁰¹ It would indicate a co-regency between Psusennes I and Amenemope, which is also possible. However, as Jansen-Winkel notes, the very assumption of a long reign for Psusennes I ultimately depends on Manetho (46 years in the recension of Africanus, 41 in that of Eusebius.) We actually do not have *one* certain date-line for Psusennes I and reliance on Manetho’s figures is methodologically unsound, however tempting it might seem in the absence of other evidence.

Further, a similar co-regency explanation (between Psusennes I and Amenemope) cannot be offered for the next highest date, which is the Year 48. This is attested twice (for references see above): first on a stela recording the restoration work done by Menkheperre (son of King Pinudjem) at Karnak; second on a bandage from Mummy 105 which says simply “Year 48 *n* (of) Menkheperre.”¹⁰² Of this Gardiner wrote that “it certainly belongs” to HPA Menkheperre.¹⁰³

Kitchen has offered this explanation:

. . . as high priest and shadow “king”, Menkheperre at the end adopted (or was attributed) the regnal years of Psusennes I—precisely as also Hatshepsut used as hers the regnal years of Tuthmosis III, or Tewosret continued the regnal years of Siptah, using in each case the years of an already-reigning king. So, Menkheperre may later have used (or been assigned) the years of Psusennes I in a precisely similar way.¹⁰⁴

The two cases cited by Kitchen are poor analogies. In the case of Hatshepsut it is agreed that she “counted her own years from her co-regent’s accession, so that Thutmose’s accession date is taken for hers.”¹⁰⁵ As Hatshepsut acted as regent for the young Thutmose III, this is hardly surprising. In the case of Twosret it seems she “counted her years as a continuation of the deceased Siptah’s reign.”¹⁰⁶ As regent for Siptah this is reasonable. But both of these were *special cases*, in that Hatshepsut and Twosret were women ruling as pharaohs. So the analogies cited by Kitchen are exceptional cases. Menkheperre was not a female regent for a junior pharaoh!

¹⁰¹ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 29. Such a restoration is accepted as possible by Jansen-Winkel (“Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21,” 227–28), given that one accepts the conventional model.

¹⁰² Niwinski, “Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy of the XXst Dynasty,” 56–59.

¹⁰³ Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, 447.

¹⁰⁴ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 534.

¹⁰⁵ Hornung, “The New Kingdom,” 201.

¹⁰⁶ Hornung, “The New Kingdom,” 213.

Niwinski preferred a plaintext reading of the epigraph on Mummy 105, taking it as a reference to the 48th year of the pontificate of Menkheperre. Likewise he saw the linen bandage fragment with a Year 49 as also belonging to Menkheperre (and as the equivalent of a restored Year 2 of Amenemope):

Both texts relate to the very high 48th and 49th pontifical years of the same high priest. No other officials held the office equally long. With such a long rule in Thebes, some claims to kingship emerge; they were expressed by the cartouche, in which the name of Menkheperre was written several times.¹⁰⁷

This, despite his expressed belief in “*the unquestionable rule*, that the high priests conformed to the practise of dating to the regnal years of the Tanite kings.”¹⁰⁸ Niwinski ventured an explanation of this apparent anomaly, by arguing that the Year 48 saw the accession of Amenemope. On the assumption that there was some accompanying disturbance, he argued that “it probably appeared necessary to allow a *temporary extraordinary strengthening of the power of the high priest in distant Thebes*.”¹⁰⁹ Yet there are conspicuous problems with this model. Why would such a situation have still prevailed in the *second* year of Amenemope? Further, while Menkheperre did indeed occasionally enclose his name in a cartouche, and even adopted a prenomen,¹¹⁰ a cartouche is conspicuously missing from his name on Mummy 105.

Interestingly most of the solutions offered to the problems in these documents have resorted to the idea that an HPA such as Menkheperre could use regnal years that were not his own. The alternative offered by Jansen-Winkel is that the “high year count” dates were simply those of Menkheperre himself, with no reference at all to Tanite rulers. Yet this seems highly unlikely as well. As noted Menkheperre only occasionally used a cartouche and on mummy 105 with the year 48 his title is simply High Priest of Amun. The question of to whom the “high year count” should be attributed thus seems intractable.

These problems prompt us to ask whether these years actually belonged specifically to any king at all, and whether they might not actually belong to an era of some kind. If they did, the need to restore or explain away the troublesome datelines 48 and 49 would simply disappear. But to what era might they belong?

¹⁰⁷ Niwinski, *21st Dynasty Coffins*, 48.

¹⁰⁸ Niwinski, “Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy of the XXst Dynasty,” 57 and *21st Dynasty Coffins*, 47.

¹⁰⁹ Niwinski, *21st Dynasty Coffins*, 48, his emphasis.

¹¹⁰ Usimare Setepenamun, known from statuette N43, Durham Museum—see Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 241–242, 340–341.

