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EARLY TO MID-20TH DYNASTY

Pierre Grandet

The origins of the 20th Dynasty remain obscure, their only indications being provided by the Elephantine Stela. After several years of political and social unrest, Sethnakhte seized power as first king of the 20th Dynasty. He was succeeded by his son Ramesses III, who is considered to be the last great king of the New Kingdom. His reign is marked by a long list of achievements, including an impressive building program, military successes, and a number of expeditions.

The 20th Dynasty was founded by king Sethnakhte when queen Tauseret, last ruler of the 19th Dynasty (Tosi 2007; Wilkinson 2012), died without an heir. The new line's inception put an end to a nineteen-year period of political and social disorder, brought about by the power struggle between two lines of rulers, all descendants of Merenptah: the illegitimate Amenmesse, the legitimate Sety II, Amenmesse’s son (?) Siptah, and Sety II’s widow, Tauseret. The true extent and nature of these troubles is unknown. The sources hint at some military unrest and at a general disruption of the cult (Papyrus Harris I: 75,2-6; Boraik 2007; Seidlmayer 1998). The Harris Papyrus specifically characterizes the period as one of political anarchy, when power was first usurped by local authorities, then by a Syrian Iarsu, “He who made him(self),” a circumlocution probably devised to retrospectively refer to—without actually naming him—the chancellor Bay, who was the true power behind Siptah’s reign, until he was executed for reasons unknown in the king’s year five (Grandet 2000). No convincing alternative explanation has yet been offered for the name Iarsu (Grandet 1994, vol. II: no. 902). The most recent (Schneider 2003) suggests that sw be understood as a phonetic wringing of the number six and the following T 14 sign as the sign for rnpt, “year,” so that the name *j-jr-sw-rnpt would read “he who made six years” and refer to Siptah. This is highly problematic, because the use of sw for “six” is unheard of and the T 14 sign is very different from that of rnpt.

Sethnakhte (1198 – 1195 BCE) Userkhaura Setepenra Sethnakhte Merrerra Meryamen

Sethnakhte reigned at least four years (Boraik 2007). His consort was queen Tiy-Merenaset and his only known progeny, the future
Ramesses III. The “Seth” element in his name, as well as the very fabric of his titulature, seem to imply that he was, like the 19th-Dynasty founders, an army general from the eastern Delta. It is possible that he was a native of Bubastis (modern Zagazig) or had served in this city for the largest part of his career, as evidenced by the existence, under Ramesses III, of an unusually important group of Bubastite dignitaries (on both points, see Grandet 1993: 42).

True to Egyptian tradition, our sources present the king’s election to the throne as a personal choice by the gods—in this case, by the god Seth—formalized by an oracular ceremony in Seth’s temple at Avaris, if we so interpret the allusion in Sethnakhte’s Elephantine Stela, l. 4-5 (Seidlmayer 1998: Beilage 3a). Behind this fiction, the true nature and means of his accession to power are unknown (rule of seniority?; election among peers?; forceful seizure?).

As he was probably already an elderly man, the king commissioned his son, the future Ramesses III, to act in his stead, both in civil and military matters. Sethnakhte retained the incumbents of the major administrative offices (Hori as Northern Vizier and Hori, son of Kama, as Viceroy of Kush) but promoted a middle-ranking officer of the Theban Amun’s Domain, Bakenkhonsu, to be First Prophet of Amun (Boraik 2007). Despite the brevity of Sethnakhte’s reign, archaeological and textual records attest to some achievements, modest in scope but encompassing the whole of Egypt. He is even mentioned outside its borders, in Serabit el-Khadim and Amara-West.

Due to technical problems, Sethnakhte’s tomb (KV 11) was still unfinished when he died and he was buried in the innermost funerary chamber of queen Tausert’s tomb (KV 14; Altenmüller 1992, 2012). No funerary temple of his has ever been found on the Theban West Bank, but his posthumous cult has left some textual traces, both in Thebes and in Abydos, where Ramesses III would consecrate a small chapel to his parent’s memory.

According to K. A. Kitchen (1972, 1982, 1984; Snape 2012; Leblanc 2001 is unsubstantiated speculation), Ramesses III had two main queens: Isis-ta-Hemdjeret and an unknown Queen X. These two ladies bore the king at least ten sons (and probably many daughters, who left no trace in the written record). Three of these sons would succeed their father: Ramesses IV and VI, both sons of Isis, and Ramesses VIII, son of Queen X; the intervening kings, Ramesses V and VII, were
sons of Ramesses IV and VI, who both died without living heirs. After Ramesses VIII, the crown passed to his nephew Ramesses IX, grandson of Ramesses III by prince Montuherkhopshef (a son of Queen X, by then already deceased) and father and grandfather of Ramesses X and XI. He probably had other consorts and offspring, as is thought to be the case of the lady Tiy and her son Pentawera who, by the end of the reign, would play a prominent part in the Harem Conspiracy.

