

STUDIEN ZUR ALTÄGYPTISCHEN KULTUR

Herausgegeben von
Jochem Kahl und
Nicole Kloth



Band 43 | 2014

HELMUT BUSKE VERLAG
HAMBURG

Die *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* (SAK), gegründet 1974, erscheinen jährlich in ein bis zwei Bänden. Manuskripte erbeten an die Herausgeber oder an den Verlag:

Helmut Buske Verlag GmbH
Richardstraße 47
D-22081 Hamburg
SAK@buske.de

Herausgeber:

Prof. Dr. Jochem Kahl
Freie Universität Berlin
Ägyptologisches Seminar
Altensteinstr. 33
D-14195 Berlin
jochem.kahl@fu-berlin.de

Dr. Nicole Kloth
Sondersammelgebiet Ägyptologie
Universitätsbibliothek
Plöck 107-109
D-69117 Heidelberg
kloth@ub.uni-heidelberg.de

Beirat:

Prof. Dr. Hartwig Altenmüller (Hamburg)
Prof. Dr. Manfred Bietak (Wien)
Prof. Dr. Angelika Lohwasser (Münster)
Prof. Dr. Joachim Friedrich Quack (Heidelberg)

Alle Manuskripte unterliegen einer anonymisierten Begutachtung (peer review); über die Annahme oder Ablehnung des Manuskripts entscheiden die Herausgeber. Über die Internetseite <http://studien-zur-altaegyptischen-kultur.de> sind die Formatvorlage sowie weitere Hinweise zur Erstellung von Manuskripten für die SAK zu finden.

ISSN 0340-2215 (Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur)

ISBN 978-3-87548-692-6

© Helmut Buske Verlag GmbH, Hamburg 2014. Alle Rechte, auch die des auszugsweisen Nachdrucks, der fotomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Übersetzung, vorbehalten. Dies betrifft auch die Vervielfältigung und Übertragung einzelner Textabschnitte durch alle Verfahren wie Speicherung und Übertragung auf Papier, Filme, Bänder, Platten und andere Medien, soweit es nicht §§ 53 und 54 URG ausdrücklich gestatten. Bildbearbeitung, Druckvorstufe: Da-TeX Gerd Blumenstein, Leipzig. Druck: Strauss, Mörlenbach. Buchbinderische Verarbeitung: Schaumann, Darmstadt. Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier: alterungsbeständig nach ANSI-Norm resp. DIN-ISO 9706, hergestellt aus 100% chlorfrei gebleichtem Zellstoff. Printed in Germany.

A Tale of Semantics and Suppressions: Reinterpreting Papyrus Mayer A and the So-called ‘War of the High Priest’ during the Reign of Ramesses XI

Kim Ridealgh

Abstract

The ‘War of the High Priest’ is a phrase commonly used by scholars to refer to the so-called ‘suppression’ of the High Priest of Amun Amenhotep by the King’s Son of Kush Panehsy during the reign of the last Ramesside king, Ramesses XI. The precise date of this event is debated, but it likely occurred around Regnal Year 17 or 18 of Ramesses XI (c. 1089–1088 BCE). The sources that document the ‘War of the High Priest’ are limited (P. Mayer A, P. BM EA 10383, P. BM EA 10052, and the Karnak Inscription) and scholarly opinion on the topic is hotly divided. What is clear, however, is that the term ‘suppression’ used to refer to this event is ineffectual in conveying the nuances of the Egyptian term *thj*, and by translating *thj* as ‘suppression’ extreme connotations are imposed upon it that alter modern perceptions concerning the ‘War of the High Priest’. This study will add to the existing debate on the ‘War of the High Priest’ by examining the terminology surrounding the event through a lexical analysis of *thj*, analysing its uses in other textual contexts, scholarly interpretation, and its wider implications. Chronological issues and debates will be discussed only on the periphery.

1. Introduction¹

The reign of Ramesses XI Menmaatre-Setepenptah (c. 1106–1077 BCE²), the final king of the Twentieth Dynasty, marked the end of the New Kingdom in ancient Egypt.³ Civil war, famine,⁴ physical threat from marauding Libyans,⁵ and economic crisis all played their part

¹ I am indebted to my supervisors, Dr Martina Minas-Nerpel and Dr Troy Sagrillo, for their support with this article. Many thanks also to Prof. Dr. Karl Jansen-Winkel for reading a draft and providing me with helpful comments, and to Maarten Horn and Gemma Smith for kindly reading drafts.

² All chronological dates are based on those given by E. Horning, et al., *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, Leiden 2006, 493. A full list of texts dating to the reign of Ramesses XI, see KRI VI, 701–879.

³ E. Young, *Some Notes on the Chronology and Genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty*, in: JARCE 2, 1963, 99–112; H. Kees, *Die Hohenpriester des Amun von Karnak von Herihor bis zum Ende der Äthiopenzeit*, *Probleme der Ägyptologie* 4, Leiden 1964, 2–6; J. Černý, *Egypt from the Death of Ramesses III to the End of the 21st Dynasty*, *The Cambridge Ancient History II* (part 2), Cambridge 1975, 606–657; E. Wente, *Late Ramesside Letters*, SAOC 33, Chicago 1967, 155–176; idem, *Scenes of King Herihor in the Court*, OIP 100, Chicago 1979, ix–xvii; K. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*, Warminster 1996, 243–254; idem, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: An Overview of Fact and Fiction*, in: G. Broekman/R. Demarée/O. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan Period in Egypt. Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a conference at Leiden University 25–27 October 2007*, *Egyptologische Uitgaven* 23, Leiden 2009, 195; M. Bierbrier, *Herere, Wife of the High Priest Paiankh*, in: JNES 32, 1973, 311; A. Niwiński, *Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy of the XXIst Dynasty: New Proposals for their Interpretation*, in: JARCE 16, 1979, 49–68; idem, *21st Dynasty Coffins from Thebes*, Mainz am Rhein 1988; idem, *Bürgerkrieg, militärischer Staatsstreich und Ausnahmezustand in Ägypten unter Ramses XI*, in: I. Gamer-Wallert/W. Helck (eds.), *Gegengabe* (Fs. Brunner-Traut), Tübingen 1992, 235–262; S. Naguib, *Le clergé féminine d’Amun thébain à la 21e dynastie*, OLA 38, Leuven 1990; K. Jansen-Winkel, *Das Ende des Neuen Reiches*, in: ZÄS 119, 1992, 22–37; J. Taylor, *Nodjmet, Payankh and Herihor: The End of the New Kingdom Reconsidered*, in: C.J. Eyre (ed.), *Proceedings of the 7th International Congress of Egyptologists*, Cambridge, 3–9 September 1995, OLA 82, Leuven 1998: 1143–1155.

⁴ For the ‘Year of the Hyenas’, see P. BM EA 10052, *rt.*10.7, 11.8; Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies*, 152, pl. 31, 153, pl. 31–32; Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*, 247, no. 26; J. Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón tebanos de la wḥm-ms.wt y dinastía XXI*, *BAR International Series* 1469, Oxford 2006, 334.

⁵ K. Kitchen, *The Arrival of the Libyans in Late New Kingdom Egypt*, in: M. Leahy (ed.), *Libya and Egypt c.1300–750 BC*, London 1990: 22; B. Haring, *Libyans in the late Twentieth Dynasty*, in: R.J. De-

in creating an unstable political scenario in Egypt. In Regnal Year 19 of the reign of Ramesses XI a new era named the *whm-ms.wt* period or ‘repeating of births’ was introduced to ‘cancel’ out these political and social troubles that had characterised his reign.⁶ Perhaps the most influential event prior to this period of renewal was the ‘War of the High Priest’⁷ in which the King’s Son of Kush *P3-nhsy* was either invited, or instructed,⁸ to restore order in Thebes through the ‘suppression’ of the High Priest of Amun *Jmn-htp*.⁹ The

marée/A. Egberts (eds.), *Village Voices: Proceedings of the Symposium ‘Texts from Deir el-Medina and their Interpretations’*. Leiden, May 31–June 1, 1991, Leiden 1992, 71–80; idem, *Libyans in the Theban Region*, 20th Dynasty, in: G. Zaccane/T. di Netro (eds.), *Sesto congresso internazionale de egittologia: Atti II*, Turin 1993, 159–165; idem, *Divine Households*, *Egyptologische Uitgaven* 12, Leiden, 1997, 271; K. Jansen-Winkel, *Der Beginn der libyschen Herrschaft in Ägypten*, in: *BN* 71, 1994, 88; L. Török, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilisation*, *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 1 (Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 31), Leiden 1997, 104–106; M. Barwik, *The Twilight of Ramesside Egypt: Studies on the History of Egypt at the end of the Ramesside Period*, Warsaw 2011, 3. Leahy argues that Egypt had suffered a large influx of Libyans at the end of the 19th Dynasty (The Libyan Period in Egypt, in: *Libyan Studies* 16, 1985, 53). See also, J. Yoyotte, *Les principautés du Delta au temps de l’anarchie libyenne*, in: *Mélanges Maspero* 1961, 65, 135; Morales, in: *GM* 181, 2001, 65–67.