VI. A King or an Era?

We have already deduced that Menkheperre became HPA in the Year 6 of Pinudjem I at the latest, and possibly in the Year 5. An earlier date in the Year 4 would be less likely, given that some time has to be allowed for the brief pontificate of Djed-Khons-ef-ankh. Yet, as we have noted, in apparent contradiction, the Maunier Stela states clearly that his accession as HPA took place in a Year 25.

In Kitchen’s model the year 25 belongs to the Tanite ruler Smendes, to be followed by a “low year” of another ruler, Amenemnisu or Psusennes I.¹¹¹ The years 6, 7 and 8 discussed above would then belong to Psusennes I, as would the years 30 to 49. While not impossible, this rather oddly separates the year 25 from the other dates in the “high year count.” It would seem more natural to include the Year 25 in the same sequence as the years 30 to 49.

Rather than belonging to another reign and preceding the Year 5, as in Kitchen’s model, it would appear that the Year 25 belongs to a different count altogether. In other words Year 5 or 6 of Pinudjem = a Year 25.

Using Table 2 as a template, and extending the count of the *wḥm-mswt* (“Renaissance”) downwards to 25, one arrives at an intriguing result:

Table 3 R = “Renaissance” era. Synchronisms indicated by *italics*.

R	20th Dynasty	HPAs/Kings (Theban)
01	(Ramesses XI)	19 Herihor?
02		20 Herihor
03		21 Herihor
04		22 Herihor
05		23 <i>Herihor ~ Wenamun’s voyage</i>
06		24 <i>Herihor</i> → (Herihor) 1?
07		25 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 2
08		26 (Herihor) 3
09		27 (Herihor) 4
10		28 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 5
11		29 <i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 6
12		Pinudjem (Herihor) 7
13		Pinudjem (Herihor) 8

¹¹¹ Kitchen (*Third Intermediate Period*, 261, n. 103) followed the restoration by von Beckerath (“Die Stele der Verbannten im Museum des Louvre,” 33 and n. 2) of a “low year” for the oracle on the Maunier Stela. Extreme caution is needed here as the restoration is of a complete blank: some scholars have not read a year date at all at this point in the text, while other restorations are possible (see Part I of this paper and James, “The Date of the Oracle on the Maunier (‘Banishment’) Stela”).

Table 3 (cont.)

R	20th DYNASTY	HPAs/KINGS (Theban)
14		Pinudjem (Herihor) 9
15		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 10
16		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 11
17		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 12
18		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 13
19		Pinudjem (Herihor) 14
20		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 15
21		Masaharta (Herihor) 16/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 1
22		Masaharta (Herihor) 17/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 2
23		Masaharta (Herihor) 18/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 3
24		Djed-Khons-ef-ankh? (Herihor) 19/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 4
25		<i>Menkheperre</i> (Herihor) 20/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 5
		<i>Menkheperre</i> (Herihor) 21/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 6
		(<i>Pinudjem</i>) 7
		(<i>Pinudjem</i>) 8

It is striking that were we to continue the count of Renaissance years downwards into the reign of King Pinudjem, then his Year 5 would equal *whm-mswt* Year 25. The exact match here may surely be due to more than coincidence.

But could the *whm-mswt* have lasted this long? It is widely agreed that the era lasted until at least the Year 11 (= Ramesses XI, 29) and probably a Year 12.¹¹² Thijs has proposed adding two anonymous years, 14 and 15, to the Renaissance count,¹¹³ though this is not widely accepted and 12 remains the highest generally discussed. Still, if the objection were raised that there is an unlikely gap of thirteen years between *whm-mswt* Year 11 and the year 25 of the Menkheperre Stela, it is not a strong one. Quite possibly there are documents belonging to the *whm-mswt* era which have been misattributed (as Thijs has argued). But it also seems reasonable that Menkheperre could have used reckoning by the *whm-mswt* (whether or not it had been dormant for a decade or so) as a tool of political expediency (see below).

A question might be raised (as indeed it was by two anonymous reviewers of this paper) regarding the feasibility of there being as many as three year-counts current at Thebes during the time of Pinudjem I's kingship: those of Herihor, Pinudjem and the *whm-mswt*. It should be noted, however, that the only two year-dates known from Pinudjem I are from funerary contexts, while the possibility of three-year counts would have only prevailed during his appar-

¹¹² Krauss and Warburton, "Conclusions," 475; Kitchen, "The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: An Overview of Fact & Fiction," 193, n. 63.

¹¹³ Thijs, "Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty. Part III."

only short reign. The presence of two year-counts is hardly exceptional: Ramesses XI continued his ‘normal’ year count during the period of the *wḥm-mswt*. And there is nothing untoward about three year-counts during the politically fragmented Egypt of the Third Intermediate Period, with its rival kings and somewhat awkward power-sharing arrangements. Note that during the mid-22nd Dynasty it is conventionally assumed that there were three year-counts simultaneously respected at Thebes: those of the 22nd Dynasty (Osorkon II and Shoshenq III), the “23rd Dynasty” (Takeloth II and Iuput I), and a rival dynasty (comprising Pedubast I and Shoshenq IV).¹¹⁴

VII. Why Would Menkheperre Have Used the *wḥm-mswt* Year Count?

The purpose of the Maunier Stela was to laud the re-establishment at Thebes of the claims of the Piankh family, now represented by King Pinudjem, whose seat was almost certainly at El Hiba.¹¹⁵ Numerous stamped bricks from the site show that Pinudjem and Menkheperre built a massive town wall at El Hiba, creating a stronghold known as Teudjoi, “their Wall” and one which was far to the north of Thebes.¹¹⁶ The political geography of Egypt at this point was clearly more complicated than a simple Tanis-Thebes dichotomy.