Beginning of the Reign (Year 1 to Year 5)

The new King was crowned at Karnak, then established his residence at Qantir. On his very accession day, he ordered the building of a funerary temple at Medinet Habu (fig. 2; see O’Connor 2012), deliberately shaped to emulate the Ramesseum. Although it was endowed with serfs and land as early as year four (Kitchen 1975 – 1989, vol. VII: 450,2-3, correcting V: 119,11-13; overlooked by Haring 1997: 65), effective construction would not begin before year five, when a large stone-gathering expedition was sent to the sandstone quarries of the Gebel el-Silsila.

The construction and decoration of the temple would last from year five to year twelve. The monument stood completely surrounded by two fortified concentric walls, which also incorporated an 18th Dynasty processional chapel, various economic and administrative facilities, and a small royal palace. True to its mortuary nature it was decorated, in addition to scenes and texts of a purely religious kind, by a large set of commemorative ones, which make it, after Papyrus Harris I, the second most important historical source of the reign.

Besides a clergy of 150 priests, the temple was endowed with a workforce of 65,000 men and almost 2,400 km² of agricultural land (that is, about 1/10th of Egypt’s land). The sheer size of these endowments raises the question of their origin. We would speculate that the bulk of them was taken from the Ramesseum, as this temple’s Middle Egyptian agricultural domain, which would have once necessarily been as large as Medinet Habu’s, had shrunken to almost nothing by the time of Ramesses V (Papyrus Wilbour A, §§ 64-68, 127-136, and 220-230 for Medinet Habu [547 lines] vs. § 69, 137-138, and 232 for the Ramesseum [42 lines]; cf. Gardiner 1941, 1948 a and b; Haring 1997: 305, 394; Grandet 2002: 121).

Medinet Habu’s administration was entrusted to a Great Steward Merybastet, whose name (“Beloved of Bastet”) denotes a Bubastite origin. This appointment would be the beginning of a true family success story, as this individual’s two sons, Usermaatranakhte (in year 21 of Ramesses III) and Ramessesnakhte (in year two of Ramesses IV), then his grandson Amenhotep, would successively become First Prophet of Amun (the second for about 40 years), until the office’s passing to Herihor’s family under Ramesses XI. Clearly, the fact that it provided this important family’s basis of power was the reason precluding Medinet Habu from losing its economic importance after the death of its founder, in contrast to the other Theban funerary temples.

While Medinet Habu was being constructed, the Deir el-Medina workers completed for Ramesses III the tomb initially begun for Sethnakhte (KV 11) in the Valley of the Kings, in addition to a set of tombs for queens and princes in the Valley of the Queens (Queen Isis [QV 51], and princes Amenherkhopshef [QV 55], Khaemwaset [QV 44], Paraherwenemef [QV 42], Ramesses [QV 43], etc.).

Figure 2. Medinet Habu, the First Pylon.
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53], and Sethherkhopshef [QV 43]). They also would begin, in the Valley of the Kings, the unfinished princely tomb KV 3.

Although the king’s tomb conforms essentially to the plan of similar late New Kingdom structures, it contains some unusual features, such as a bakery scene, paintings of rows of arms and vessels, and the depiction of harpists playing their instruments for various divinities—hence its being formerly known as “the harpers’ tomb” (fig. 3). The king’s mummy was transferred to Deir el-Bahri’s cachette (DB 320) in year 15 of Smendes and has been preserved in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (CG n° 61083) since its rediscovery in 1871.

Figure 3. Harper playing before Onuris-Shu and Ra-Horakhty, tomb of Ramesses III (KV 11), Room Cd, north wall.

In year five, Ramesses III commissioned an inventory of the resources of all the temples of Egypt. However, before it was even begun, the inventory was interrupted by the outbreak of war and would not be resumed before year 15.

Egypt at War (Years 5 to 11)

Ramesses III fought three wars, all of them defensive campaigns against attempted invasions of Egypt: in year five, against the Libyans; in year eight, against the “Peoples of the Sea”; and in year eleven, against a second Libyan wave. The rapid succession of these attempts, the interaction between their actors, and their chronological connection to the destruction of Hatti and of other states in the ancient Near East generally lead to the conclusion that they were caused by some common factor, or factors, that have yet to be clearly identified (useful review in Bryce 2005: 341-342).