⁶ Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*, xiv–ix, 4–6, 248; Jansen-Winkel, in: *ZÄS* 119, 1992, 22–37; Hornung, *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, 2006, 217; B. Haring, *Stela Leiden V65 and Herihor’s Damnatio Memoriae*, in: *SÄK* 41, 2012, 146; Barwik (The Twilight of Ramesside Egypt, 134) attributes the initiation of this period to *Hrj-hr*. Often this period of renewal is referred to as the ‘renaissance’, and its introduction has resulted in complications in accurately assigning textual documents during the reign of Ramesses XI due to such a variance in official dating records. See: D. Redford, *Herihor*, in: *LÄ* II, 1129; A. Thijs, *Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty Part III*, in: *GM* 173, 1999, 179; Barwik, *The Twilight of Ramesside Egypt*, 135–137.

⁷ The date concerning when this event occurred is heavily debated: Th.E. Peet, *The Supposed Revolution of the High Priest Amenhotpe under Ramesses XI*, in: *JEA* 12, 1926, 257; J. Černý, *The Contribution of the Study of Unofficial and Private Documents to the History of Pharaonic Egypt*, in: S. Donadoni (ed.), *Le fonti indirette della storia egiziana*, Rome 1963, 51; Wente, in: *JNES* 25, 1966, 86; Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*, 247; M. Bierbrier, *A Second High Priest Ramessesnakht?*, in: *JEA* 58, 1972, 199; C. Aldred, *More Light on the Ramesside Tomb Robberies*, in: J. Ruffle/G. Gaballa/K. Kitchen (eds.), *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt* (Fs. Fairman), Warminster 1979, 94; Jansen-Winkel, in: *ZÄS* 119, 1992, 28; P. Vernus, *Affaires et scandales sous les Ramsès*, Paris 1993, 39; C. Vandersleyen, *L’Égypte et la vallée du Nil II*, Paris 1995, 644; Morales, in: *GM* 181, 2001, 73; A. Thijs, *Reconsidering the End of the Twentieth Dynasty, Part 7*, in: *GM* 184, 2001, 66; idem, *The Troubled Careers of Amenhotep and Panehsy*, in: *SÄK* 31, 2003, 291; idem, ‘I was Thrown Out of My City’, in: *SÄK* 35, 2006b, 308; idem, *The Second Prophet Nesamun: His claim to the High-Priesthood* in: *SÄK* 38, 2009, 350; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 333. The King’s Son of Kush’s troops were also responsible for plundering tombs and temples, see Niwiński, *Bürgerkrieg*, 259–62; Gnirs, *Militär und Gesellschaft*, 193–195.

⁸ See P. Turin Cat. 1896, a royal order sent to *P3-nhsy* in Thebes (A. Bakir, *Egyptian Epistolography*, BdÉ 48, Cairo 1970, pl. 31; KRI VI, 734–735; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 45, pl. 4). Thijs claims that there must have been a controversy of some kind involving the authority of the High Priest of Amun, stressing that striking workmen, presence of hostile forces, ration troubles, and a conflict between workers and higher authority reflect ‘an ‘ideal’ background for the actions against *Jmn-htp*’ (in: *SÄK* 31, 2003, 293). *P3-nhsy* is also documented in P. BM EA 10053, v.1.2 (Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies*, pl. 19; KRI VI, 755, 12), and P. Turin Cat. 1895 + 2007, rt.1.4–5 (A. Gardiner, *Ramesside Administrative Documents*, Oxford 1968, 36); see also Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 44–45.

⁹ The tenure of *Jmn-htp* as High Priest of Amun is firmly documented between Regnal Years 9/10 of Ramesses IX and Regnal Year 2 of Ramesses X (P. Turin Cat. 1932+1939, v.1.3; KRI VI, 686; Černý, *Egypt from the Death of Ramesses III*, 629, no. 4; Thijs, in: *SÄK* 31, 2003, 293). For further information on *Jmn-htp*, see G. Lefébvre, *Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d’Amon Romê-Roÿ et Amenhotep*, Paris 1929, pl. 2; H. Kees, *Das Priestertum im ägyptischen Staat, Probleme der Ägyptologie* 1, Leiden 1953, 126–127; Bell, in: *Serapis* 6, 1980, 17; Morales, in: *GM* 181, 2001, 61; Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 24–25. Although von Beckerath (in: *Tanis und Theben*, Hamburg 1951, 91–4) and E. Wente (*The Suppression of the High Priest*

aim of this paper is to examine certain elements of the data that concern the classification of the ‘War of the High Priest’, not to add to the ever-growing chronological debate on the issue surrounding when this event supposedly took place.¹⁰ Rather, this paper will focus on the term *thj* and its interpretation by scholars in regards to the ‘War of the High Priest’ and in other genres of texts. Through such an analysis conclusions regarding whether the ‘War of the High Priest’ can accurately be defined as a ‘suppression’ can be made. In turn this will allow for a new interpretation and understanding of the ‘War of the High Priest’.

2 Sources for the War of the High Priest

Very little evidence survives concerning the ‘War of the High Priest’, and what does survive is somewhat ambiguous. P. Mayer A, v.6.6–7,¹¹ is the most prevalent of the remaining documents, and links *P3-nḥsy* with a ‘suppression’¹² (𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏, *thj*¹³) of *Jmn-ḥtp*:

(v.6.4) *dd=f n3 3^{cc}.w¹⁴ jw jw=w mḥ m t3 ḥw.t jw=j m-s3 nhy n c3w* (v.6.5) *n p3y=j jt=j jw P3-h3tj w^c 3^{cc} mḥ m.jm=j jw=f jt3=j* (v.6.6) *r Jpjp jw j.jr.tw thj Jmn-ḥtp wn [m] ḥm-ntr tpj (n) Jmn* (v.6.7) *r-š3^c 3bd 6 jw ḥpr j.jr jy 9 3bd n hrw n thj* (v.6.8) *j.jr.tw Jmn-ḥtp wn m ḥm-ntr tpj n Jmn jw jr w h3w p3y pr-n-st3¹⁵* (v.6.9) *jw djdj.tw ht m jm=f*

(v.6.4) He¹⁶ said “the foreigners came and conquered the temple, whilst I was following after some donkeys (v.6.5) belonging to my father. *P3-h3tj*, a foreigner, captured

Amenhotep, in: JNES 25, 1966, 85) both argue that *P3-nḥsy* was in fact instructed to restore *Jmn-ḥtp* to his previous position. Kees argued that the activity against the High Priest was a Theban insurrection spurred on by his mismanagement and resentment over his wealth (Die Hohenpriester des Amun, 2–6; contra: Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 87).

¹⁰ See K. Kitchen, in: Broekman/Demarée/Kaper, The Libyan Period in Egypt, 195; Thijs, in: SÄK 31, 2003, 293; A. Morales, The Suppression of the High Priest Amenhotep, in: GM 181, 2001, 64–65; Lull, Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón, 44–46; Barwik, The Twilight of Ramesside Egypt, 2011, 85–108; Haring, in: SÄK 41, 2012, 146.

¹¹ W. Spiegelberg, Ein Papyrus aus der Zeit Ramses V, in: ZÄS 29, 1891, 73–84; Th.E. Peet, The Great Tomb Robberies of the Ramesside Age, in: JEA 2, 1915, 173–7; idem, The Mayer Papyri A & B, London 1920.

¹² This translation of *thj* is first used by Peet, The Great Tomb Robberies, 125.

¹³ *Wb* 5, 319.3–320.23; *TLA* Lemma no. 172920; L. Lesko, A Dictionary of Late Egyptian IV, Providence 1987, 93–94; P. Wilson, A Ptolemaic lexicon: a Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu, OLA 78, Leuven 1997, 1148.

¹⁴ Whilst *3^{cc}.w* is often translated as ‘interpreter’ (*Wb* 1, 2.15; *TLA* Lemma no. 18; Lesko, A Dictionary of Late Egyptian I, 2), for the purposes of this document it is generally understood to refer to foreigners, specifically Nubians, highlighting the foreign aspect of the term (Morales, in: GM 181, 2001, 65). The same applies to its use in P. BM EA 10053 *verso*; P. BM EA 10383, *rt.2.5*; P. Turin Cat. 2018, *verso* (KRI VI, 856). A wide discussion on the term is provided by L. Bell, Interpreters and Egyptianized Nubians in Ancient Egyptian Foreign Policy: Aspects of the History of Egypt and Nubia, University of Pennsylvania PhD, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1976, especially pages 84–90.

¹⁵ Wente (in: JNES 25, 1966, 73) translates v.6.8–9, as ‘this portable chest had been misappropriated and set on fire that I returned’. Peet (The Mayer Papyri, 9–10) provides further discussion of *pr-n-st3*, concluding that it was some form of portable house and that it had more in common with a movable chest in which valuables are stored. He translates the section as ‘this Corridor-House was violated and it was set on fire’ (The Mayer Papyri, 13).