A key insight provided by the Maunier (or “Banishment”) Stela is that Menkheperre came to power at Thebes in the course of a civil war—not, apparently, between the dynasties of Upper and Lower Egypt (though the Tanite dynasty may well have played some role), but between what appear to have been two rival Theban factions. Here the evident “diminution” of Pinudjem’s royal titles at the Temple of Khonsu at Karnak offers another piece of the puzzle. An unknown party ordered the careful chiselling out of most of Pinudjem’s royal attributes on the Khonsu reliefs.¹¹⁷ As his kingship would only have been an “issue” during his lifetime and that of his close descendants, the defacement was possibly done while he was still alive—very likely by the same enemies that Menkheperre expelled when he retook power in Thebes and

¹¹⁴ See Jansen-Winkeln, “The Chronology of the Third Intermediate Period: Dyns. 22–24,” 247–52, esp. 251, Fig. II.10.1.

¹¹⁵ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 338–39.

¹¹⁶ Černý, “Egypt: From the Death of Ramesses III,” 652–53; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 257, 259, 269). Lull (*Los sumos sacerdotes*, 339; “Beginning and End of the High Priest Menkheperre”, 242–43) draws an analogy here to the political set-up in the time of Crown Prince and HPA Osorkon, who like Menkheperre was excluded from Thebes for a while, having his seat at El Hiba.

¹¹⁷ Weeks in Epigraphic Survey, *The Temple of Khonsu 1*, xviii–xix; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 570–71.

proudly announced that he had taken his father's seat there as HPA and commander of the armies.

The importance, status and (presumably) popularity of the faction opposing Menkheperre can be judged from a number of points:

- A. As Lull noted: "Only a powerful family would have had options, in these conditions, to rebel in Thebes."¹¹⁸
- B. The rebels (rather, presumably their leaders) were exiled to the Oasis rather than having been executed in the first place. Even were this to reflect a general policy of clemency on Menkheperre's part, it would suggest that the exiles were not mere "rebels" of no particular standing, but people of high status.
- C. The need felt by Menkheperre to make a rapprochement with the exiles also suggests that they were of great political importance. Their return was achieved by an elaborate procedure which spared Menkheperre loss of face—through an oracle which gave divine sanction for the exiles' return. So Lull:

This amnesty, maybe, is more evidence that the exiles had to be related with a powerful Theban political force of great importance and influence because only by this could Menkheperre have been pressurised in favour of their pardon.¹¹⁹

- D. There is a conspicuous lack of appointees by Menkheperre to important Theban offices, as keenly observed by Kitchen:

One remarkable fact, however, is that the ruling family of the high priests from Menkheperre onwards seemingly did *not* lay claim to the Theban key-posts of 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Prophet of Amun. This is in clear contrast to their position under Piankh and Pinudjem I, when, for example, the latter's brother was 2nd prophet of Amun. Instead, these offices were now held by men of *other* Theban families, whose links with the ruling house were by marriage, not by descent. This changed situation most probably resulted from the clearing-up of Theban grievances by Menkheperre in the years shortly following his appointment . . . Under an agreement to 'live and let live', in return for a proper share in the priestly and administrative positions in Thebes, the local Theban notable families would not oppose the acquisition of 'livings' by Menkheperre's family in provinces beyond Thebes.¹²⁰

- E. Another oracle arranged by Menkheperre (and inscribed on the walls of the Temple of Khonsu at Thebes) condemns those who "falsely" expropriated

¹¹⁸ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 338.

¹¹⁹ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 339.

¹²⁰ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 276.

land in his name, and sets out in very detailed terms whereby land might be legitimately bought jointly by Amun and the HPA. As summarised by Ritner:

The god's estate pays 60 percent, with the remaining 40 percent paid by the high priest himself. As Kitchen has noted, the transaction suggests an act of expropriation with overly generous terms to avoid friction, perhaps in deference to the earlier conflicts of Menkheperre's tenure noted in The Banishment Stela.¹²¹

All these considerations make it certain that the enemies of Menkheperre in Thebes, with whom he had to make strenuous efforts at reconciliation after their initial defeat, were a rival political group of equivalent power. While one side in this political and military struggle was clearly the party of Pinudjem I, the other is harder to identify. The Maunier Stela seems to deliberately avoid naming them. But it is a reasonable guess that the other party was that of Herihor's family.¹²² It is hard to imagine who they might otherwise have been.