1. First Libyan war (year 5). In year five, the Libyans, who had already attempted to invade Egypt under Merenptah, moved against Egypt through Marmarica (the border region between Libya and Egypt). This wave consisted of the Libu, the Meshwesh, and the Seped peoples, with the Libu in a leadership role. According to our sources, they were defeated in a single battle northwest of Memphis, with enormous casualties: approximately 12,000 dead and 4,000 prisoners.

2. The war against the Peoples of the Sea (year 8). In year eight, Egypt was faced with another threat of invasion—this time on its Mediterranean shore and its northeastern frontier—by a group of peoples of probable heterogeneous ethnicity, but whom the Egyptians clearly perceived as a kind of confederation of related tribes. This perception was mainly due to two features common to all these tribes: their being equipped with Mycenaean weaponry and their geographical origin being “their isles” or “the sea,” an Egyptian designation for the Aegean world (Cline and O’Conner 2012; Haider 2012).
Under Ramesses III, the confederation comprised two main peoples: the Pulasti (fig. 4) and the Sikala (fig. 5), helped by the lesser Shakalusha, Danuna, and Washasha (these names are often transcribed, without vocalization, as Tjekel [Tj transcribing emphatic S], Peleset, Shekelesh, Dnen, and Weshesh). Less than one generation earlier, a group of peoples of the same origin (including the Shakalusha), had been party to an attempted Libyan invasion of Egypt in year five of Merenptah, and had been dubbed “Peoples of the Sea” in the commemorative inscription of this king’s victory (Menassa 2003). Some of them had been known to the Egyptians as sea-raiders and mercenaries since the reign of Akhenaten, in the 18th Dynasty, and took to plundering the Nile Delta and other parts of the Mediterranean in the following centuries. When captured, they were often included in the Egyptian elite troops, as the Shardana of Ramesses II’s guard at the battle of Qadesh—a position that they still retained under Ramesses III.

Around 1200 BCE, these peoples began a large and destructive migration to the south and east of the Aegean (contemporary destruction has been recorded at all significant archaeological sites of the Aegean, Asia Minor, and Near East, cf. Drews 1993: 8-30; Weinstein 2012). While the bulk of them proceeded by land, their advance was preceded by nautical raids against the coast and the islands of the Eastern Mediterranean. Cilicia, Cyprus, Ugarit, and even the Hatti fell to their attacks, which reached inland as far as Karkemish on the Euphrates. In year eight of Ramesses III, they invaded Amurru, whose territory adjoined Egypt’s, where they took the time to regroup their forces before moving south, allowing the pharaoh to mobilize his forces.

Medinet Habu sources, both textual and iconographic, reduce this campaign to two main battles, addressing the twofold threat the Sea Peoples represented: first, the repelling of an attempted landing by a group of enemy ships, crushed between Egyptian warships coming from the high sea and Ramesses III’s infantry waiting for them on the shore (fig. 6); and second, an inland battle, fought against a migrating group of the same invaders, who possessed chariots and were accompanied by carriages laden with their women, their children, and all their belongings (pace Drews 2000, hopelessly prejudiced against the Egyptian testimony; cf. fig 7). Although a precise localization of both these battles is impossible, our sources locate them on the shore of the Delta and in “Djahy,” an Egyptian name for Canaan.
Figure 6. Ramesses III repelling an attempted landing of Sea Peoples’ ships.

Figure 7. Ramesses III storming the Sea Peoples.
3. Second Libyan war (year 11). Three years after the battle against the Peoples of the Sea, Ramesses III fought a second coalition of Libyan invaders, composed of seven tribes: the Meshwesh, Libu, and the lesser Ibzet, Qeysesh, Sheytepu, Hesu, and Beqenu (Papyrus Harris I: 76,11-77,1). This time it was the Meshwesh and their chief, Mesher, son of Kaper, who played the leading role. Though armed with powerful Mycenaean swords, carefully represented in Medinet Habu’s pictorial record, the invaders, who had come all the way from Cyrenaica through Marmarica in the hope to settle in Egypt, were once again defeated in the desert northwest of Memphis (fig. 8).