¹⁶ The ‘he’ in this section refers to the Porter *ḥ3.tj-nfr* who is on trial for stealing from the portable-chest (See P. Mayer A, v.6.1–3. Peet (The Mayer Papyri, 13) translates his profession as workman, but this is an incorrect reading of *k3w.tj* meaning porter (*Wb* 5, 102.4–10; *TLA* Lemma no. 163280; Lesko, A Dictionary of

me and took me (v.6.6) to *Jpjp*.¹⁷ *Jmn-ḥtp*, who used to be High Priest of Amun, had been ‘suppressed’¹⁸ (v.6.7) for 6 months. Then it so happened that I came back (after) 9 whole months of the ‘suppression’¹⁹ (v.6.8) that was made to *Jmn-ḥtp*, who was High Priest of Amun, when this Portable-House was violated, (v.6.9) it was burned throughout’.²⁰

P. Mayer A presents a conundrum as the text records two different temporal periods, six months (*ḳbd 6*) and nine months²¹ (*9 ḳbd*), which show a different position of the numerical value in separate subordinate clauses.²² It appears that this variation may have been an intentional construction on the part of the scribe, possibly in order to demonstrate that they were distinct, separate events. The *ḳbd 6* is written in a similar fashion as items on a list, indicating that this was, perhaps, the full length of time that *Jmn-ḥtp* was ‘suppressed’.²³ The *9 ḳbd* is directly influenced by the following *n hrw* genitival adjective, which requires the placement of the numerical value before the noun, as is often common in expressions of time.²⁴ This suggests that the period of time experienced by the individual in P. Mayer A was distinct from that experienced by *Jmn-ḥtp*.²⁵

Late Egyptian IV, 32; J. Janssen, in: *Altorientalische Forschungen: Schriften zur Geschichte und Kulture des Alten Orients* 19, 1992, 13). The Porter *ḥ.tj-nfr* also appears in P. BM EA 10068, v.8.3 and P. BM EA 10403, rt.1.3.

¹⁷ Gauthier comments that this toponym must be somewhere within the traditional boundaries of the Theban Necropolis, but the exact location is unknown (*Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques*, Osnabrück 1975, 66).

¹⁸ Peet (*The Mayer Papyri*, 13) actually translates *thj* as ‘violence/violated’, but then later changed it to ‘suppression’ (in: *JEA* 12, 1926, 254). He does comment that *thj* is difficult to translate into English and often requires the use of a noun (in: *JEA* 12, 1926, 256, no. 1). Černý translated this as ‘attacked’ (*J. Černý/S. Groll/C.J. Eyre, A Late Egyptian Grammar, Studia Pohl (series maior) 4, Rome, 1978, 386*).

¹⁹ Spiegelberg (in: *ZÄS* 29, 1891, 12) does not translate these lines in his original publication of P. Mayer A.

²⁰ Barwik argues that this passage indicates that *Jmn-ḥtp* was a victim of the suppression and not the instigator of the civil war (*The Twilight of Ramesside Egypt*, 77, no. 2). However, no sources survive stressing that he was a victim as such. P. Mayer A, v.6.4–9, makes no reference to the individual responsible for the event, and P. BM EA 10383, rt.2.5 is ambiguous in the exact identity of the individual superior in question. As such, the instigator of the event is open to debate, and no sources survive detailing *P3-nḥsy*’s account of events (the notion that *Jmn-ḥtp* was a victim comes from Peet, in: *JEA* 12, 1926, 254; contra: W. Spiegelberg, *Die Empörung des Hohenpriesters Amenhotpe unter Rameses IX*, in: *ZÄS* 58, 1923, 47–48).

²¹ Th.E Peet originally translated v.6.7 as ‘5 whole months’ (*The Mayer Papyri*, 15, pl. 10; as does K. Sethe, *Die angebliche Rebellion des Hohenpriesters Amenhotp unter Rameses IX*, in: *ZÄS* 59, 1924, 60.), but he later changed it to ‘9 whole months’, where he comments that ‘the first point to be noted is that the second numeral in line 7 is not a 5 but a 9, a fact which should never have escaped my observation in the first place’ (in: *JEA* 12, 1926, 255).


²² First observed by Peet, in: *JEA* 12, 1926, 256, no. 3.

²³ Junge states that in lists all numerals can follow their noun (*Late Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction*, Oxford 2005, 68), whilst Gardiner states that at least during the Middle Kingdom the numeral follows the noun, which, as a general rule, exhibits the singular form (*Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford 1957, 192).

²⁴ A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford 1957, 194. As stated by Černý, for numbers 3–9 the number generally stands immediately before the noun numbered, but in expressions of time the numeral often follows the noun (Černý/Groll/Eyre, *A Late Egyptian Grammar*, 86–87). For discussion on subordinate clause see Peet, in: *JEA* 12, 256; Černý/Groll/Eyre, *A Late Egyptian Grammar*, 368.

²⁵ The events in P. Mayer A may also have occurred in a linear fashion, although the problem is that the text is somewhat vague on this topic. The reviewer of this paper suggested the following translation of this text, for which I am very grateful: ‘Pa-Hati, der Dometscher ergriff mich und brachte mich nach Ipi, als man schon

This may imply two distinction notions, both of which are not clearly explained in the text. Firstly, that the whole action, i.e. the so-called ‘suppression’, lasted nine months, or, secondly, that the individual returned after nine months. If the first hypothesis is accepted, and it generally is, then this would complement the inscription on the rear wall of the Tuthmoside chapel near the 7th pylon at Karnak, which records the eight month long ‘suppression’ of an unidentified Ramesside High Priest of Amun, identified by Edward Wente as *Jmn-htp*.²⁶ The eight months recorded in this text is close enough to the nine months of ‘suppression’ recorded in P. Mayer A to suggest that the two texts record the same event, even if the scribes disagreed on the exact start date, or rounded up the number of months in question. It also does not provide clarity as to the exact length of the conflict, only that after nine months the looting occurred.

Antonio Morales argues that this distinction regarding the amount of months is reflective of the affected testimonies of the individuals involved, due to the ‘War of the High Priest’ occurring earlier in the reign of Ramesses XI, or one of his predecessors, and not at some point between Regnal Years 17–19²⁷. However, this would result in vastly different time periods, not simply one month, which certainly lies within the realms scholarly possibility. Jose Lull argues convincingly that it was not until Regnal Year 18 or 19 that the ‘War of the High Priest’ climaxed. He bases this hypothesis on P. Turin Cat. 1896, which suggests *P3-nḥsy* was in Thebes in Regnal Year 17 still receiving orders from Ramesses XI,²⁸ and the change in the composition of *P3-nḥsy*’s name at beginning of the *wḥm-ms.wt* (Regnal Year 19 of Ramesses XI), which from this point onwards is determined by the sign of a fallen enemy:  (Gardiner A14).²⁹ Of course it is quite possible that the Karnak Inscription in fact refers to another High Priest of Amun, but this is something that is difficult to determine.³⁰ Hence, it seems unlikely that the differing durations for the ‘suppression’

sechs Monate lang gegen Amenhotep, der Hoherpriester des Amun war, gefrevelt hatte, wobei es so war, daß es zu genau 9 Monaten des Frevelns gegen Amenhotep, der Hoherpriester des Amun war, kam, als dieser Tragschrein verwertet und Feuer an ihn gelegt wurde’. I have followed a sequential translation for the purposes of this article as it reflects the most common form of translation. The reviewer also suggested that it is possible that the event was not limited to only nine months, which may certainly be the case, and would further support my argument below on the continuous conflict/tension between *Jmn-htp* and *P3-nḥsy*.

²⁶ Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 82 (supported by D. Polz, The Ramesside Dynasty and the Fall of the New Kingdom, in: SÄK 25, 1998, 283; contra: W. Helck, Zur Datierung der Hohenpriesterinschrift PM II², 174 (516), *Orientalia* 53, 1984, 52–56). Sources for this text can be found in KRI VI, 536–538; Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 78; E. Froid, *Biographical Texts from the Ramesside Period*, Atlanta 2007, 77–81. Thijs argues that this inscription can be linked with the Banishment stela in his attempt to re-sequentialise the Twentieth Dynasty (Introducing the Banishment Stele into the 20th Dynasty, in: ZÄS 138, 2011, 168).

²⁷ Morales, in: GM 181, 2001, 70; this is also commented on by Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 82.

²⁸ P. Turin Cat. 1896; KRI VI, 734–735.


²⁹ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 333. The King’s Son of Kush’s troops were also responsible for plundering tombs and temples, see Niwiński, *Bürgerkrieg*, 259–62; Gnirs, *Militär und Gesellschaft*, 193–195. This highlights the possibility that *P3-nḥsy* did not become *persona non grata* until well after Regnal Year 12, hence the suppression of the High Priest had to occur after Regnal Year 12.

³⁰ Bell highlights that in between the succession of *R^c-ms-sw-nḥt* and his son *Jmn-htp*, there may have been the appointment of another son to the position of High Priest of Amun, that of *Ns-Jmn* (Only One High Priest Ramessenakht and the Second Prophet Nesamun His Younger Son, in: *Serapis* 6, 1980, 16). *Ns-Jmn* is known only from a single inscription on the front of a statue inscribed for his father, possibly set up around

can be associated with ‘affected’ memories, but more probable that they reflect the different authors of the two texts.