At an earlier point peaceful relations seem to have existed between the houses of Piankh and Herihor. Indeed, Herihor's queen Nodjmet seems to have been Piankh's daughter.¹²³ The list of Herihor's 'sons' at the Khonsu Temple¹²⁴ also contains two individuals who otherwise seem to have belonged to the house of Piankh: No. 1, Ankhefenmut, bears the same titles (Chief Steward of Amun and Prophet of Mut) as a like-named son of Piankh,¹²⁵ while No. 7, Masaharta, bears conspicuously the same Libyan name as that of the future HPA, son of King Pinudjem. It would seem that during the earlier part of the "Renaissance" era the two houses were operating closely together; it has been argued that both Pinudjem I and his son Masaharta held their pontificates under King Herihor, and reckoned by his regnal years.¹²⁶ Nevertheless, a sign of tension might be detectable in the case of No. 18 on the list of Herihor's "sons"; the original name was completely erased and replaced with that of Nespaneferhor, God's Father of Amun, son of Pinudjem. Are we seeing here a recension of a text similar to the diminution of King Pinudjem's royal titles (see above)? Otherwise it is easy to see how the complex power-sharing arrangements of these

¹²¹ Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 130—with reference to Kitchen, Review of *The Temple of Khonsu* 2, 85.

¹²² Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 339 and "Beginning and End of the High Priest Menkheperre," 243–44.

¹²³ For discussion and references see James and Morkot, "Herihor's Kingship," 238–41.

¹²⁴ Epigraphic Survey, *The Temple of Khonsu* 1, 11–13, Pl. 26.

¹²⁵ Epigraphic Survey, *The Temple of Khonsu* 1, 13; Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 42; Jansen-Winkel, "Der Majordomus des Amun Anchefenmut"; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 121–123, 336–37.

¹²⁶ James and Morkot, "Herihor's Kingship."

two houses could have descended into dissension over offices including the highpriesthood and even the kingship.

Lull has explored the idea that Herihor's son Ankhefenmut may have led the opposition to Menkheperre. Otherwise it has been suggested elsewhere that the Osorkon listed as a "son" of Herihor with 16 others on the Khonsu temple was more likely a "son-in-law" (or other relative by marriage) and none other than the future Osorkon Akheperre (the "Osochor" of Manetho's 21st Dynasty).¹²⁷ Osorkon was of course a full-blooded Libyan, the uncle of Shosh-enq I, founder of the 22nd Dynasty. Even if the two Osorkons were related, rather than being identical, it would seem clear that Herihor had allied himself with a family of Libyan chieftains—presumably bolstering his military power against the party of Piankh's family. (The Libyan name of Pinudjem I's son Masaharta suggests that he may have been courting similar alliances.) As to who was banished by Menkheperre to the Oasis of Dakhleh, the exiles may well have included Herihor himself. What his fate may have been once if and when he was allowed to return to Thebes can only be guessed at.

Some clue may be offered by the Year 21 graffito (1359) from the Wadi Qubânêt el-Qirûd, which records how the Necropolis Scribe Nebhepet (son of Butehamun) and others arrived to do work in the valley.¹²⁸ The graffito is dated near the beginning of the civil year: I 3^{ht} 20. It appears to belong to the sequence of Years 1 to 20 discussed above and attributed to Herihor. The arrangement posited in Table 3 above would place this year 21 parallel to the Year 26 of the *wḥm-mswt* era, hence in the year following Menkheperre's arrival at Thebes, as described on the Maunier Stela. This might suggest that Menkheperre's take-over was not as complete as he retrospectively claimed, and that Herihor loyalists were still able to use his regnal year count on the graffito in question. Alternatively, and echoing a suggestion of Peden,¹²⁹ might this graffito (and another dated in the Year 20), actually reflect preparations for the burial of Herihor?

Whatever the fate of Herihor, the purpose of both the oracles recorded on the Maunier Stela and the Temple of Khonsu (see above) was to reconcile two warring political groups at Thebes. As part of the process of reconciliation, it may not have seemed politic to use the year-dates of royal claimants from either side on a public monument such as the Maunier Stela (as opposed to the bandage epigraphs on the reburials evidently from Pinudjem's Years 6–8). Pinudjem I seems to have still been alive, most likely seated at El Hiba, when

¹²⁷ Morkot, *The Black Pharaohs*, 101, 309, n. 20; Morkot, "Tradition, Innovation and Researching the Past," 145; James and Morkot, "Herihor's Kingship," 240, n. 36.

¹²⁸ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 419; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes*, 196.

¹²⁹ Peden, *The Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt*, 260.

Menkheperre marched on Thebes in a Year 25. But the Stela itself was drawn up somewhat later, possibly in a Year 30 or later:¹³⁰ the text is incomplete. By this time both Herihor and Pinudjem I—presumed rivals—were both probably dead. (There is no evidence to the contrary.) In keeping with his apparently restrained approach to appropriating Theban benefices and land, Menkheperre did not claim full-fledged kingship, despite the occasional use of a cartouche (see above). It may well have been part of the peace process that an interregnum of some kind was accepted at Thebes—at least for while.

