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The purpose of this doctoral thesis is to make a prosopographical reconstruction of the Theban personnel of Khonsu during 21st Dynasty as a means to understand the role played by their members both as servants of the different forms of Khonsu and as part of the cultic and administrative domains at Thebes.

Although my research initially included the servants of this god during the whole Third Intermediate period throughout Egypt, the outstanding interpretations suggested by the variety of materials collected forced me to demarcate the limits of this dissertation. In this regard, I present a methodological proposal as well as a part of the results of a further research, whose main lines are summarised at the end of the dissertation. I focus my interest on the initial stages of Khonsu’s personnel, which flourished at the beginning of the I millennium BCE; I aim to respond to the lack of studies on this topic, a significant gap that seems quite surprising when looking at the available amount of biographical and genealogical information left by the servants of Khonsu during this period. In addition, I want to demonstrate how the prosopographical study of a group is an indicator of the some transformations that the sacerdotal, administrative and governmental structures might have suffered, even though imperceptibles at first glance.

On the other hand, it is imperative to highlight the importance of the prosopographical database used for collecting the comprehensive corpus of documents and servants of the god Khonsu. For neither this research nor the database is conceivable without the other. This essential tool was created ad hoc based on the specific features of the aforementioned individuals and the
monuments dedicated by them. It suits my research needs and the digital format guarantees its functionality. Consequently, besides the printed version at the end of the thesis, on page 46 a link to access to the online version is provided; while it is true that consulting the database it is not strictly necessary to understand the hypothesis stated on the following pages.
El principal objetivo de esta tesis consiste en realizar una reconstrucción prosopográfica del sacerdocio del dios Khonsu durante la Dinastía XXI egipcia y poder así entender el papel que desempeñaron sus componentes tanto como parte del propio sacerdocio, al igual que dentro de las esferas administrativa y cultural tebanas.

Aunque mi investigación abarca todo el Tercer Período Intermedio e incluye a los servidores de las diferentes formas del dios en todo Egipto, la riqueza y heterogeneidad del material y las interesantes conclusiones extraídas de su análisis me llevaron a acotar el tema presentado en esta tesis doctoral. De este modo, centrándome en la etapa inicial de desarrollo de un clero en auge desde principios de I milenio a.C., presento una propuesta metodológica y los resultados de una estudio más amplio –cuyas principales líneas son esbozadas en las últimas páginas de esta tesis. Pretendo dar respuesta a una falta de estudios en la materia, principalmente llamativa si tenemos en cuenta la abundante información biográfica y genealógica sobre sacerdotes y servidores de Khonsu que encontramos para estos momentos, y asimismo demostrar cómo el análisis prosopográfico exhaustivo de un colectivo permite reconocer cambios en las estructuras de poder imperceptibles a simple vista.

Del mismo modo, es indispensable hacer una mención a la base de datos utilizada para organizar de manera sistemática el corpus de documentos y personajes que constituyen la evidencia material de dicho personal. Esta herramienta esencial, sin la cual no es posible entender mi trabajo, ha sido creada
*ad hoc* conforme a las necesidades impuestas por los documentos e individuos estudiados. Por ello, y aunque acceder a la base de datos prosopográfica no es un requisito indispensable para comprender los resultados de la investigación, ésta puede ser consultada tanto en su versión impresa –en las últimas páginas de la tesis– como a través del enlace proporcionado en la página 46. De este modo, el formato original garantiza su total funcionalidad, algo que quedaría desvirtuado si se optara por su presentación en papel únicamente.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty 21</th>
<th>Lower-Egyptian Kings</th>
<th>Upper-Egyptian King/High Priest of Amun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smenodes I</td>
<td>1076–1052</td>
<td>Henhur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemnisut</td>
<td>1051–1049?</td>
<td>Pnodiem I (HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseusennes I</td>
<td>1051–1003</td>
<td>(King)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemope</td>
<td>1005–993</td>
<td>Masaharta (HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osochor (Osoorkon the elder)</td>
<td>992–987</td>
<td>Djdlkhonsuankh (HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siamun</td>
<td>986–968</td>
<td>Menkeepere (HPA/King)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseusennes II</td>
<td>967–944</td>
<td>Smenodes II (HPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty 22</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenuq I</td>
<td>943–919</td>
<td>Pnodiem II (HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoorkon I</td>
<td>918–884</td>
<td>Pnodiem II (HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smenodes III (HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenuq IIa</td>
<td></td>
<td>976–968?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenuq IIb, together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenuq II</td>
<td>883–866</td>
<td>Pnodiem II (HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoorkon II</td>
<td>865–831</td>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenuq III</td>
<td>830–792</td>
<td>834–809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenuq IV</td>
<td>791–779</td>
<td>Podubast I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimay</td>
<td>778–773</td>
<td>808–795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenuq V</td>
<td>772–735</td>
<td>794–790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoorkon IV</td>
<td>734–715</td>
<td>Osorkon III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>789–762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Takeloth III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>766–754/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rudamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>753/0–749/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. OBJECTIVES, ADVANTAGES AND LIMITS OF THE STUDY

The works of scholars such as H. Kees¹, K. A. Kitchen², M. L. Bierbrier³ or G. Vittmann⁴ have become essential reference books for the prosopography, genealogy and chronology of the Third Intermediate Period (in the following TIP) (c. 1069-664 BCE). In these, an in-depth analysis of the evidence attested through the archaeological and epigraphic records had provided the basis for a historical reconstruction of the Egyptian late second and first millennia BCE.

With the major intention of establishing a coherent sequence of dignitaries and events, scholars’ attention has been focused on chronological debates for decades; the chronological issues have become a defining element in the study of this period. However, the nature and inherent limitations of the data turn this reconstruction and interpretation into an arduous task. The existence of numerous theories about the dating of kings’ or officials’ succession has further resulted in an impression of complexity and a feeling of uncertainty when discussing the TIP.