Two other sources also discuss the so-called ‘suppression’ of *Jmn-ḥtp*. P. BM EA 10383, *rt.2.5*,³¹ identifies *P3-nḥsy* as the ‘suppressor’ (*jw=f thj p3y=j hrj*) of an unnamed official. The text states *dd=f.j.jr(=j) pr m p3 pr n pr-c3 cnh wd3 snb m-dr jw P3-nḥsy jw=f thj p3y=j hrj jw mn thj m.jm=f*, ‘He³² said “I made to leave from the house of Pharaoh LPH, when *P3-nḥsy* came and ‘suppressed’ my superior, although there was no transgression in him”’.³³ Whilst this text may also refer to the ‘suppression’ of *Jmn-ḥtp*, the exact identity of the ‘superior’ is unknown, and *P3-nḥsy* may have had to ‘suppress’ more than one individual in his attempt to control Thebes.³⁴ The conflict between *P3-nḥsy* and *Jmn-ḥtp* is also recorded in P. BM EA 10052, *rt.13.24–5*, a document dated to Year 1 of the *wḥm-ms.wt* period (=Regnal Year 19). This text states that: *dd=s jr m-dr jry.tw p3 hrw.yw hm-ntr tpj jw p3 r(m)t jt3j ht n p3y=j jt*, ‘She said³⁵ “when the conflict of the High Priest occurred, the man stole things from my father”’.³⁶ In this example, however, *hrw.yw* is used instead of *thj*; this significantly links the two terms together, and is discussed further in more detail below.

3. Interpreting *thj*

The issue here concerns the interpretation of the term *thj* in relation to the ‘suppression’ of *Jmn-ḥtp*. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines ‘suppression’ as ‘the action of supressing (forcibly putting an end to) something such as an activity or publication’.³⁷ Historically, the word ‘suppression’ possesses negative connotations often associated with cruel oppressions³⁸ or military sieges of settlements.³⁹ In Egyptian, the word *d3r*⁴⁰ ()⁴¹ is used

Regnal Year 2–10 of Ramesses XI (CGC 42162; PM II: 146; Wentz, in: JNES 25, 1966, 82; C. Desroches-Noblecourt, *Rameses le Grand*, Paris 1976, 136–137; J. Leclant, *L’univers des formes*, Paris 1978, 202).

Wentz commented that *Rc-ms-sw-nḥt* may have remained in office until the reign of Ramesses IX, extending the tenure of *Rc-ms-sw-nḥt* as High Priest rather than introducing a second man with the same name (in: JNES 25, 1966, 83). See also no. 16, for comments about a possible additional High Priest named *Ns-Jmn*; Morales, in: GM 181, 2001, 62–3; Bierbrier, in: JEA 58, 1972, 195–199; J. Černý/ A. Sadek, *Graffiti de la montagne thében*, Cairo 1970, IV, 21 (no. 1860a).

³¹ Complete text can be found in: Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies*, 122–127, pl. 22, (individual passage: 125, pl. 22).

³² Here, the ‘he’ refers to the *Wcb* –priest *P3y-sn*, who is being interrogated for theft from Medinet Habu (P. BM EA 10383, *rt.2.4*). *P3y-sn* also appears in P. BM EA 10068, v.2.17 and P. BM EA 10053, v.3.10.

³³ Translation by Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies*, 125. Wentz (in: JNES 25, 1966, 84) questions whether this superior truly is *Jmn-ḥtp*.

³⁴ Reference to *P3-nḥsy* also appears in P. BM EA 10053, v.1.2, dated to Year 9 of the *wḥm-ms.wt* period or a later reign (Regnal Year 28 of Ramesses XI).

³⁵ The ‘she’ in this line refers to a woman named *Mw.t-m-j3* wife of the Scribe of Divine Records *Ns-Jmn* (P. BM EA 10052, *rt.13.22*).

³⁶ Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies*, 155, pl. 33.

³⁷ The word ‘suppression’ has its origins in the Late Middle English period, and is based on the Latin word ‘suppress’, to press down upon: <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/suppress?q=suppressing> (accessed April 2013).

³⁸ There are many occurrences throughout history of minority groups who have deemed themselves to be oppressed, primarily due to an event or constraint placed upon them that restricts their freedom to live as they choose, perhaps the largest groups are African Americans, women, Native Americans, etc.

to imply these concepts, since it is generally translated by scholars as ‘to control’, ‘to suppress’ (‘beherrschen’, ‘unterdrücken’). *Dʒr* is not an overly common word, but appears to be used throughout the Pharonic period.⁴² However, *thj* is treated in a different manner, and, as will be discussed below in further depth, is often translated as ‘to err’, ‘to transgress’, ‘to injure’ (‘übertreten’, ‘freveln’, ‘schädigen’, ‘irreführen’, ‘angreifen’).⁴³ The slight alteration to the nuance of *thj* modifies the effect of the word. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, ‘transgression’ has a rather different meaning than ‘suppression’, stating that the word refers to the act of ‘go[ing] beyond the limits of what is morally, socially, or legally acceptable’.⁴⁴

In early 2013, the online Wörterbuch, *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (TLA),⁴⁵ provided 157 examples of the verb *thj*.⁴⁶ For the purpose of this study, each of these entries was assessed to examine the individual lexemes and translations of *thj*. All dates given by the TLA have been assimilated for this study, although some texts have disputed dates. The full results are too large for inclusion in this article, but can be made available on request. This list compiled by the TLA does include some duplicate references, and has yet to include the texts under consideration in this article: P. Mayer A, P. BM EA 10383, P. BM EA 10052,

³⁹ Military sieges are a common tactic in warfare; perhaps the most famous siege in Egyptian record is the seven month siege of Megiddo conducted by Thutmosis III (H. Goedicke, *The Battle of Megiddo*, Baltimore, Maryland 2000, 80–87).

⁴⁰ *Wb* 5, 418.3–12; *TLA* Lemma no. 177740. L. Lesko states that *mnj* can also be interpreted as suppress (A Dictionary of Late Egyptian I, 217).

⁴¹ The classifiers for *dʒr* (𓄎𓄏) are shared by the following: *ʒr* (restrain), *mʒr* (wretched), (A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford 1957, 512).

⁴² For example, the first occurrence of the term *Dʒr* is during the Old Kingdom: Wadi Magharah, no. 5, line K7, (A. Gardiner/ Th.E Peet/J. Černý, *The Inscriptions of Sinai*, Part I, Introduction and Plates, London 1952, Pl. 2, no. 5). It is also found in the Pyramid Texts of Unas, PT 251 (A. Piankoff, *The Pyramid of Unas*, Texts Translated with Commentary, ERTR 5, Princeton 1968, pl. 12, 13), and continues in use until the Ptolemaic Period, where it is found in P. Turin Museo Egizio 1791, Tb 114–165, Tb 125, line 4 (R. Lepsius, *Das Todenbuch der Ägypter*, Neudruck Osnabrück 1969, pl. 46; B. de Rachewiltz, *Il Libro dei Morti*, Mailand 1958, 66).

⁴³ See no. 10.

⁴⁴ The word ‘transgress’ comes from late fifteenth century Middle English from either Old French (transgresser) or Latin (transgredi) <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/transgress> (Accessed April 2013).

⁴⁵ *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities 2012). <http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/index.html> (Accessed April 2013). All temporal classifications used by the TLA have been used in this paper for organisational purposes. Many of the texts in question given by the TLA have debated origins, but for the purpose for this word study, I have followed the TLA date classification.

⁴⁶ There are some examples included that may not be *thj*; see, P. Boulaq 13, line Frg. XV.1, where F. Haikal argues that *twhʒ* is actually *rwhʒ*, to return in the evening (in: BIFAO 83, 1983: 246, pl.49, see, *Wb* 2, 409.7; *TLA* Lemma no. 93700); In regards to P. Chester Beatty I, verso, line C 3.4, K. Kitchen (Poetry of Ancient Egypt, Jonserved 1999, 324–325) argues that it is not *tw-hʒ* but *tw(y) hʒ.tj* (‘brought down’, classified by D55) and indeed other scholars translate it in a similar manner; A. Gardiner, *The Library of A. Chester Beatty: Description of a Hieratic Papyrus with a Mythological Story, Love-Songs and other Miscellaneous Texts*, London 1931, 32 (distracted); P. Gillbert, *La poésie égyptienne*, Bruxelles 1949, 71 (qu’egaré); J. White, *A Study of the Language of Love in the Song of Songs and Ancient Egyptian Poetry*, Missoula, SBL Dissertation Series 38, Montana 1978, 179 (given in); M. Fox, *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love-Songs*, Madison 1985, 53 (collapsed); C. Lalouette, *Textes sacrés et textes profanes de l’ancienne Égypte. II: Mythes, contes et poesies*, Paris 1987, 251 (tombée); E. Hornung, *Gesänge vom Nil: Dichtung am Hofe der Pharaonen*, Zürich/München 1990, 150 (verfiel); P. Vernus, *Chants d’amour de l’Égypte antique*, Paris 1992, 66 (egaré); B. Fowler, *Love Lyrics of Ancient Egypt*, Chapel Hill, California 1994, 61 (collapsed).

the Karnak Inscription. From this compilation of the usage of the word *thj* some key observations can be made. Firstly, the term *thj* is used with some frequency throughout the Pharaonic period, first appearing in the Old Kingdom, where it can be viewed in a pyramid text found in the pyramid of Pepi I (PT484),⁴⁷ and then continuing into the Roman Period, where the TLA lists the last entry of the word in the Opet temple at Karnak.⁴⁸ The term also survives into demotic,⁴⁹ but no attestations are known from Coptic.