The Maunier Stela of Menkheperre describes the recovery of the highpriesthood for his family, and the complex political arrangements for the rapprochement with his rivals. It is important to note that the events described in it were written up retrospectively. Given the circumstances, his recording of events that took place in a Year 25 (and possibly a Year 30 as well) may have used the politically neutral *whm-mswt* era for dating purposes, with good reason. Moreover, Menkheperre could be seen to be continuing the “repetition of births” originally heralded by the “Renaissance” era. While the phrasing is clichéd, the words of the Maunier Stela echo such a sentiment:

In valor and victory he came southward to make the land content, to drive out his opponent, and to cause that [...] be [...] as they were in the reign of Re.¹³¹

VIII. Consequences for Theban 21st Dynasty Chronology

Attributing the high regnal years from the Menkheperre period to an extended *whm-mswt* would produce the following picture:

Table 4 R = “Renaissance” era. Synchronisms indicated by *italics* and **bold**.

R	20th Dynasty	HPAs/Kings (Theban)
01	(Ramesses XI)	19 Herihor?
02		20 Herihor
03		21 Herihor
04		22 Herihor
05		23 <i>Herihor ~ Wenamun’s voyage</i>
06		24 <i>Herihor</i> → (Herihor) 1?
07		25 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 2
08		26 (Herihor) 3
09		27 (Herihor) 4

¹³⁰ James, “The Date of the Oracle on the Maunier (‘Banishment’) Stela.”

¹³¹ ll. 6–7, trans Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy*, 126.

Table 4 (cont.)

R	20th Dynasty	HPAs/Kings (Theban)
10		28 <i>Piankh</i> (Herihor) 5
11	Kings (Tanis)	29 <i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 6
12	?Smendes	<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 7
13		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 8
14		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 9
15		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 10
16		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 11
17		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 12
18		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 13
19		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 14
20		<i>Pinudjem</i> (Herihor) 15
21		<i>Masaharta</i> (Herihor) 16/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 1
22		<i>Masaharta</i> (Herihor) 17/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 2
23		<i>Masaharta</i> (Herihor) 18/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 3
24		Djed-Khons-ef-ankh? (Herihor) 19/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 4
25		<i>Menkheperre</i> (Herihor) 20/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 5
26		<i>Menkheperre</i> (Herihor) 21/ (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 6
27		<i>Menkheperre</i> (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 7
28		<i>Menkheperre</i> (<i>Pinudjem</i>) 8
29		<i>Menkheperre</i>
30		<i>Menkheperre</i>
31		<i>Menkheperre</i>
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		<i>Menkheperre</i>
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48	Psusennes I	<i>Menkheperre/Smendes II?</i>
49	Amenemope	<i>Menkheperre?/Smendes</i> ¹³²

¹³² See Lull (“Sobre la cronología de Menkheperre” and “Beginning and End of the High Priest Menkheperre”) for the arguments that the pontificate of Smendes II briefly overlapped that of

While admittedly a radical departure from the standard understanding, there is much to recommend a model in which the “high year count” actually belongs to the *wḥm-mswt* era, rather than to a king or to Menkheperre himself.

- It obviates the need to ascribe the Year 48 to a High Priest of Amun (Menkheperre), which would be totally unprecedented (see above).
- It relieves historians from the endless and intractable tangle about which Tanite king (Psusennes I or Amenemope) was linked to the “high year count.” Neither model has proved to be convincing (see above).
- The anonymity (in terms of kings) of the inscriptions and epigraphs from the “high year count” would be explained. (Admittedly there was a tendency during the 21st Dynasty to have anonymous datelines but an explanation for a large set of them would nevertheless be welcome).¹³³
- Menkheperre’s pontificate would be reduced by some three decades from 53 to 24, going a long way to closing the half-century gap in some coffin styles noted by Niwinski.
- A similar length of time can be deducted from the extremely high ages of Menkheperre and his contemporaries required by the conventional model.
- The reduction of three decades would also help to explain the almost complete lack of high officials known from his pontificate.

IX. Conclusions Regarding Tanite 21st Dynasty Chronology

As a glance at Table 4 above will show, the proposed model leaves precious little information regarding datelines for the Tanite rulers of the 21st Dynasty. But in truth (as stressed near the beginning of this paper) there is no firm evidence at all for a single dateline of the Tanite rulers until the reigns of Amenemope and Siamun, either from Tanis or Thebes. Adherents of Manetho will be dismayed in that they will no longer be able to amend his figures to make alleged matches with those from the monuments. Their order, however, is

Menkheperre, a scenario explainable by the latter’s adoption of quasi-royal status (see nn. 38 and 68 above). The placement of Smendes’ ephemeral pontificate in the last year of Psusennes I can be deduced from the gift of Smendes in the latter’s burial and is commonplace and the occurrence of his name on pendants from mummy 135, with the name of Amenemope on the braces (see e.g. Kitchen *Third Intermediate Period*, 421).