¹ Kees 1958.
³ Bierbrier 1975.
⁴ Vittmann 1978.
Together with the typical problems of the study of the ancient Egyptian society, the specific complexities of the TIP could have sometimes been perceived as a further difficulty in producing a precise historical overview. This impression may have caused a sort of aversion to the analysis of this epoch, which, however, does not alter the fascination that its own features and singularities equally generate.

Notwithstanding this fact, leaving apart some of the arduous chronological issues—which sometimes cannot give an answer to certain questions or needs—and focusing the attention on different research approaches and objectives, it is possible to make substantial progress and to elucidate some obscure points in the understanding of the TIP. For instance, a potential avenue for study has consisted in trying to discover how the religious, administrative or territorial structures were operating. The purpose of this approach is the production of a more accurate idea of how some social groups and elites lived.

In this regard, the Theban region has played a central role in Egyptological research, which has further emphasised the dominant cult of Amun-Re. A number of its members belonged to some of the most important and best attested Theban families at that time; this fact has drawn the focus to their careers and the interrelations between their lineages for decades\(^5\). Consequently, with the exception of the first four *hm-nTr* priests of Amun, other priests serving different gods at Thebes during the TIP have not been studied in depth.

Nevertheless, the ancient Theban society was far more complex and can hardly be analysed through the examination of the local priesthood of a single

\(^{5}\) One of the most significant examples is the family of the Fourth *hm-nTr* priest of Amun and Mayor of Thebes Montemhat (A); his lineage was firstly rigourously studied by J. Leclant (1961), and it is still nowadays a recurrent research topic.
god, despite the importance that this god might have attained. Our understanding of the behaviour and identity of a given group of individuals can rest on its comparison with analogous groups. Therefore, the examination of other Theban priestly and administrative personnel besides Amun’s may offer a valuable field of research that would further our understanding of the Theban TIP.

In this line of investigation it is necessary to remember some recent works as: the research conducted by F. Payraudeau into the 22nd Dynasty’s administrative structure⁶; C. Naunton’s summary on the dignitaries of the 25th Dynasty⁷; or C. Sheikholeslami’s studies, based on the families associated with the service to the cult of Montu in the whole TIP⁸. The results of these studies, which extend the field of research beyond the prominent religious hierarchy of Amun, allow us to gain insight into the internal functioning of Thebes during the so-called Late New Kingdom.

Along these lines, this dissertation offers clarification of the growing importance of the servants of the god Khonsu in Thebes during the TIP by explaining the structure of a sacerdotal institution and how its components functioned in the Theban cultic and administrative domains during the 21st Dynasty. Even though this methodological approach can be extrapolated to different cities or regions, the sources directed my research to the aforementioned Theban area: the prosopographical material shows the growing presence of different forms of the god Khonsu by the TIP at Thebes; simultaneously, a substantial increase in the number of individuals connected to the service of the

---

⁶ Payraudeau 2014.
⁷ His doctoral dissertation –Regime Change and The Administration of Thebes During The Twenty-fifth Dynasty– was submitted to the Swansea University in November 2011 (Naunton 2011).
⁸ See, for instance: Sheikholeslami 2003 and 2009.
god Khonsu becomes apparent at this time.

The incompleteness of the archaeological record and the consequent difficulties when formulating interpretations complicate the reconstruction of the sequence of holders of the different offices related to Khonsu’s cult. However, a systematic and consistent compilation and analysis of the available prosopographical materials allows us to gain an idea of how the servants of Khonsu operated, to reconstruct their internal structure and organisation as well as to understand the role played by their members as part of the Theban society during this period.

The significance acquired by Khonsu from the New Kingdom onwards is an additional factor to bear in mind. Considered as the legitimate son and heir of Amun, the child god of the Theban triad gained importance from the Ramesside Period in parallel to the birth of the *naissance* doctrine, which progressively increased the attention paid to child gods. As previously stated, this prominence is reflected in the biographical and genealogical information, which documents several individuals performing administrative and religious functions in connection with Khonsu; that means, personnel in service of this deity. In addition, the administrative documents also witnessed Khonsu’s increasing importance. However, although some of these servants have been mentioned in reference works and articles before –usually because of their other administrative or religious duties, mainly due to their offices in Amun’s service–, a complete and systematic compilation and study of this priesthood and its sources has never been

---

9 See, for instance, Forgeau 2002.
undertaken\textsuperscript{11}. Therefore, at the beginning of my study, one of the primary objectives was to compile a complete prosopography of Khonsu’s Theban personnel to fill this gap in the studies; this would build solid foundations for the understanding of their structure and way of operating.

A research of this nature must take into consideration many different factors before selecting an efficient methodology. The availability of sources and their representativeness are significant elements to bear in mind. The scarcity of historical data is a common issue in many researches, and it is not less important for this subject. The problems associated with the collection of evidence related to these individuals’ lives and careers, along with the danger of falling into the mistake of drawing conclusions from individual cases and generalising from a handful of examples, confirmed that the prosopographical approach is the most suitable tool for my research objectives.

The importance of a prosopographical study for historical purposes is unquestionable. Prosopography\textsuperscript{12}, as a research method or approach, attempts to “Bring together all relevant biographical data of groups of persons in a systematic and stereotypical way. As such it is a system for organising mostly scarce data in such a way that they acquire additional significance by revealing connections and

\textsuperscript{11} In this respect, we require to highlight two works that, even though not intended to be global studies of the priesthood of Khonsu, have paid attention to its members: the study of the priests and theology of Khonsu the Child in the Ptolemaic Period (Klotz 2009), as well as the recent article of G. Broekman, in which the offices of Second, Third and Fourth \textit{hm-nfr} priests of Khonsu are analysed as part as the most influential offices of the Libyan Period at Thebes (Broekman 2011). The personnel of Khonsu during the Libyan Period is also briefly studied in Payraudeau 2014: 268-269.