Secondly, there is a noticeable evolution of the composition of *thj* in the texts, as the following chart demonstrates:

<i>Old Kingdom</i>	𓂏				
<i>First Intermediate Period</i>	𓂏𓏏				
<i>Middle Kingdom</i>	𓂏𓏏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏			
<i>Second Intermediate Period</i>	𓂏𓏏𓂏				
<i>New Kingdom</i>	𓂏𓏏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏
	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏		
<i>Third Intermediate Period</i>	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏
<i>Late Period</i>	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	
<i>Ptolemaic and Roman Period</i>	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏𓂏	𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏		𓂏𓏏𓂏𓂏




In the above chart, the classifiers used change depending on the period in question. In the Old Kingdom no classifiers are present, with the first classifier appearing in the First Intermediate Period, where 𓏏 (G37) is used implying negative connotations to the lexeme.⁵⁰ The most frequently used classifiers, which first appear in the Middle Kingdom, are: 𓂏














⁴⁷ K. Sethe, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte II*, Leipzig 1910, 75, line 1024c; J. Allen, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts, Writings from the Ancient World 23*, Atlanta 2005, 336.

⁴⁸ C. de Wit, *Les inscriptions du temple d'Opet, à Karnak. III. Traduction intégrale des textes rituels – Essai d'interprétation*, *Bibl. Aeg. XIII*, Bruxelles, 1968, 111–112, no. 2; see also, Wilson, *A Ptolemaic lexicon*, 1148.

⁴⁹ W. Erichsen, *Demotische Glossar*, Milan 1972, 649–650, here it is translated as *übertreten/schädigen* (transgress/damage).

⁵⁰ Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 471.

(D54) and  (D56). As noted by Arlette David, Alan Gardiner argued that the double classifiers are used to determine various verbs expressing movement.⁵¹ David goes on to state that ‘if the icon  (D54) is used to represent movement, one must admit that no real movement is involved here’. However, once combined with the  (D56) classifier, which appears to be associated with connotations of ‘trampling down’ or ‘taking over’, then ‘the group relates metaphorically to the lexeme, when ‘trespassing is walking over someone’.⁵²

From the New Kingdom onwards three new classifiers are introduced, the most frequent of which becomes prominent in the construction of the lexeme during both the latter stages of the New Kingdom and later in the Pharaonic period:  (D57), which can be found in lexemes for ‘mutilation’ (*jʒt*), ‘cheat’ (*sjʒ.tj*) and ‘damage’ (*nkn*).⁵³ Also found are the classifiers  (D40), which is used to convey a sense of ‘strength’ (*nht*),⁵⁴ and  (A24), which provides a sense of violence, appearing in lexemes for ‘strike’ (*hwj*), ‘strong’ (*nht*), and ‘take away’ (*nhm*).⁵⁵ Also, to briefly note, from the New Kingdom onwards, *thj* can also be written *thʒ* (  ), with the addition of  (G1) to the composition, perhaps reflecting a possible shift in the pronunciation of the word. Other variations of *thj* are apparent in the chart, but these do not occur with regularity,    and   , for example, only appear once each in P. Cairo CG 51189 (Tb 125, lines 720 and 743, respectively) dating to the New Kingdom.⁵⁶

The third observation to make in regards to *thj* concerns its interpretation. Several scholars have attempted to define *thj*,⁵⁷ although the majority of studies remain generally within

⁵¹ Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 457.

⁵² A. David, *Syntactic and Lexico-Semantic Aspects of the Legal Register in Ramesside Royal Decrees*, *Göttinger Orientforschungen IV. Reihe Ägypten*, Wiesbaden 2006, 29.

⁵³ Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 457.

⁵⁴ Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 455.

⁵⁵ Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 444.

⁵⁶ I. Munro, *Die Totenbuch-Handschriften der 18. Dynastie im Museum Cairo*, *ÄA* 54, 1994, pl. 65.

⁵⁷ Other scholars do also discuss *thj*. Krutchen states that ‘*jr th* représente la forme néo-égyptienne, construite avec l’auxiliaire *jrj*, du participe perfectif de *thj*. Comme nous l’avons vu, l’auxiliaire *jrj* est parfois employé des le moyen-égyptien avec des verbes de mouvement (Le decret d’Horemheb: Traduction, commentaire épigraphique, philologique et institutionnel, Brussels 1981: 125, see also 70, no. 212). Lesko provides several translations of the word dependent on the text in which it appears, including ‘to wrong, to transgress, to violate, to damage, to disobey, to mislead, to interfere with, and to rebel against’ (*A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*, VI, 93–94). Parkinson states that *thj* can be translated as ‘to overstep/attack and usually has negative connotations (transgress) similar to *hnn*’ (Two New “Literary” Texts on a Second Intermediate Period Papyrus? A Preliminary Account of P. BM EA 10475; in: E. Blumenthal/J. Assmann (eds.), *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen Ägypten. Vorträge der Tagung zum Gedenken an Georges Posener 5.–10. September 1996 in Leipzig*, *BdE* 127, Cairo 1998, 186). Vernus states that ‘presque tous les traducteurs ont rendu *pʒ th.k* par quelque chose comme <celui qui s’oppose à toi> violant ainsi allégrement la grammaire (*Sagesses de l’Égypte pharaonique; Présentation, traduction et notes*, Paris 2001, 332, no. 50). See also, A. Erman, *Gespräch eines Lebensmüden mit seiner Seele: Aus dem Papyrus 3024 der Königl. Museen*, Berlin 1896, 21–22; Kitchen, *Studies in Egyptian Wisdom Literature I: The Instruction by a Man for His Son*, in: *OrAnt* 8, 1969, 191–2, no. 2; E. Blumenthal, *Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königstum des MR. I: Die Phraseologie*, Berlin 1970, 416; H. Goedicke, *The report about the dispute of a man with his Ba: Papyrus Berlin 3024*, Baltimore 1970, 92; S. Allam, *Trois missives d’un commandant (pap. CGC 58053–5)*, in: *Annales du Service des Antiquités Égypti-*

the scope of the individual document under consideration. Gardiner had perhaps the largest impact on outlining the definition of *thj*. In his commentary on the *Story of Sinuhe*, he stated ‘it must be admitted however that the sense ‘to lead astray’ [given in the text] is not supported by any further evidence; elsewhere *th(j)* is ‘to err’, ‘to transgress’ or ‘to violate’.⁵⁸ He extended on this point further during his analysis of the Nauri Decree, pondering that ‘the verb *thj* undoubtedly possesses some implication of wrongdoing.’⁵⁹ Anthony Spalinger briefly argued that in the context of the Nauri Decree it implied that ‘the people of Abydos are protected against ‘violation’ (i.e. wrong doing).⁶⁰ However, David has expanded on this notion in her analysis of the Decree, stating that ‘it is not clear [in the Nauri Decree] if the transgression nature is incompetence or abuse within the scope of the transgressor authority’, suggesting that *thj* also had legal connotations, normally represented as *thj-r*.⁶¹

Thus, what is seen in regards to the translation of *thj* in both literary and non-literary texts is that the term is treated in a similar manner; translated as ‘to transgress’, ‘to violate’, ‘to injure’, ‘to lead astray’. The complete list of translations of *thj* is too large to include in this article, but a brief demonstration of the usage of the word will now be provided. One of the earliest occurrences of *thj* is contained in a Sixth Dynasty letter from Elephantine P. Berlin 8869, *rt.* K9.⁶² In this document *thj* has been translated as ‘violate’ and ‘transgression’.⁶³ Two sources are known from the First Intermediate Period, the Stele of Rediukhnum (CCG 20543), line A14, where *thj* is translated as ‘neglected’,⁶⁴ and the Stele of Tjeti (BM EA 614), line 9, where it is translated as ‘transgress’, ‘neglected’, and ‘overstep’.⁶⁵

ennes 71, 1987, 7, no. g; W. Hovestreydt, A Letter to the King related to the Foundation of a Statue (P. Turin 1879 verso.), in: *LingAeg* 5, 1997, 108. See also Jansen-Winkel, in: *ZÄS* 119, 1992, 29.

⁵⁸ A. Gardiner, Notes on the Story of Sinuhe, Paris 1916, 74, 161, especially 74, no. 202, in regard to his discussion on P. Berlin 3022.

⁵⁹ A. Gardiner, Some Reflections on the Nauri Decree, in: *JEA* 38, 1952, 28 (L. 31); based on earlier discussions by Edgerton (The Nauri Decree of Seti I, in: *JNES* 6, 1947, 221, no. 11).

⁶⁰ A. Spalinger, Some Revisions of Temple Endowments in the New Kingdom, in: *JARCE* 28, 32, no. 50.

⁶¹ David, Syntactic and Lexico-Semantic Aspects of the Legal Register, 29. Kutchen also comments on this, finding a similar conclusion (Le décret d'Horemheb : Traduction, commentaire épigraphique, philologique et institutionnel, Brussels 1981, 209); Polaček (Le décret d'Horemheb à Karnak: essai d'analyse socio-juridique, in: Théodoridès, Le droit égyptien ancien, 87–111) and Lephron (The Reign of Akhenaten Seen through the Later Royal Decrees, in: Posener-Kriéger, Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar II, 93–103) both translate *thj* as ‘corruption’ in this text.