¹³³ It would be tempting to rationalise the picture further by considering all the anonymous Upper Egyptian datelines from the early 21st Dynasty as “Renaissance” dates. However, the bandage epigraphs of HPA Pinudjem from Years 6, 9 and 10 would pose an obstacle to such a model. His father Piankh is attested as HPA in *wḥm-mswt* Years 7 and 10, which would require two pontiffs simultaneously, at a time when Herihor was still including High Priestly titles in his royal cartouches. Further, it seems reasonably clear from the case of the Year 8 of Pinudjem as King that some datelines at least from this period are royal.

reasonably established. From the Theban evidence it can be seen that Siamun succeeded Amenemope, while the royal burial finds from Tanis (plus the Memphite High Priest list) establish the order Amenemnisu—Psusennes I—Amenemope. This leaves the poorly attested Nesubanedjed (a.k.a. Smendes) as the first ruler and presumed founder of the Tanite Dynasty, a position confirmed by reference to him in the Wenamun story (*wḥm-mswt* Year 5) as governor of the north, with his seat at Tanis. When he assumed kingship remains unknown, depending on the vexed question of the exact length of the reign of Ramesses XI and whether Smendes assumed kingship before the latter's death.

Nevertheless, the scenario proposed here allows us to make a new estimate for the overall length of the 21st Dynasty. On Kitchen's model 76 years separate Year 29 of Ramesses XI (which he equates with Year 1 of Smendes) from the first year of Amenemope. On the model set out in Table 4 above this is shortened to a maximum of 37 years, resulting in a reduction of the 21st Tanite Dynasty by some four decades. Compared to Kitchen's model of 124/5 years a new estimate would be about 85 years.

Shortening the length of the 21st Dynasty by some four decades is in accord with a wide range of controlling evidence, notably the "gaps" (briefly mentioned above) in a range of archaeological finds, including Apis bulls, ostraca, donation stelae, administrative documents, statuary and coffin styles. The overall case for a drastic shortening of the 21st Dynasty from genealogies spanning the late New Kingdom to the Libyan period will be reviewed in detail elsewhere.¹³⁴ Three cases have already been examined. Two concern the genealogies of the High Priests of Memphis and Ankhfenkhons, which have given particular trouble to Egyptologists because they are *too short* to cover the 125 presently assigned to the 21st Dynasty—so it is assumed that six to seven and three to four generations respectively were accidentally omitted by the scribes drawing up the documents.¹³⁵ The third case concerns the royal genealogy. HPA Piankh was a contemporary of Ramesses XI, and two generations (Pinudjem I—Menkheperre) separate him from Pinudjem II, a contemporary of Siamun. Kitchen's entirely hypothetical genealogy for the Tanite kings has four generations separating the reigns of Ramesses XI and Siamun.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ James and Morkot, "A Genealogical Approach to the Chronology of the 21st Dynasty"; see already the following references on the HPM and Ankhfenkhons genealogies; and James and Morkot, "Herihor's Kingship," 253, on the Theban HPA genealogy of the early 21st Dynasty.

¹³⁵ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 189–92; Bierbrier, *The Late New Kingdom in Egypt*, 51–3. See James, *et al.*, *Centuries of Darkness*, 238–42.

¹³⁶ Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, 473, Table 7; see James, *et al.*, "Mediterranean Chronology in Crisis," 32–33.

For how long the 21st Dynasty ruled as an independent entity (*i.e.* how long were possible overlaps with the preceding 20th and succeeding 22nd Dynasties) remains a question for further investigation.