\textsuperscript{12} The term prosopography is derived from the Greek “prosówrón” (προσώπων) –“face” – and “graphia” (γραφία) –“description”–, and it literally means “The description of the form or personal appearance of an individual”. Additionally, the \textit{OED} (online edition, revised September 2009) defines “prosopography” as “A study or description of an individual's life, career, etc.; esp. a collection of such studies focusing on the public careers and relationships of a group in a particular place and period; a collective biography” (“Prosopography”, def. 2).
patterns influencing historical processes”\textsuperscript{13}. According to this method –and without forgetting other complementary disciplines such as biography, genealogy or onomastics–, this dissertation aims to classify and survey the available evidence of Khonsu’s personnel in order to recreate their functioning; that means, to reconstruct the basic structure of this Theban institution or institutions during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty, even though, as I will mention, I have considered at all the available sources for the whole TIP.

By integrating a large number of data into a quantitative and statistic study, I contextualise historical processes and phenomena, more specifically, the social and economic milieu in which these servants lived. Additionally, the analysis and processing of the common and external characteristics of this homogeneous group allow us to distinguish between exceptional cases and common patterns of organisation and behaviour, as well as to make sense of incomplete data.

Likewise, prosopography is concerned with the biographical data of an aggregate of chronologically and geographically well-defined individuals. The study of biographical and genealogical information about individuals in office in a given place and at a given time is an indicator of the changes that the sacerdotal, administrative and governmental structures might have undergone. The effects that the shifting political situation in Egypt had on families, institutions and titles are attested by the prosopographical record. Therefore, as essential as my research objectives, another essential issue of this study is the geographical and the chronological boundaries. In this respect, both the city of Thebes –one of the most important ancient religious centres and a place where Khonsu was worshiped as part of its main divine triad– and the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty –the time when the sources

\textsuperscript{13} Verbovem, Carlier & Dumolyn 2007: 37.
show a growth in the servants of this lunar deity— are a coherent and realistic framework for a doctoral dissertation. In this regard, I need to say that I have already made a compilation and analysis of the available material for the whole TIP. However, due to the richness and variety of the material, the personnel of Khonsu during the Libyan and Kushite Period will be thoroughly studied and published in future works.

These matters quickly lead me into another inexorable question: Whom am I exactly looking for? Which are the elements that define an individual’s membership of this group? What are the key identifying features of this collective?

Individualising persons out of a large amount of data is not a simple task; defining a target group of which our knowledge is reduced is complex. Given the absence of conclusive evidence, for instance, a list or annals recording the Theban servants of this god, the only way to identify members of this group is to assess the inscriptions left by them and to study their biographical and genealogical details. The common denominator that identifies the members of this group is their possession of functions in relation to Khonsu. Therefore, the selection criterion by which I determined who is and who is not included in this research is the tenure of titles connected to this divinity; those individuals identified in a primary source as performers of ritual or administrative functions related to the service of Khonsu are the basis of my research.

Nevertheless, the search for individuals connected to the service of Khonsu was the starting point of my research. The prosopographical method provides a useful tool to understand patterns of collective behaviour and to recognise formal
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14 As the so-called Annals of the priests of Karnak, see Kruchten 1989.
and informal relationships between the members of a group; for instance, the connection between genealogy and titles or the existence of marriage and hereditary patterns. Additionally, the fact that many persons chose to identify themselves in association with a specific deity or temple reflects the prestige that the god might have had and the role that his personnel played within the Theban society. The social prestige and influence were linked to the economic development of the domain of the god, in this case Khonsu.

The complete picture of Khonsu’s personnel during the TIP seems more complex than it might appear at first sight. During the New Kingdom, the evidence for servants of Khonsu is more limited than afterwards. Most of their members are dated to the Ramesside Period, and Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep is the main and almost single form of this god attested in the prosopographical record. And except for the family of the usurper of TT 54 –whose members were consistently in service of Khonsu as Scribes, wḏ priests and Lector Priests, as well as involved in the food supplies of the temple and the god’s offerings–, the rest of the individuals performed mostly wḏ priest functions. It is also remarkable that the owner of TT 25 was apparently the only High Hm-nTr priest of Khonsu attested; his wife was Chief of the Sacred Musical Troupe of the same god. Additionally, a small number of women served as Smṯywt or Songstresses of the Theban triad.

15 For the different manifestation of Khonsu, see section 1.2. The God Khonsu and the Prosopographical Record.

16 Instead of translating Hm-nTr tpy of a god as First Hm-nTr priest, I decided to use High Hm-nTr priest because of its widespread use in English literature. However, for the other functions within the Hm-nTr priests hierarchy, I opted for Second, Third and Fourth Hm-nTr priests.

17 For precise details about the priests of Khonsu during the New Kingdom it is necessary to consult, inter alia, the following works: Porter & Moss 1960; Helck 1961; Kitchen 1975-1990; Kampp 1996; Polz 1997; and al-Ayedi 2006.

In quantitative terms, this situation contrasts with the complex panorama of Khonsu’s personnel revealed during the subsequent period. As previously stated, the growing presence of different manifestations of Khonsu by this time and the increase of individuals connected to their service were factors that determined my research choice. In addition to the numerous specialised functions and titles borne by their members –who were, among others, Scribes, ḫm-ntr and wḥb priests or God’s Fathers–, the attestation of different forms of the god as part of their titulary must be taken into account.

In this sense, it is important to ask oneself numerous questions: Did the same individuals hold titles related to several forms of the god? Were the servants of the different forms of Khonsu connected by kinship between each other? Could we speak about different personnel or priesthoods? Did they have the same internal organisation or development? We could even wonder whether all the individuals holding Khonsu’s titles were servants of the main form of the god or of secondary ones.