⁶² G. Möller, Hieratische Papyrus aus den Königlischen Museen zu Berlin III, Leipzig 1911, pls. 2–3. Only two sources are known from the Old Kingdom, the second source PT Pepi I (PT484) is discussed above in no. 82, Allen translates *thj* in this text as ‘contravenes (The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts, 336).

⁶³ E. Wente, Letters from Ancient Egypt, Writing from the Ancient World 1, Atlanta 1990, 58 (violate); G. Vittman, in: Porten, The Elephantine Papyri in English, 32–34 (transgression); C. Manassa, The Crimes of Count Sabni, in: *ZÄS* 133, 2006, 152 (transgression).

⁶⁴ H. Lange/H. Schäfer, Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reichs im Museum von Kairo, No. 20001–20780 II, No. 20400–20780, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Berlin 1908, 164–167 (no. 20543); H. Stock, Die erste Zwischenzeit Ägyptens, *Studia Aegyptiaca* 2 (Analecta Orientalia 31), Roma 1949, 46–48, pl. 5; M. Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian Autobiographies Chiefly of the Middle Kingdom, OBO 84, Freiburg/Göttingen 1988, 43 (neglected).

⁶⁵ A. Blackman, The Stele of Thethi: British Museum No. 614, in: *JEA* 17, 1931, 56, pl. 8; W. Schenkel, Memphis - Herakleopolis – Theben, *ÄgAbh* 12, Wiesbaden 1965, 105 (überträt); M. Lichtheim, Ancient Egyptian Literature I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1975, 92 (overstep); idem, Ancient Egyptian Autobiographies, 47 (neglected).

In the Middle Kingdom text P. *Hk3-nht* I, *rt.16*, *thj* was translated by T. G. James as ‘disobey’,⁶⁶ but later translated by Hans Goedicke as ‘trespass’,⁶⁷ by Wente as ‘overstep’,⁶⁸ and by James Allen as ‘violate’.⁶⁹ In another Middle Kingdom text, P. Prisse, *rt.5.8*, which contains the *Maxims of Ptahhotep*, *thj* is interpreted as ‘to harm’ or ‘to damage’;⁷⁰ the same translation of the term appears in a Second Intermediate Period text from the Stele of Juf (Kairo TR 9/6/18/26), line x+8.⁷¹ In the New Kingdom text P. Moscow 4658, *rt.5.8*, which contains a copy of *The Teachings for Merikare*, *thj* is generally translated as ‘to transgress’ and in German as ‘frevel’.⁷² Other New Kingdom texts translate *thj* in a similar fashion; in P. MMA 27.3.560, *rt.2*, *thj* has been translated as ‘transgressed against’⁷³ and ‘interfered with’,⁷⁴ in P. BM EA 10184, v.5.2, it is translated as ‘to lead astray’,⁷⁵ whilst in P. BM EA 10509, *rt.1.13*, it is thought to mean ‘to transgress’ and ‘to damage’.⁷⁶

Thj continues then to be interpreted in a similar manner throughout the Third Intermediate Period,⁷⁷ the Late Period,⁷⁸ and indeed into the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.⁷⁹ These

⁶⁶ T.G. James, *The Hekanakhte Papers*, New York 1962, 14, pl. 2a.

⁶⁷ H. Goedicke, *Studies in the Hekanakhte Papers*, Baltimore 1984, 43–44, pl. 5.

⁶⁸ Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt*, 59 (overstep), 61, no. y (overstepping).

⁶⁹ J. Allen, *The Heqanakht Papyri*, PMMA 27, New York 2002, 15 (violate).

⁷⁰ G. Jéquier, *Le papyrus Prisse et ses variantes*. Papyrus de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Nos 183 à 194), Papyrus 10371 et 10435 du British Museum, Tablette Carnarvon au Musée du Caire, Paris 1911, pl. 2; E. Dévaud, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep d'après le Papyrus Prisse*, les Papyrus 10371/10435 et 10509 du British Museum et la Tablette Carnarvon: Texte, Fribourg 1916, 18, line 50; Z. Zaba, *Les maximes de Ptahhotep*, Prague 1956, 71 (enfrendra); H. Brunner, *Altägyptische Weisheit: Lehren für das Leben*, Darmstadt 1988, 111 (schaden); A. Roccati, *Sapienza egizia. La letteratura educativa in Egitto durante il II millennio a.C.*, Testi del Vicino Oriente antico, Brescia 1994, 36 (disobbedira); Vernus, *Sagesses de l'Égypte pharaonique*, 75; F. Junge, *Die Lehre Ptahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, OBO 193, Freiburg/Göttingen 2003, 189 (schaden).

⁷¹ D. Franke, *Personendaten aus dem Mittleren Reich*, ÄgAb 41, Wiesbaden 1984, 63; M. Daressy, *Monuments d'Édfou datant du Moyen Empire*, in: ASAE 18, 1918, 49–50; S. Kubisch, *Lebensbilder der 2. Zwischenzeit: biographische Inschriften der 13.–17. Dynastie*, SDAIK 34, Berlin/New York 2008, 75 (beschädigen), 245–6 (schädigen).

⁷² W. Golénischeff, *Les papyrus hiératiques 1115, 1116A et 1116B de l'Ermitage Impérial à St. Pétersbourg*, St. Pétersbourg 1913, 4, pl. suppl. B, line 71; A. Volten, *Zwei altägyptische politische Schriften: Die Lehre für König Merikarê (Pap. Carlsberg VI) und die Lehre des Königs Amenemhet*, *Analecta Aegyptiaca* 4, Kopenhagen 1945, 36; W. Helck, *Die Lehre für König Merikare*, *Kleine ägyptische Texte*, Wiesbaden 1977 (= 1988), 42; J. Quack, *Studien zur Lehre für Merikare*, GOF IV, 23, Wiesbaden 1992, 179, 43 (Frevel); A. Gardiner, *New Literary Works from Ancient Egypt*, in: JEA 1, 1914, 28 (transgressed); V. Tobin, *The Teachings for Merikare*, in: Simpson, *The Literature of Ancient Egypt*, 159 (transgresses).

⁷³ W. Hayes, *Varia from the Time of Hatshepsut*, MDAIK 15, 1957, 81, 89, pl. 13.

⁷⁴ Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt*, 90.

⁷⁵ A. Gardiner, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca* VII, Brussels 1937, 92, line 12; R. Caminos, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, *Brown Egyptological Studies* I, London 1954, 350 (lead astray).

⁷⁶ E. Dévaud, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep d'après le Papyrus Prisse*, les Papyrus 10371/10435 et 10509 du British Museum et la Tablette Carnarvon. Texte, Fribourg 1916, 18; Z. Zaba, *Les maximes de Ptahhotep*, Prague 1956: 20 (l'enfreindra); R. Parkinson, *The Tale of Sinuhe and Other Ancient Egyptian Poems 1940-1640 BC*, Oxford 1997, 251 (transgress); F. Junge, *Die Lehre Ptahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, OBO 193, Freiburg/Göttingen 2003, 189 (schädigen).

⁷⁷ Appears, for example, in the Stela of Tjeti (BM EA 614) from the Theban area, in line 9, where it is translated as ‘damage’, see Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Autobiographies*, 46–48; E. Russman, *Eternal Egypt: Masterworks of Ancient Art from the British Museum*, London 2001, 82–83.

⁷⁸ For example, in the Late Period it appears in P. BM EA 10474, *rt.4.10*, *The Teachings of Amenemope*, and is generally translated in the following manner: F. Griffiths, *The Teaching of Amenophis the Son of Kanacht*: Papyrus B.M. 10474, in: JEA 12, 1926, 200 (injured); H. Lange, *Das Weisheitsbuch des Amenemope*

sources and their translations demonstrate that there is no clear development in the usage of the term *thj*, it seems consistently to refer to the act of ‘going against’ someone, projecting strong, negative connotations. More importantly, however, is that *thj* is not once in all 157 examples given by the TLA translated by scholars into English as ‘to suppress’, where ‘to transgress’ and ‘to damage’ are prevalent translations in English, and ‘übertreten’, ‘frev-eln’, and ‘schädigen’ in German.⁸⁰ So why then is this trend not repeated in regards to the ‘War of the High Priest’ at the end of the Twentieth Dynasty?

4. *Thj and the ‘War of the High Priest’*

With the above discussion in mind, how then does this improved understanding of *thj* alter the translations and nuances of the texts that discuss the ‘War of the High Priest’? If the *thj* present in P. Mayer A, v.6.7, is translated as ‘transgression’, rather than the usual ‘suppression’, the text implies that for a period of time (at least 9 months) the High Priest of Amun *Jmn-ḥtp* was ‘transgressed’ against. Certainly this ‘transgression’ appears to have been violent, as P. Mayer A, v.6.8, records the destruction of a portable-chest.⁸¹ Morales proposes, and to a certain degree this is supported by this study, that the ‘suppression’ of *Jmn-ḥtp* was not ‘describing a violent action’ against the religious institution of Medinet Habu, but rather ‘a forced appointment by a new superior’.⁸² Morales approaches this conclusion not from a semantic view point, but via an examination of the administration during the ‘War of the High Priest’. It certainly appears that a ‘new superior’ was appointed, and thus, under this hypothesis, the ‘transgression’ committed against *Jmn-ḥtp* involved the loss of both his titles and his authority.