Although these wars were military successes in the conventional sense (and presented Egypt with a wealth of booty), they could not prevent the Pulasti and Sikala from settling in Canaan’s coastal plain, nor the Libyans from persistently raiding the western bank of the Nile until the end of the New Kingdom (see Weinstein 2012). The Pulasti would give their name to the Biblical “Philistines,” then to the land of “Palestine” (Lewis 1980), where their presence would, less than a century after Ramesses III, bring to an end all Egyptian control over the country. As for the Libyans, who would gradually become, by way of capture or mercenary enlistment, the largest ethnic group in the Egyptian army, they would eventually seize political power by the end of the New Kingdom; thus all independent kings until the end of Pharaonic Egypt would be of Libyan descent.

Egypt at Peace (Years 12 to 29)

The inventory of the resources of Egypt’s temples, which had been ordered by Ramesses III in year five but subsequently postponed by his wars, was resumed and completed in his year 15 (fig. 9). It was a preparatory step to a systematic program of reorganizing the cults of the gods, which left traces in more than 70 places in Egypt and led to the employment of several Upper Egyptian quarries. This program essentially implied the founding and funding of new cults by the allocation of resources (men, land, cattle) and the building or restoration of temples, as well as the passing of measures to legally exempt their dependents and their temporal domains from the provisions of the general law.

After the completion of Medinet Habu in year 12, the main architectural works of the reign were the building and decorating of bark
stations located at Karnak, in the first court of the Amun Temple and in the precinct of Mut, as well as the construction and partial decoration of the Temple of Khons. Similar structures were erected in various places in Egypt, especially Heliopolis and Memphis, but have generally left only scanty remains. Like Medinet Habu itself, some temples of Upper and Middle Egypt located on the west bank of the Nile (Hermopolis, Thinis, Assiut, and Abydos) required heavy fortified walls to cope with the recurring Libyan threat. To the same end, Ramesses III resumed Ramesses II’s policy of settling the Fayum and Middle Egypt’s west bank with military colonies of former prisoners of war.

Around year twenty, three expeditions were sent abroad for the needs of the cult and of the king’s works: 1) an expedition on the Red Sea to the land of Punt, from which was brought back incense, as well as cuttings and seeds from incense trees, with the intent to grow them in Egypt; 2) a combined terrestrial-nautical expedition to the copper mines of Timna, north of the Gulf of Aqaba, possibly made easier by a short campaign against the people of Seir (Edom) and the building of a fortified well in or near el-Arish; and 3) in year 23, a turquoise-quarrying expedition to the mines of Serabit el-Khadim in Sinai.

End of the Reign (Years 29 to 32)

In year 30, the king celebrated his Sed Festival at Memphis. A year earlier, the Upper-Egyptian vizier To had been appointed vizier of both Upper and Lower Egypt to better manage the administrative aspects of the event. The four preceding months had been marred, in Thebes, by a series of strikes by the Deir el-Medina workers, as the authorities, focused on the celebration of the coming festival, were unable to deliver to them in due time the grain that constituted their wages. The workers then went asking for grain from the various West-Theban mortuary temples, which all had large granaries, until the local government found a solution. This disruption of Deir el-Medina’s lines of supply has been repeatedly interpreted as the first symptom of the final collapse of New Kingdom Egypt’s economic system that would take place a century later, but this view seems emphatically naive (would one say, for example, that failing to pay workers on time in 1829 portended the stock market crisis of 1929?). It seems in fact better explained by the administration’s all-consuming focus on the coming celebration of the pharaoh’s jubilee: the strikes would precisely end with its celebration (Grandet 2006; cf. also Müller 2004).

“Harem Conspiracy” and Death

Just before Ramesses III’s death, a large conspiracy was unveiled that led to the execution of approximately 30 people. Although their prosecution was publicly reported, the names of some of them were quoted in the form of infamous nicknames, e.g., Mesedsura, “Ra hates him” (the original name being Meryra, “beloved of Ra”).

The whole point of the conspiracy is a matter of debate, since our principal source, the Judicial Papyrus of Turin, is missing its first page, where the conspirators’ indictment was probably stated. A lady of the harem, Tiy (allegedly a queen, though she is nowhere given the title), had supposedly planned to promote to the crown her son Pentawera (who is nowhere given a title) instead of the legitimate heir, Ramesses IV. The coup was obviously to be triggered by Ramesses III’s death, whether from assassination or natural causes. Despite its romantic attractiveness, the assassination theory is wholly unsubstantiated.

Contrary to what was widely announced in a variety of media, the recent discovery that Ramses III’s mummy had had its throat cut (Hawass et al. 2012) does not provide any proof as to the manner of the king’s death. That the king perished due to his throat being cut could only be proven if it could be confirmed that the cut had been administered ante mortem. As it is not possible to do so, it seems more sensible to suppose that the cut had been administered post mortem, either as part of the mummification process (the
position of the cut would be wholly consistent with the removal of the digestive-respiratory tract, or as the result of the many injuries the mummy had to endure at the hands of robbers during antiquity.