This state of affairs leads me to undertake a broader study determined by the multiplicity of manifestations of Khonsu attested in the cultic sphere and by the complexity of the substantial prosopographical material compiled. Nevertheless, the process of collecting the materials is an essential step to support any kind of hypothesis about the functioning of these personnel. The only way to fully understand the nature and organisation of a defined group resides in knowing more about all its members; the role of a single servant will only be comprehensible if contextualised. Consequently, the compilation of selected biographical data –carefully assessed in advance– proves valuable to the requirements defined by my aims since it provides the means to understand the structure of this institution or institutions.
In order to interpret and analyse the research results in a coherent manner, I decided to build a prosopographical database (PDB) adequate for the type of population under study, the available sources and my research needs. A systematic catalogue held in this PDB is a suitable tool for a multivariable analysis. Since it comprises the particular characteristics and nature of this group, it provides the keys to examine the personnel of Khonsu, further, to understand the role that their members played both in the Theban society and within the personnel of Khonsu itself.

The recording of large amounts of prosopographical information is exceptionally well suited to computer analysis: a biographical collective dossier as broad as possible converted into a computer format is a very convenient instrument. As stated by R. W. Mathisen, one of the leading experts in the field of prosopography and Director of the Biographical Database for Late Antiquity Project, the speed and accuracy of access or the ease of reporting and exchanging are some of the advantages of PDBs. This tool is not just a means to achieving a historical interpretation as a final stage of the investigation, but at the same time a useful source for future studies in itself. However we should be aware that a PDB is far from offering all the solutions; the researcher is the only one who can interpret the prosopographical information by answering the questions previously formulated.

The compilation of primary and secondary sources must be consistent and follow a uniform pattern, always bearing in mind the broad range of multiple sources left by the servants of Khonsu. It is essential to use a standardised format for entering and storing prosopographical materials in order to create a practical

---

\(^{19}\) A more detailed study of the design and usage of my PDB is carried on from page 33 to 46.

\(^{20}\) Mathisen 2007: 98.
and comprehensive PDB. And even though a preliminary interpretation of the sources is already made while collecting the selected biographical data, this mechanism ensures rigour in the analysis of the information.

Nevertheless, as has been mentioned before, the record of Khonsu’s administrative and religious personnel is incomplete. This frequent deficiency forms a barrier which is not always surmountable. Absolute certainty is rarely achievable and, unfortunately, the sources cannot always offer satisfactory answers for reconstructing the past; however, these issues may not be serious obstacles when beginning a project. When I draw conclusions from my historical research I am aware of the limitations related to the source material and its representativeness. Proposals, interpretations and hypotheses must be always supported by a well-founded study and a good methodology.

Another common problem arising at the beginning of any investigation is the accessibility of the sources. In this regard, I should make a special mention to the work done by K. Jansen-Winkeln, which was invaluable in this arduous task. Apart from his numerous prosopographical articles, it is necessary to underline his three exhaustive volumes of *Inschriften der Spätzeit*\textsuperscript{21}, an extremely useful publication that makes easily accessible most of the Egyptian materials dated to the TIP. This accurate compilation of inscriptions becomes a helpful instrument of work, especially considering that most of the primary sources are distributed around different museums worldwide; or even worse, their location is sometimes unknown nowadays.

Before going on further, I would like to underline that the study of the corpus of Theban servants of Khonsu has been conducted from a

\textsuperscript{21} Jansen-Winkeln 2007\textsuperscript{1}, 2007\textsuperscript{2} and 2009.
prosopographical perspective *sensu stricto*. My investigation has no intention of making a philological or religious analysis of the documents, nor an iconographical study of those materials. My aims consist in establishing the structure and evolution of Khonsu’s personnel essentially by analysing biographical and genealogical material. I give priority to the owner of the text rather than to the function or form of the text; for instance, I have focused my attention on the statement of the owner’s titles and biographical details instead of examining the invocations to various deities, offering formulae, appeals, hymns or other religious inscriptions. After having learned about this group, other research paths may offer additional information about this institution, as well as new details about the role played by its members in the Theban society. While interesting, this current research was not intended to address topics such as, for instance: whether some cultic practices are reflected in iconographical and textual patterns; if the appearance of specific formula or rituals associated with these individuals is recurrent; or if common external features or attributes used by these priests, scribes and administrators are recognisable through the iconography of the documents left by them.

On the other hand, the structure of the contents of this dissertation is determined to a great extent by the nature of the sources and the information provided by them. The devotion towards a god usually goes through several stages. A cult can experience rises and falls and undergo significant transformations that usually go hand in hand with the surrounding political, economic and social landscapes. In our specific case, the nature of Khonsu’s personnel experienced some changes during the TIP. It seems that, depending on the political situation at Thebes, the personnel of Khonsu adapted their
organisation by means of different routes; in general terms, these adaptations correspond to the traditional division of ancient Egyptian history into dynasties.

In line with the general trend of the TIP, the sources change substantially depending on the dynasty studied. During the 21st Dynasty the funerary equipment found in the so-called cachettes of Deir el-Bahri are predominant; on the other hand, statues and graffiti are as essential documents for the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties; meanwhile, we can observe both kinds of documents, but in a less significant proportion, for the Kushite Period and the beginning of the reign of Psamtik I. Consequently, in accordance with the internal structure of Khonsu’s servants itself, a chronological approach is a coherent way of undertaking a study. For this reason, and following a chronological pattern, this dissertation presents the result of my research concerning the 21st Dynasty, while the servants of Khonsu during the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties and the 25th and early 26th Dynasties are simply outlined in the final chapter.

Nevertheless, in view of the fact that the artificial division into dynasties may not necessarily be reflected in the administrative or cultic domains, it is necessary to bear in mind the limits of a chronological approach. A consistent study must take into account the periods before and after the time under investigation to gain a full picture; the boundaries between dynasties should always be interpreted with caution. Subsequently, we have to be flexible on dates and always take into account the concrete historical and political characteristics of the Theban region.