Yet, rather than a minimally-violent event, as implied by the term ‘forced’ employed by Morales that suggests a localised act of violence against either an individual, in this case *Jmn-ḥtp*, or a small number of individuals, the event was permeated with violent actions on a much wider scale than that envisaged by Morales. P. Mayer A, v.6.4, states that the Nubians conquered the temple, and presumably its supplies, during the transgression of *Jmn-ḥtp*,⁸³ leaving the priest impotent during this period. However, this does not imply that a ‘suppression’ occurred. Similar representations of the suffering experienced by *Jmn-ḥtp* can

aus dem Papyrus 10,474 des British Museum, København 1925, 35 (verletzt); V. Laisney, L'Enseignement d'Aménémopé, *Studia Pohl: Series Maior* 19, Roma 2007, 54–55 (t'attaque); A. Erman, Das Weisheitsbuch des Amen-em-ope, in: *OLZ* 27, 1924, 243 (verlässt); . I. Grumach, Untersuchungen zur Lebenslehre des Amenope, *MÄS* 23, Munich/Berlin 1972, 30 (angreift); W. Simpson, The Teachings of Amenemope, in: Simpson, *The Literature of Ancient Egypt*, 226 (interfered with); M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature II: The New Kingdom*, Berkeley, Los Angeles/London 1976, 150 (attacks); Brunner, *Altägyptische Weisheit*, 239 (vergeht); A. Roccati, *Sapienza egizia: La letteratura educativa in Egitto durante il II millennio a.C.*, Testi del Vicino Oriente antico, Brescia 1994, 127 (assale); E. Brescianni, *Letteratura e poesia dell'antico Egitto. Cultura e società attraverso i testi*, Turin 1969, 493 (attaccato); Vernus, *Sagesses de l'Égypte pharaonique*, 310 (t'opposes).

⁷⁹ Wilson (*A Ptolemaic lexicon*, 1148) translates it as ‘to violate, transgress, with direct object–to attack’. Additionally, it appears several times in P. Turin Museo Egizio 1791 where it is translated either as ‘attack/damage’ (Lepsius, *Das Tottenbuch der Ägypter*, Tb109, line 9, pl. 39, and Tb125, line 11, pl. 46), or as ‘transgress’ (Lepsius, *Das Tottenbuch der Ägypter*, Tb125, line 28.1, pl. 47). de Rachewiltz (*Il Libro dei Morti*, 62, 65, 67) translates these lines in Italian in a similar manner.

⁸⁰ In Italian most common is ‘trasgredire’, whilst in French ‘celui qui s'oppose a toi’ is prevalent.

⁸¹ See no. 49.

⁸² Morales, in: *GM* 181, 2001, 68.

⁸³ See no. 48.

be found in the Karnak Inscription on the rear east wall of the Tuthmoside chapel near the 7th pylon. In this text *thj* appears three times, and is, once again, translated differently by scholars. In line 18 of the inscription, it states that [...] *tʃj=s jw=f jr 8 ʒbd n hr.w jm=st jw=j šnj gr=f r-jqr sp-2*, ‘...seized it. He spent 8 whole months in it, and I suffered exceedingly under him!’ This line asserts that an unknown man, unknown due to damage on the wall of the shrine, seized it (the temple) for a period of eight months. It does not suggest that *Jmn-htp* was ‘suppressed’ for this period, but rather the man, presumably *Pʒ-nḥsy*, controlled Medinet Habu and its supplies for a period of eight months, thus ‘seizing’ *Jmn-htp*’s titles and authority for this period, and hence, he ‘suffered exceedingly’.

In later lines, *Jmn-htp* refers to this seizure of the temple as a ‘transgression against’ him. This only appears in line 21, where Elizabeth Froid translates this nominal use of the infinitive form of *thj* as ‘transgression’ (Wente translated it as ‘wrong done’⁸⁴), with the implication that it refers to an ‘injustice’ conducted towards *Jmn-htp*.⁸⁵ This sudden change in the translation of *thj* is not limited to this text, it also occurs in P. BM EA 10383, rt.2.5, which states *dd=f j.jr(=j) pr m pʒ pr n pr-ʿʒ ʿnh wḏʒ snb m-dr jw Pʒ-nḥsy jw=f thj pʒy=j hrj jw mn thj m.jm=f*, ‘He said “I made to leave from the house of Pharaoh LPH, when *Pʒ-nḥsy* came and ‘suppressed’ my superior, although there was no ‘transgression’⁸⁶ in him”’. The notable problem with this translation is the two separate ways in which *thj* is interpreted; the section should perhaps read ‘when *Pʒ-nḥsy* came and transgressed against my superior’, i.e. removing his authority.

In line 24 of the Karnak Inscription, the text states: (24): [...] *jry=j n=f ʒh.w thʒ=f pʒ thʒ=j ʒs jw-bw-pw=f dj wḏffj*, ‘I have accomplished for him (likely a reference to the pharaoh)⁸⁷ benefactions, (for) he has ‘suppressed’ quickly the one who had ‘suppressed’ me, without his ever having permitted delay’.⁸⁸ It asserts that the ‘suppressor’ of *Jmn-htp* was himself ‘suppressed’. No sources are known concerning a ‘suppression’ of *Pʒ-nḥsy*, but if *thj* is instead understood here to represent an act of hostility (as *hrw.yw* is in P. BM EA 10052, see below) then this would support documentation concerning the later persecution of *Pʒ-nḥsy*.⁸⁹ Hence, it would be better to translate this line as ‘he has transgressed quickly, the one who had transgressed me’, referring to the restoration of *Jmn-htp*’s titles and authority, and the removal of *Pʒ-nḥsy*’s.⁹⁰ This would then link back to the notions of the Eng-

⁸⁴ Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 78.

⁸⁵ Froid, Biographical Texts from the Ramesside Period, 80. For a comparable sentence, see P. Anastasi V, rt.27.5, where Caminos states that ‘the transitive infinitive of *thj* ‘to wander, transgress, disobey’, is sometimes used nominally in the sense of the present instance (Late Egyptian Miscellanies, London 1954).

⁸⁶ Peet translates this second *thj* as ‘there was no fault’, he does not translate the two occurrences of *thj* in the same manner (The Great Tomb Robberies, 125).

⁸⁷ This section likely refers to pharaoh (Ramesses XI) as line 21 states ‘I appealed to pharaoh’, with his action discussed in line 24 (see Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 78).

⁸⁸ Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 78–79; Also, Froid (Biographical Texts from the Ramesside Period, 80) follows Wente’s translation. See also J. Quack, Die Lehren des Ani: ein neuägyptischer Weisheitstext in seinem kulturellen Umfeld, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 141, Göttingen 1994, 181.

⁸⁹ Lull, Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón, 45.

⁹⁰ It is unlikely that he lived longer than the initial years of the *whm-ms.wt* period, although it does seem like he resumed his position as High Priest of Amun. He had already exercised this position for 31 years and would have been of a considerable age. Furthermore, he is not mentioned in a tribunal dated to the beginning of the *whm-ms.wt* (see Lull, Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón, 46–7). This is counter-argued by Barwik (The Twi-

lish definition of ‘transgression’, involving the act of going beyond what is morally, legally, or socially acceptable, and for *Jmn-ḥtp* this involved the removal of his titles and authority. This would then also reflect the usage of *thj* in the Nauri Decree, where David argues that the transgression reflects an abuse of the transgressor’s authority,⁹¹ in this case the ability of *P3-nḥsy*, as the king’s son of Kush, to remove the authority of the High Priest of Amun.

The tension between *Jmn-ḥtp* and *P3-nḥsy* had probably been developing for at least eight years since *P3-nḥsy*’s arrival in Thebes, as suggested by his presence in P. BM EA 10053, v.1.2, dated to Regnal Year 9 of Ramesses XI. The growing friction between them is supported by the use of the word *ḥrw.yw*⁹² in P. BM EA 10052, *rt.*13.24–5. This text states that: *jr m-dr jry.tw p3 ḥrw.yw ḥm-ntr tpj*, ‘when the conflict of the High Priest occurred’. In this example, *ḥrw.yw* is used instead of *thj*, referring to ‘conflict’ or ‘hostility’, rather than ‘suppression’. Moving the connotation of *thj* away from the idea that it infers a form of ‘suppression’ to the notion that it implies some form of hostility would better compliment the treatment of *thj* in textual sources beyond its use in sources concerning the ‘War of the High Priest’. Hence, a semantic connection can be made between *thj* and *ḥrw.yw*, a union supported by the shared classifier 𓆎 , and the violent nuances expressed by its inclusion. The variation in treatment of *thj* in relation to the ‘War of the High Priest’ results in extreme nuances being placed on both the term and the event itself. In actuality, all that can accurately be ascertained from the use of the term here is that *P3-nḥsy* committed some form of (more than likely violent) offence against *Jmn-ḥtp*, perhaps on more than one occasion as the sources imply, resulting in the loss of titles and authority.