Abbreviations

ZPE *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

Bibliography

- von Beckerath, J. "Die Stele der Verbannten im Museum des Louvre." *RdÉ* 20 (1968): 7–36.
- . "Zur Datierung des Papyrus Brooklyn 16.205." *GM* 140 (1994): 15–17.
- Bierbrier, M. *The Late New Kingdom in Egypt (c. 1300–664 B.C.): A Genealogical and Chronological Investigation*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1975.
- Breasted, J.H. *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906.
- Broekman, G. "The Founders of the Twenty-First Dynasty and Their Family Relationships." *GM* 191 (2002): 11–18.
- . "On the Chronology and Genealogy of the Second, Third and Fourth Prophets of Amon During the Twenty-First Dynasty in Egypt." *GM* 174 (2000): 25–35.
- Budge, E.A.W. *A History of Egypt. Vol. VI: Egypt Under the Priest-Kings, Tanites and Nubians*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1902.
- Černý, J. "Egypt: From the Death of Ramesses III to the End of the Twenty-First Dynasty." In *The Cambridge Ancient History* II:2, eds. I.E.S. Edwards, N.G.L. Hammond, E. Sollberger, 606–657. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1975.
- Daressy, M.G. "Les Cercueils des Prêtres d'Ammon (Deuxième Trouvaille de Deir El-Bahari)." *ASAE* VIII (1907): 3–38.
- . "Contribution à l'étude de la XXI^e dynastie égyptienne." *RA* 28 (1896): 72–90.
- Demidoff, G. "Hérihor-Piankhy, Piankhy-Hérihor. Retour sur une controverse." In *Mélanges offerts à François Neveu*, eds. C. Gallois, P. Grandet and L. Pantalacci, 99–111. Cairo: IFAO, 2008.
- Dillery, J. "The First Egyptian Narrative History: Manetho and Greek Historiography." *ZPE* 127 (1999): 93–116.
- Dodson, A. "An Enigmatic Cartouche." *GM* 106 (1988): 15–19.
- . "Psusennes II." *RdÉ* 38 (1987): 49–54.
- . "Psusennes II and Sheshonq I." *JEA* 79 (1993): 267–268.
- . "The Transition Between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties Revisited." In *The Libyan Period in Egypt*, eds. G.P.F. Broekman, R.J. Demarée and O.E. Kaper, 103–112. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- . "Towards a Minimum Chronology of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period." *BES* 14 (2000): 7–18.
- Dodson, A. and Janssen, J.J. "A Theban Tomb and its Tenants." *JEA* 75 (1989): 125–138.
- Epigraphic Survey. *The Temple of Khonsu, Volume 1: Scenes of King Herihor in the Court with Translations of Texts*. OIP 100. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1979.
- . *The Temple of Khonsu, Volume 2: Scenes and Inscriptions in the Court and the First Hypostyle Hall*. OIP 103. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1981.
- Gardiner, A. *Egypt of the Pharaohs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Gasse, A. "Panakhemipet et ses complices (à propos du papyrus BM EA 10054, R^o 2, 1–5)." *JEA* 87 (2001): 81–92.

- Hagens, G. "A Critical Review of Dead-Reckoning from the 21st Dynasty." *JARCE* 33 (1996): 153–163.
- Hall, H.R. "The Eclipse of Egypt." In *The Cambridge Ancient History* III, eds. J.B. Bury, S.A. Cook and F.E. Adcock, 251–269. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925.
- Hornung, E. "The New Kingdom." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, eds. E. Hornung, R. Krauss and D.A. Warburton, 197–217. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- James, P. "The Date of the Oracle on the Maunier ('Banishment') Stela." In prep.
- . "Naukratis Revisited." *Hyperboreus (Studia Classica)* 9:2 (2003): 235–264.
- James, P., N. Kokkinos and I.J. Thorpe. "Mediterranean Chronology in Crisis." In *Sardinian and Aegean Chronology: Proceedings of the International Colloquium 'Sardinian Stratigraphy and Mediterranean Chronology, Tufts University, March 17–19, 1995*, eds. M.S. Balmuth and R.H. Tykot, 20–43. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1998.
- James, P.J., I.J. Thorpe, N. Kokkinos and J. Frankish. "Bronze to Iron Age Chronology in the Old World: Time for a Reassessment?" *Studies in Ancient Chronology* 1 (1987): 2–143.
- James, P., I.J. Thorpe, N. Kokkinos, R. Morkot and J. Frankish. *Centuries of Darkness: A Challenge to the Conventional Chronology of Old World Archaeology*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1991; New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1993.
- James, P. and R. Morkot. "A Genealogical Approach to the Chronology of the 21st Dynasty." In prep.
- . "Herihor's Kingship and the High Priest of Amun Piankh." *JEGH* 3:2 (2010): 231–260.
- . Letter [reply to Kitchen]. *Times Literary Supplement* (June 7, 1991): 15 [online at 0–].
- Jansen-Winkeln, K. "The Chronology of the Third Intermediate Period: Dyns. 22–24." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, eds. E. Hornung, R. Krauss and D. A. Warburton, 234–264. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Der Majordomus des Amun Anchefenmut." *DE* 38 (1997): 29–36.
- . "Relative Chronology of Dyn. 21." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, eds. E. Hornung, R. Krauss and D. A. Warburton, 218–233. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Die thebanischen Gründer der 21. Dynastie." *GM* 157 (1997): 49–74.
- . "Das Ende des Neuen Reiches." *ZÄS* 119 (1992): 22–37.
- Kitchen, K.A. Review of *The Temple of Khonsu, Volume 2. BiOr* 41 (1984): 84–85.
- . *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 BC)*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1973/1986/1996.
- . "The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: An Overview of Fact & Fiction." In *The Libyan Period in Egypt*, eds. G.P.F. Broekman, R.J. Demarée and O.E. Kaper, 161–202. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Kokkinos, N. "Ancient Chronography, Eratosthenes and the Dating of the Fall of Troy," *AWE* 8 (2009): 37–56.
- Krauss, R. "An Egyptian Chronology for Dynasties XIII to XXV." In *The Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B.C. III: Proceedings of the SCIAM 2000—2nd EuroConference, Vienna, 28th of May—1st of June 2003*, eds. M. Bietak and E. Czerny, 173–189. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2007.
- . "Ein Modell für die chronologische Einordnung der Maunier-Stele (Stele der Verbannten)," *GM* 219 (2008): 41–48.
- . "Das wrš-Datum aus Jahr 5 von Sheshonq [I]." *DE* 62 (2005): 43–48.
- Krauss, R. and D.A. Warburton. "Conclusions." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, eds. E. Hornung, R. Krauss and D.A. Warburton, 473–489. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Kruchten, J.-M. *Les Annales des Prêtres de Karnak (XXI–XXIII^{èmes} Dynasties) et Autres Textes Contemporains Relatifs à L'Initiation des Prêtres d'Amon*. OLA 32. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- Leahy, A. "A Battered Statue of Shedsunefertem, High Priest of Memphis (BM EA 25)." *JEA* 92 (2006): 169–184.