This dissertation clarifies some aspects and patterns of organisation of Khonsu’s personnel and the role played by their members within the Theban socio-cultural milieu, giving original explanations for the significant growth of
servants of Khonsu and the existence of specific ritual functions on behalf of this deity during the 21st Dynasty. Nevertheless, this study may also heighten interest about how Khonsu’s cult might have evolved after this period; one may wonder what was the nature and extent of the impact of the Libyans and Kushites on these hierarchies and institutions. As for the 21st Dynasty, the new rulers’ decisions – both the Libyans and the Kushites – had definitely an impact on the Theban administrative and governmental structures, and most certainly on the cultic spheres of the different forms of Khonsu too. Some of these questions and answers will be introduced in the final chapter.

Prosopography is considered an instrument of chronological precision in the study of ancient cultures, including ancient Egypt; although it is not the only solution to the traditional chronological issues of the TIP. My aim is not to make a general reconstruction of the political events of this period. Some of the main topics that I deal with are the existence of family links between some servants of Khonsu, the recurrence of inheritance patterns of titles and functions or the distribution of certain positions between the most important Theban lineages. Even though the historical context is essential to understanding the organisation and functioning of the aggregate under study, chronological debates could deflect the attention from the main objective of this research: the contribution to the knowledge of the unexplored and flourishing Theban personnel of the god Khonsu.

On the whole, this study presents significant challenges: the partiality of the evidence, the complexity of the prosopographical material and the lack of previous studies on the subject, as well as the uncertainties regarding rights, duties and organisation of the functioning of the temples. However, the exhaustive biographical catalogue compiled and the systematic examination and
interpretation of the sources provide an innovative reconstruction of a collective that fulfilled an essential role in the city of Thebes during the TIP. Consequently, in line with current studies of other Theban clergies and gods besides Amun, this research offers new insights into the social structures and processes that determined everyday life in Thebes, the ancient religious capital par excellence. Nevertheless, before dealing with the PDB’s results, it is necessary to discuss in detail two fundamental matters that serve to contextualise my dissertation in a broader sense, both at a theoretical and practical level.

The first one refers to the god Khonsu and his different manifestations. This thesis does not intend to make an in-depth study of this divinity and his forms. However, taking into consideration different aspects of the god may facilitate the reconstruction of his personnel within the religious and social Theban milieu. An analysis of the nature of Khonsu, combined with the examination of the ways and periodicity in which he is presented in the prosopographical record during the TIP, might provide some clues to the internal structure of his servants.

The second topic focuses on the chosen methodology, and more precisely on the already mentioned PDB used for collecting the biographical and genealogical data. The complex nature of the sources and the prosopographical information turns this databank into an indispensable instrument for the reconstruction of Khonsu’s personnel. For this reason, the explanation of how this database was built and how it works is essential to a comprehensive understanding of my research.
1.2. The God Khonsu and the Prosopographical Record

1.2.1. The Different Forms of Khonsu

Khonsu was considered a lunar deity in the Egyptian religion and, consequently, he was closely associated with the god Thot. He was generally depicted with a falcon-head or as a mummified young man with a side lock of hair and holding a flail and a w3s-scepter. His lunar role becomes evident when he is represented with the symbols of the moon disk or crescent on his head, while his solar aspect is also revealed in different contexts.

As the legitimate child and successor of Amun and Mut, Khonsu was also connected with other divine children such as Horus, the legitimate heir of Osiris. Nevertheless, and despite the significance of this god because of his preeminent
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22 For the general features of the god, see: Brunner 1975: 960-963; Leitz 2002: 761-773; and Houser-Wegner 2011: 233.

23 This lunar aspect is occasionally represented as the syncretic form Khonsu-Thot, who usually fulfils the role of supreme judge (see n. 41); this association can be found, for instance, in the Propylon of the Khonsu temple in Karnak (Labrique 2003). Additionally, this syncretic form is attested by the Theban TIP prosopographical record only in relation to Khonsu ps-fr-shrw and Khonsu (ps)-wn-nhw: Posener 1968: 405-406.

24 During the TIP, the syncretic form of Khonsu-Ra, Lord of Thebes or Khonsu-Ra in Thebes is attested among the wall decorations of the Khonsu temple at Karnak: see Degardin 1992 and 2000 and Klotz 2008: 138-139. However, the prosopographical record documents only few servants of Khonsu-Ra.

position in the Theban triad, there is no in-depth study about him\textsuperscript{26}. Perhaps the complex and partly uncertain nature of this deity and the conflicting interpretations of his name\textsuperscript{27} may help to explain the absence of global studies.

Khonsu displayed a furious nature in the Cannibal Hymn\textsuperscript{28}, ferocity that connected him later on with Heracles, who was also a child god and the offspring of a god-king\textsuperscript{29}. In the Book of the Dead Khonsu’s violent qualities were underlined. Nevertheless, at some point, some new features were linked to Khonsu’s nature: during the second millennium BCE, Khonsu was considered, apart from an aggressive and ferocious divinity, a generous and benevolent young god\textsuperscript{30}.

Even though it seems that the region of Gebelein might have been an ancient cultic centre of Khonsu\textsuperscript{31}, this juvenile god rose to prominence in Thebes during the New Kingdom. Then, and when his personality had already changed, Ramesses III started to build a major temple for Khonsu, known as *pr ḫnsw* or *Bnnt*\textsuperscript{32}, to the south-west of the Karnak complex. He built a new structure –oriented north-south– over an earlier Khonsu temple, possible dated to the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty and modified later

\textsuperscript{26} D. Klotz (2008: 105 n. 359) gives a brief statement of the studies about the god Khonsu underlying the pioneering work done by G. Posener, mainly published by the Collège de France, as well as points out some recent studies carried out by Prof. J.-C. Degargin and Prof. F. Labrique.

\textsuperscript{27} For the theory of the derivation of Khonsu’s name from the royal placenta or, as accepted nowadays, his connection with a travelling nature, see: Posener 1965\textsuperscript{1}, 1965\textsuperscript{2} and 1966\textsuperscript{2}.

\textsuperscript{28} Posener 1965\textsuperscript{1}: 343 and 1966\textsuperscript{1}: 339-340.

\textsuperscript{29} Quaegebeur 1975-1976: 471.