A large number of the harem’s denizens and administration enrolled in the conspiracy, which gained further support from important civil and military leaders. However, despite its secrecy, it was finally unveiled, and all of its participants were arrested, then tried and judged by a special commission of twelve. Almost all the indicted persons would be found guilty and executed, the five deemed the guiltiest, including Pentawera, being condemned to take their own lives. (Tiy’s fate is unknown.) This outcome was widely publicized as a warning against any such future endeavor. In fact, unusual features in the Turin Judicial Papyrus’s layout can be explained only if we assume that the document was intended to be posted in a public place.

Figure 10. Papyrus Harris I (BM 9999), pl. 2: Ramesses III addresses the gods of Thebes.

Shortly before the death of Ramesses III, the exceptional Papyrus Harris I (42 meters long) was composed, providing an official autobiographical history of the king’s reign, complete with tabulated economic data. Structurally, the document associates an address of the king to the gods of Egypt and an address to his subjects. The first comprises four parts, in which Ramesses III narrates his deeds for the gods of Thebes, Heliopolis, and Memphis, and a selection of important but minor cities. The first three parts are headed by in-text scenes (the so-called vignettes), which show the king addressing the gods of the relevant cities. As stated by the document itself, its whole purpose was to convert Ramesses III’s deeds into a moral obligation for the gods and the people of Egypt to favor Ramesses IV’s reign. There is not, therefore, the least doubt that it was composed at the latter’s order. The document’s date (6th day of the third month of Ahemu of year 32), which precedes by nine days Ramesses III’s actual death (15th day of the same month), is probably the day of Ramesses IV’s effective seizure of power, prompted by his father’s impending death and the discovery of the Harem Conspiracy.

By the virtue of its content, the Harris Papyrus —like the Judicial Papyrus of Turin— would have been completely pointless had it not been intended for some form of publication. This was keenly perceived by Struve as early as 1916, in a valuable but little-known essay, where he hypothesized that the medium of this publication would have been a public reading at Ramesses III’s funeral (Struve 1926: 23-40). This hypothesis, however, elicits some technical and logistical issues (among others, the impracticability of reading a 42-meter-long roll, and the papyrus vignettes’ pointlessness). Now, if we consider that the document’s script is of uncommon height and that it is written in hieratic (easier to read than hieroglyphics), or the fact that the vignettes that head its three first sections (fig. 10) conform to the iconography of the king’s addresses to the gods in the royal stelae and inscriptions, it seems clear that it was made for display. Indeed, if we deliberately forget, for a while, its being written on papyrus, there is fundamentally no difference—its exhaustivity and hieratic script notwithstanding—between the document and a royal commemorative inscription. This leads to the logical conclusion that, huge as it was, it was actually intended as a kind of gigantic poster, pasted on a wall or displayed on a frame for all to see, and for which setting a funerary service held for Ramesses III at Medinet Habu would have been the ideal venue (Grandet 1994, vol. I: 122-
The Reign of Ramesses III and Its Aftermath

As contrasted with the reigns of his successors, that of Ramesses III appears to be the last great reign of the New Kingdom (see Kitchen 2012; Snape 2012). The record of his achievements—exceptionally well documented—is certainly impressive, with the building of Medinet Habu and the implementation of a large architectural and institutional program throughout the country. His accomplishments, however, were largely the result of his application of the simple political recipe of emulating Ramesses II, the ideal pharaoh. This policy, as would rapidly become apparent, was no longer adapted to the circumstances and the resources of Egypt: less than a century later, the 20th Dynasty would collapse amidst political and social unrest. By this time, the country would be but a shadow of its New Kingdom self, having lost all control over Canaan and a large part of Nubia.

Although the king prevented the invasion of Egypt by the Sea Peoples, their migration forever changed the geopolitical landscape of the ancient Near East and seems to have been a key factor in this mutation by gradually depriving Egypt of any control of its former Asiatic territories. Egyptian leadership, weakened by the outcome of the Harem Conspiracy, a series of short reigns, and repeated changes of line, wasn’t able to devise a coherent policy to cope with the situation. The loss of the Asiatic territories’ resources brought about the stalling of the redistributive economy on whose implementation Egypt’s “social pact” (obedience vs. plenty) was based, and finally deprived its traditional power structure of the largest part of its legitimacy. By then, the country was ready for the emergence of a new political regime.
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