- . “The Date of the ‘Larger’ Dakhleh Stela.” *GM* 226 (2010): 45–53.
- Leclant, J. “Psousennès.” *Orientalia* 22 (1953): 401–415.
- Lull, J. “Beginning and End of the High Priest Menkheperre.” In *The Libyan Period in Egypt*, eds. G.P.F. Broekman, R.J. Demarée and O.E. Kaper, 241–240. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- . “Sobre la cronología de Menkheperre y la llegada de Nesubanebdjed y Painedjem II como sumos sacerdotes de Amón en Tebas a finales de su gobierno.” *Aula Orientalis* 25 (2007): 255–267.
- . *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón tebanos de la wḥm mswt y dinastía XXI (CA. 1083–945 a.C.)*. Oxford: BAR International Series 1469, 2006.
- Montet, P. *La Nécropole Royale de Tanis, II. Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis*. Paris: Fouilles de Tanis, 1951.
- Morkot, R.G. *The Black Pharaohs*. London: Rubicon Press, 2000.
- . “Tradition, Innovation and Researching the Past in Libyan, Kushite and Saïte Egypt.” In *Regime Change in the Ancient Near East and Egypt. From Sargon of Agade to Saddam Hussein*, ed. H. Crawford, 141–164. Oxford: Oxford University Press, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 136, 2007.
- Niwinski, A. “Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy of the XXIst Dynasty: New Proposals for their Interpretation.” *JARCE* 16 (1979): 49–68.
- . *21st Dynasty Coffins from Thebes*. Mainz: Philipp Von Zabern, 1988.
- Payraudeau, F. “De nouvelles annales sacerdotales de Siamon, Psousennès II et Osorkon I^{er}.” *BIFAO* 108 (2008): 293–308.
- Peden, A.J. *The Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt: Scope and Roles of Informal Writings*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Petrie, W.M.F. *A History of Egypt III*. London: Methuen & Co, 1905.
- Ritner, R.R. *The Libyan Anarchy: Inscriptions from Egypt's Third Intermediate Period*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Sternberg-el Hotabi, H. “Die Stele der Verbannten (Louvre C256).” In *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* II, ed. O. Kaiser, 112–117. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1986.
- Thijs, A. “In Search of King Herihor and the Penultimate Ruler of the 20th Dynasty.” *ZÄS* 132:1 (2005): 73–91.
- . “King or High Priest? The Problematic Career of Pinuzem.” *GM* 211 (2006): 81–88.
- . “‘My father was buried during your reign’: the burial of the High Priest Ramessesnakht under Ramses XI.” *DE* 60 (2004): 87–95.
- . “Pap. Turin 2018, the journeys of the scribe Dhutmose and the career of the Chief Workman Bekenmut.” *GM* 199 (2004): 79–88.
- . “‘Please tell Amón to bring me back from Yar’, Dhutmose’s visits to Nubia.” *GM* 177 (2000): 63–70.
- . “Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, Part I: The Fisherman Pnekhtemope and the Date of BM 10054.” *GM* (1998): 95–108.
- . “Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, Part II.” *GM* 170 (1999): 83–99.
- . “Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty. Part III: Some Hitherto Unrecognised Documents from the wḥm mswt.” *GM* 173 (1999): 175–192.
- . “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part IV: The Harshire-family as a test for the shorter chronology.” *GM* 175 (2000): 99–102.
- . “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part V: P. Ambras as advocate of a shorter chronology.” *GM* 179 (2000): 69–82.
- . “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part VI: some minor adjustments and observations concerning the chronology of the last Ramessides and the wḥm mswt.” *GM* 181 (2001): 95–103.

- . “Reconsidering the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, part VII: the history of the viziers and the politics of Menmare.” *GM* 184 (2001): 65–73.
- . “The troubled careers of Amenhotep and Panehsy: The High Priest of Amun and the Viceroy of Kush under the last Ramessides.” *SAK* 31 (2003): 289–306.
- Wente, E.F. “On the Chronology of the Twenty-First Dynasty.” *JNES* 26 (1967): 155–176.
- Young, E. “Some Notes on the Chronology and Genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty.” *JARCE* 2 (1963): 99–111.