\textsuperscript{30} Posener 1966\textsuperscript{1}: 339-341.

\textsuperscript{31} Posener 1966\textsuperscript{1}: 341-342.

\textsuperscript{32} For the temple’s structure and general features, see Porter & Moss 1972: 224-244. In addition, for the scenes and inscriptions in the first court and the hypostyle hall, see *Khonsu I and II*, i.e., the two first volumes published by the Epigraphic Survey of the Oriental Institute (University of Chicago) about this temple, where they have been working since the 1930’s.
on by Ramesses II\textsuperscript{33}; he reused newly quarried stone as well as ancient limestone blocks from almost a dozen different dismantled temples. This building was nevertheless continuously adapted and modified until the Roman era, so, the present temple is the work of many different hands.

The god was worshiped under several manifestations during the Pharaonic period, the most important of which was Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep –\textit{Hnsw m W\^{\text{\textasciitilde}}st Nfr-htp}–, part of the notable Theban triad and venerated inside the temple referred to before. A plurality of these forms dominates the Late Period\textsuperscript{34}; by this time, the cult of Khonsu had attained a great significance and it is precisely then when the so-called Khonsu Cosmogony was inscribed in his Karnak temple\textsuperscript{35}.

As Professor G. Posener stated, there was a multiplication of “Khonsus” at that time. Particular functions, aspects or epithets of the god were personified in several divine entities and, consequently, these acquired certain independence\textsuperscript{36}. And even if these minor manifestations are not very prominent before Ptolemaic times, inscriptional evidence suggests that some of them were already known during the TIP. The biographical inscription of Montemhat (A) at the Mut temple of Karnak\textsuperscript{37}, one of the numerous statues of the same dignitary\textsuperscript{38} or a statue that belonged to the Steward of the God’s Wife Akhamenrou\textsuperscript{39} mention Khonsu holding

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{33} For updated information about the epigraphic fieldwork at Khonsu temple, see Kimpton, McClain, V\^{e}rtes & Johnson 2010.
\textsuperscript{34} Quaegebeur 1975-1976: 469-474.
\textsuperscript{35} This Ptolemaic cosmogonic text –composed by two symmetrical representations on the west and east walls of the bark sanctuary of Khonsu temple– has been recently analysed by C. Zivie-Coche (1994, 2008, 2008-2009 and 2009) and D. Mendel (2003).
\textsuperscript{36} Posener 1967: 345.
\textsuperscript{38} Berlin 17271, cols. 7-9: Leclant 1961: 58-64, doc. 9 and Lichtheim 2006: 31-33, n. 4.
\textsuperscript{39} Louvre E.13106: Jansen-Winkeln, 2009, doc. 115, 327-328.
\end{flushleft}
a number of different epithets: besides ḫnsw m Wṣt Nfr-ḥtp, additional forms of Khonsu such as ḫnsw pꜣ-ḥrd –Khonsu the Child–, ḫnsw ḡṣ-pẖw –Khonsu Who Exalts the Crowns–, ḫnsw (pꜣ)-wn-nḥw –Khonsu the Protector–, ḫnsw pꜣ-ir-sḥrw –Khonsu the Healer, the Provider or the One Who Fixes the Destiny\(^{40}\), ḫnsw ḫṣb-ẖḥ –Khonsu Reckoner of Lifetime\(^{41}\)– and ḫnsw ḫḥr-ib-ẖt-Dẖmr –Khonsu Who Lives inside Djeme– are alluded to in these inscriptions.

The biographical data do not attest all these forms throughout the entire TIP and do not confirm the existence of cultic and religious structures related to all of them. This fact may well be a consequence of the partiality of the prosopographical record; however, it is more probable that some of these divinities were in an initial stage of development at that time –or even that they did not yet exist– and that their presence was therefore minor in the cultic sphere.

Egyptians were concerned with presenting themselves in an appropriate manner in a given situation. Depending on the circumstances, one’s functions were stressed or, on the contrary, omitted. In addition, the writing of names and religious, administrative or honorary titles varied according to different factors, including space and distribution issues, as well as epigraphic and tendency patterns. As a consequence, we cannot expect to find the same denomination of Khonsu in every single piece of evidence that we find, even if the sources alluded to the same manifestation of the god.

\(^{40}\) As mentioned by M. G. Posener (1968: 402-403), this epithet has different meaning depending on the context; therefore, this form of Khonsu has received a large variety of translations. For a summary of them, see Klotz 2008: 134 n. 531.

\(^{41}\) As said by J. Quaegebeur (1995-1996: 470), this is a designation of Khonsu-Thot, also known as ḫnsw nb-ḥḥ “Khonsu the lord of lifetime”. See also the comments on the Theban cult of this form of Khonsu and both variants of his name in de Meulenaere 1998: 1128-1129.
On the other hand, the already mentioned increasing number of this god’s servants was closely connected to some forms of Khonsu than to others. As might be expected, the servants of the main form of Khonsu, Khonsu in Thebes, are dominant. As stated before, multiple variations in the writings of names and titles require observing different points of reference to identify the personnel in service of any god. In this case, either when the name of Khonsu appears alone, when he is characterised as Theban or when it is associated with other deities of the Theban Triad, we are dealing with the principal manifestation of the god.

Since the New Kingdom, “Neferhotep”, which means “Perfect for clemency”, seems to be one of the most prominent epithets of the main form of Khonsu. Indeed, it reflects the transformation that occurred in the nature of this god at that time: from negative connotations to a young and benevolent deity. This designation is not apparently related to the most recent god Neferhotep of Diospolis Parva, which was also used as an epithet for other divinities, such as Khnum or Sobek. Consequently, the presence of Khonsu connected with this epithet among the offices of an individual serves to identify the personnel associated with this primary form of the god.