5. Aftermath of the ‘War of the High Priest’ and Concluding Remarks

The events that unfolded after the so-called ‘suppression’ are even more vague, but it would appear that the restriction of *Jmn-ḥtp*, whether officially endorsed or not, forced Ramesses XI to intervene with his army from the north in order to prevent a potential separation between northern Egypt and the area south from Thebes.⁹³ *P3-nḥsy* seems to have responded to this threat with a military reply and P. Mayer A, *rt.*13, B.2–3 details his march northwards. In P. BM EA 10052, *rt.*10.18–20, it states that *P3-nḥsy* looted Cynopolis,⁹⁴ and that he may have even reached Heracleopolis Magna.⁹⁵ Karl Jansen-Winkel hypothesises that

light of Ramesside Egypt, 108), who states that *Jmn-ḥtp* must have been removed by ‘representatives of the new regime’. For further information on the burial of *Jmn-ḥtp* in K93.12, see D. Polz, An Architect’s Sketch from the Theban Necropolis, in: MDAIK 53, 1997, 234; idem, in: SÄK 25, 1998, 276; idem, Das Ramsesnacht-Bauwerk-Archäologie und Architektur, in: MDAIK 53, 1999, 348–349; U. Rummel, Grab oder Tempel? Die funeräre Anlage des Hohenpriesters des Amun Amenophis in Dra’ Abu el-Naga (Theben-West), in: D. Kessler et al. (eds.), Theben-Texte-Tonfragmente. Festschrift für Günter Burkard, ÄAT 76, Wiesbaden 2009, 348–360; idem, Der Tempel im Grab: Die Doppelgrabanlage K93.11/K93.12 in Dra’ Abu el-Naga, in: I. Gerlach/D. Raue (eds.), Sanktuar und Ritual: Heilige Plätze im archäologischen Befund, MKT 10, Rahden/Westf. 2013, 223–225.

⁹¹ David, Syntactic and Lexico-Semantic Aspects of the Legal Register, 29.

⁹² *Wb* 3, 326.1–3; *TLA* Lemma no. 120090.

⁹³ Lull, Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón, 45.

⁹⁴ P. BM EA 10052, *rt.*10.18; A. Gardiner, The Wilbour Papyrus, Oxford, 1941–1952, 39; idem, Ancient Egyptian Onomastica II, London, 1947, 98–103; F. Gomaà, Hardai, in: LÄ II, 1977, 962.

⁹⁵ A. Niwiński, Le passage de la XXe à la XXIIe dynastie, in: BIFAO 95, 1995, 339; Morales, in: GM 181, 2001, 67.

P3-nḥsy was able to reach as far north as the Ramesside capital at Per-Ramesses,⁹⁶ although Lull suggests that this is doubtful.⁹⁷ The army of the pharaoh was apparently able to push *P3-nḥsy* back southwards,⁹⁸ however, the Tomb Robbery Papyri do question the success of this manoeuvre, since he still appears causing trouble for the local populous in the early years of the *whm-ms.wt* period.⁹⁹ In the aftermath of this revolt, *Jmn-ḥtp* was likely reappointed to his previous position of High Priest of Amun¹⁰⁰ and *P3-nḥsy* was labelled *persona non grata*.¹⁰¹

The fact remains that the events before, during, and after the ‘War of the High Priest’ and the ‘suppression’ of *Jmn-ḥtp* remain ambiguous, but what is clear is that modern understanding and interpretation of the event needs to be re-evaluated. Current scholarship appears to be too focused on the motivations behind *P3-nḥsy*’s decision to enter Thebes and when this occurred, and as such, very little consideration has been given to what took place when he entered the city from the sources that have actually survived.

Further questions arise concerning the interpretation of the verb *thj*, suggesting that translating it as ‘suppression’ in relation to the ‘War of the High Priest’ alters the nuance of the term, when in all other cases it is understood to mean ‘transgression’ or possibly ‘to damage’, ‘to injure’, or ‘to lead astray’. Hence, it is plausible to argue that instead of a sustained ‘suppression’ of *Jmn-ḥtp* at Medinet Habu, where the High Priest was trapped behind the *temenos* wall of the temple, the ‘War of the High Priest’ consisted of a series of violent transgressions against *Jmn-ḥtp*, the ultimate of which resulted in the removal of his title of High Priest of Amun for a period of time. Thus, *thj* can be observed in relation to the ‘War of the High Priest’ as highlighting that *P3-nḥsy*’s removal of *Jmn-ḥtp*’s titles and authority was considered by *Jmn-ḥtp* to be legally and socially unjust, and as such, he is able to state that he was ‘transgressed against’, as he viewed this action as an abuse of *P3-nḥsy*’s authority. These transgressions carried out during the specified periods were most likely the cause of a power struggle between these two men over the control of Thebes, which had presumably been increasing ever since *P3-nḥsy* first appeared in Thebes in Regnal Year 9 of Ramesses XI.

⁹⁶ Jansen-Winkel, in: ZÄS 119, 1992, 31.

⁹⁷ Lull, *Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 46.

⁹⁸ Lull (*Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 46) even suggests that this army included support from Smendes.

⁹⁹ See P. BM EA 10383, *rt.2.4* (Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies*, 125, pl. 22), dating to Year 2 *whm-ms.wt*, discusses the suppression of a Theban superior. However, the date of the suppression itself is not given, so it may have happened before *P3-nḥsy* marched north or on his return south after the so-called suppression of the High Priest.

¹⁰⁰ See inscription on rear wall of the Tuthmoside chapel near the 7th pylon in Karnak (Wente, in: JNES 25, 1966, 73–87; KRI VI, 536–538; Froot, *Biographical Texts from the Ramesside Period*, 77–81).

¹⁰¹ Lull (*Los sumos sacerdotes de Amón*, 46) claims that perhaps it would be more logical to interpret the observed destruction found in the archaeological reports by Hölscher at Medinet Habu dated to the end of the Twentieth Dynasty, as not being directly related to the capture of the temple by *P3-nḥsy* during his dispute with the High Priest of Amun *Jmn-ḥtp*, but, rather, the seizure by the forces of Pharaoh against the last major pockets of resistance as *P3-nḥsy* retreated southward (U. Hölscher, *Medinet Habu*, Leipzig 1933; *The Excavation of Medinet Habu*, Chicago 1934–1954).

Inhaltsverzeichnis

<i>Abdel-Raziq, Abdalla</i> Three Late Middle Kingdom Stelae from Al-Salam School Museum, Assiut (Taf. 1-3)	1-16
<i>Antoine, Jean-Christophe</i> Social position and the organisation of landholding in Ramesside Egypt. An analysis of the Wilbour Papyrus	17-46
<i>Breyer, Francis</i> Vorlagen zur ›Punthalle‹ von Dair al-Bahrī aus dem Alten Reich. Philologisch-epigraphische, textkritische und ikonographische cruces im Zusammenspiel von Darstellungen und Inschriften	47-91
<i>Di Biase-Dyson, Camilla</i> Multiple Dimensions of Interpretation. Reassessing the Magic Brick Berlin ÄMP 15559 (Taf. 4)	93-107
<i>Díaz Hernández, Roberto A.</i> The Role of the War Chariot in the Formation of the Egyptian Empire in the Early 18 th Dynasty	109-122
<i>Hellum, Jennifer</i> Toward an Understanding of the Use of Myth in the Pyramid Texts.....	123-142
<i>Hsu, Shih-Wei</i> Pharaos Körper: Tiere als bildliche Ausdrücke in den Königsinschriften	143-157
<i>Kahl, Jochem</i> Assiut – Theben – Tebtynis. Wissensbewegungen von der Ersten Zwischenzeit und dem Mittleren Reich bis in Römische Zeit	159-172
<i>Klotz, David</i> Hibis Varia (§1-3): Diverse Liturgical Texts from Hibis Temple	173-207
<i>Lapp, Günther</i> Totentexte der Privatleute vom Ende des Alten Reiches bis zur 1. Zwischenzeit unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Sargkammern und Särgen	209-222
<i>Malaise, Michel</i> Le calathos sur la tête d’Isis: une enquête	223-265

<i>Metawi, Dina</i> The False Door of <i>Wd^c-Dri</i> (Cairo Museum, without number) (Taf. 5-7)	267-276
<i>O'Rourke, Paul F.</i> The Book of the Dead of Ankhefenkhonsu in Brooklyn (Taf. 8-12)	277-315
<i>Ramcke, Rainer</i> Der Sothis-Zyklus und die zwei Anfänge des altägyptischen Verwaltungskalenders. Eine astronomische Simulation	317-358
<i>Ridealgh, Kim</i> A Tale of Semantics and Suppressions: Reinterpreting Papyrus Mayer A and the So-called 'War of the High Priest' during the Reign of Ramesses XI	359-373
<i>Rummel, Ute</i> War, death and burial of the High Priest Amenhotep: the archaeological record at Dra' Abu el-Naga (Taf. 13-15).....	375-397
<i>Spalinger, Anthony John</i> Eleventh Day, Twelfth Night: Further Remarks Concerning Three Feasts in Egyptian Civil Tooth	399-415
<i>Stefanović, Danijela</i> The overseer of <i>mš^c</i> of the section of <i>nfrw</i> (stela London BM EA 1822) (Taf 16).....	417-421
<i>Theis, Christoffer</i> Zu den an der Pyramide Lepsius XIII gefundenen Namen. Die Frage nach <i>Nfr-k3</i> und <i>B3-k3</i>	423-438
<i>El-Tonssy, Mohamed A. / Mohamed, Yossef</i> Two Unpublished False Doors from Saqqara (Taf. 17-18)	439-455
Anschriften der Autorinnen und Autoren.....	457-458

Tafeln 1-18