It can also be assumed that the individuals who served Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep were connected with the place were his cult was carried out: the temple of Khonsu at Karnak. Consequently, administrative and priestly duties associated with the temple of Khonsu –pr n Hnsw or Benen– also denote a link with the
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service of this god, who was Lord of Benenet –\textit{nb Bnnt}–. Even though the official
decoration of the temple walls do not usually documents members of Khonsu’s
personnel\textsuperscript{45}, the roof slabs offer a testimony of immeasurable value to understand
the composition of this priesthood: a unique corpus of 334 graffiti carved by some
members of the lower clergy, possibly in connection with certain ritual functions\textsuperscript{46}.

Besides this preeminent god of Karnak, a few of the plural forms of Khonsu
were also attested in the prosopographical record, Khonsu the Child\textsuperscript{47} being the
most significant among them in quantitative terms. The development of his
theology at Thebes –already initiated by Herihor\textsuperscript{48}– represents the beginning of
child deities’ worship in temple cult and private devotion from the TIP onwards\textsuperscript{49}.
The members of his personnel are not as prominent as the servants of Khonsu in
Thebes Neferhotep; however, the role played by them –mainly women– and the
significance of his cult are essential elements to understand how Thebes was
functioning during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty, as it will be discussed later in this dissertation.

The primary cult for Khonsu \textit{p3-hyrd} took place in the vicinity of the Mut
temple at Karnak, presumably in the Temple A, traditionally named the “temple of

\textsuperscript{45} There are some exceptions discussed in section 2.1.1. The family of High \textit{hm-ntr} Priests of Amun
and the Theban milieu.

\textsuperscript{46} This corpus, first published by H. Jacquet-Gordon (2003), exceeds the chronological limits of the
21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty; however, its tremendous value will be outlined when laying the basis for the study of
the personnel of Khonsu during the Libyan and Nubian periods: see Chapter 4. See also Villar 2014\textsuperscript{2}
for the analysis of some of these graffiti.

\textsuperscript{47} He was fully named \textit{Hnsw p3-hyrd t3 wr tpy n \textit{Imn}}, an epithet formula that signals his first position
in the hereditary succession as son of Amun.

\textsuperscript{48} Forgeau 2002: 8.

\textsuperscript{49} For a summary of child deities, their functions, iconography, theology, etc., see Budde 2010.
Khonsu pa-khered”\textsuperscript{50}. Located in the northeast corner of the precinct, this structure has been one of the most problematic buildings of ancient Thebes because of the uncertainties about its function. Scholars such as F. Daumas\textsuperscript{51} suggested that Temple A was a bark sanctuary for Khonsu the Child. However, and even though it is clear that this structure functioned as a \textit{mammisi} or \textit{pr-ms}\textsuperscript{52} from the Ptolemaic period onwards\textsuperscript{53}, the currently accepted theory is that first proposed by H. de Meulenaere\textsuperscript{54}, who extends this identification to the whole TIP. Without entering into the suitability of those theories, the building seems to be associated with the child form of Khonsu in some way. Likewise, it is possible to connect this temple and Mut’s precinct with the personnel in service of Khonsu the Child already during the TIP.

To a lesser extent, there are documented three other secondary forms of the god through priestly titles: $\textit{Hnsw w}\textit{ts-h}\textit{tw}$, $\textit{Hnsw (p3)-wn-nhw}$ and $\textit{Hnsw p3-ir-s}\textit{hrw}$.

According to G. Posener, $\textit{Hnsw w}\textit{ts-h}\textit{tw}$ was related to Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep\textsuperscript{55}. Although his presence during the TIP was quite limited, some members of two of the most influential Theban lineages of the Libyan period held

\textsuperscript{50} Porter & Moss 1972: 270-272. For updated information about the archaeological works at the temple and its surroundings, see the reports of the successive archaeological seasons in \url{http://www.brooklynmuseum.org/features/mut/}, as well as some publications of R. Fazzini, such as: Fazzini 2005, 2007\textsuperscript{1} and 2008\textsuperscript{1}.

\textsuperscript{51} Daumas 1958: 53.

\textsuperscript{52} F. Daumas (1958: 26-27) defined a \textit{mammisi} as a shrine “Consacré au dieu-fils, et à l’accouchement de la déesse-mère et lié au culte royal puisque l’enfant divin y est mis au monde afin d’exercer la fonction bienfaisante de roi sur le pays tout entier”.

\textsuperscript{53} For this god and some remarks about his clergy during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, see Klotz 2008: 120-130 and 2009.


\textsuperscript{55} He based this assumption on the fact that these two gods were mentioned together in the biographical inscription of Montemhat: Posener 1969: 377 and n. 37 above.
offices associated with his service: the family of Nespakashuty and the one of Fourth ḫm-ntr priest of Amun Nakhtefmut (A)⁵⁶.

On the other hand, the evolution of Khonsu ḫm-inšrw and Khonsu (ḫm)wn-nḫw ran in parallel. On occasions, as documented in oracular amuletic decrees, both deities appear subordinated to Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep forming a sort of triad: they were characterised as two baboons that flanked the main form of Khonsu, which additionally had adopted some attributes from the god Thot⁵⁷. Therefore, some servants of the main temple of Khonsu at Karnak might have had specific ritual functions related with this triad, and not with the main god worshipped in the sanctuary: Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep⁵⁸.

On the other hand, this joint cult within the Benenet might have been related just to certain manifestations of these two secondary forms of Khonsu and, accordingly, an independent cult for each of them might also have been developed. The limited knowledge of Khonsu (ḫm)-wn-nḫw⁵⁹, who seems to have personified the most youthful features of the offspring of Amun and Mut, makes it difficult to study this issue in depth. However, the situation is different for Khonsu ḫm-inšrw⁶⁰, a god with healing qualities and quite popular in later times who appears to have

---

⁵⁶ See section 2.2.1.1. and Chapter 4.
⁵⁸ Based on a personal communication from Prof. Lanny Bell to B. Bohleke, the latter states: “There must have been a sanctuary within the temple in which a cult statue of Khonsu was flanked by two images of baboons representing these gods” (Bohleke 1997: 162 n. 27).
⁵⁹ For the characteristics of this god, see Posener 1968: 405-406.
⁶⁰ For a general study of this divinity, see Posener 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970. The oracular statements and curative and protective qualities of this god are reflected in the Bentresh Stela (Louvre C 284) and in the oracular amuletic decrees from the 21st Dynasty. See, inter alia, Edwards 1960; Boklehe 1997; and Simpson 2003: 361-366 and 550.
had his own servants and even his own temple—presumably Temple C to the south-east of Karnak. It is likely that an independent cult of Khonsu was established beyond the cult of the aforementioned triad of the Khonsu temple.

These are broadly some of the features and peculiarities that must be taken into account when examining the personnel in service on behalf of these additional forms of Khonsu. The multiplicity of forms, firmly established within the Egyptian religious life during the TIP, is a challenge to interpretation. For that reason, analysing all the forms of the god and the frequency in which their personnel appear in the prosopographical record became guidelines for my research.

### 1.2.2. Priests and Priesthood

Additionally, further concerns emerge when topics such as titles and temple administration are addressed. The different priestly grades and offices borne by Khonsu’s servants, their internal hierarchy or the correspondence between titles and the performance of real functions are questions that increase the complexities of the panorama. In this regard, the examination of the biographical inscriptions of priests and administrators is the only way of presenting a fairly complete picture of the

---

61 Regarding Khonsu, G. Posener (1967: 348) stated: “Ainsi, au XIIe s. av. J.-C, le dieu a un culte autonome à Thebes avec un temple et un clergé”.

62 Porter & Moss 1972: 254-255. Even though D. Redford (1988: 10-11) suggested that this temple might have been related to Khonsu the Child, its connection with Khonsu is the most accepted idea nowadays (for instance, see Thiers 2003).

63 G. Posener suggested that a possible difference between Khonsu as part of this triad of Khonsus or as an independent god depends on the form in which his epithet is written: for the second case, “n Wṣt” is usually added to his name (1969: 379) and Khonsu (ps)-wn-nḥw would be most likely absent from the scene (1970: 394-39).
complex structure of Khonsu’s personnel. Nevertheless, this fact does not preclude the importance of having a sound and theoretical framework on which to build any interpretation.

Nowadays, the publication of S. Sauneron in 1957\textsuperscript{64} still remains a point of reference when priests and priesthood are concerned. Besides, the consultation of numerous articles and book sections such as, \textit{inter alia}, those of A. M. Blackman’s\textsuperscript{65}, A. H. Gardiner’s\textsuperscript{66} or J.-M. Kruchten’s\textsuperscript{67}, is required to gain insight into this topic. However, the absence of integrated studies makes the personnel and organisation of the temples for the gods even more difficult to understand.

Even though researches on Egyptian priests and temples in a broader sense are tasks which remain to be done, a recent work of N. Spencer\textsuperscript{68} offers an excellent way of overcoming this important gap in the field. He offers an updated synthesis on the subject and presents traditional problems regarding the role and organisation of the priesthood. For this reason, according to his work, the following lines discuss some of the traditional notions about temple personnel, since specific cases in relation to Khonsu’s servants are considered in depth below.

In essence, the monarch was the one who had to satisfy the god’s requirements, the one that had to regularly complete rituals in the temple. In practice, the priests were the ones that fulfilled his ritual obligations. Since his duties spread all over the country, a subsequent multiplication of the number of temple personnel was required.

\textsuperscript{64} Sauneron 1998.
\textsuperscript{65} Blackman 1918\textsuperscript{2}.
\textsuperscript{66} Gardiner 1947: 13-98.
\textsuperscript{67} Kruchten 1989: 251-267.
\textsuperscript{68} Spencer 2010.
Every single Egyptian temple required cult service. With the main intention of ensuring a complete service in all of them—as well as guaranteeing the productive fabric for Egypt—, priests were generally organised on a rotational basis. This model of organisation appeared for the first time in the funerary temples of the 5th Dynasty and persisted throughout most of Pharaonic history. In this regard, major temples functioned by rotation on the basis of four phyles—augmented after the Canopus Decree in 238 BCE, when a fifth phyle was added. Except for those in high offices, who possibly served full time, the rest of the servants worked one month out of four; consequently, for many lower-rank priests their service in the temple was not a permanent profession.

During the late New Kingdom, approximately 22% of the population belonged to the priestly class69. Priests generally fulfilled very different roles and were more than religious officiants; usually, they were also worshippers of several divinities and in several temples. For instance, the well-known High ḫn-nṯr Priests of Amun (in the following HPAs or simply HPs) also performed high military offices during the 21st Dynasty; some of them even displayed clear political ambitions. Albeit on a lesser scale, numerous priests of Khonsu simultaneously undertook scribal and administrative duties and/or religious offices on behalf of Amun, Mut and other deities.

On the other hand, besides being the houses of the gods, cult temples were also important economic cells. Therefore, when discussing their personnel, it is essential to think also about Stewards, Scribes, Craftsmen, Farmers or Brewers, among others. Particularly from the New Kingdom, the holdings of some of those temples reached unexpected heights; apart from enacting sacred rituals and regular

69 As stated in Gee 1998: 68, although this estimate needs to be used with caution.
festivals, they owned large areas of land and cattle, collected taxes, oversaw resources and produced bread and beer for offerings. As a result, secular and administrative duties became an essential part of the functioning of temples.

For these reasons, it is possible to state that one of the keys to understanding the ancient Egyptian priesthood is to avoid looking at it through a modern prism. As stated by A. M. Blackman, “An Egyptian priesthood, therefore, may be described as a body of men separated from the rest of the community for the service of the god”\textsuperscript{70}. A great number of titles –traditionally classified as priestly titles– do not match with our modern expectations regarding the sacerdotal sphere. For instance, in this particular case, high and lower priests, as well as Scribes of the Temple, Overseers of the Architectural Works or Chamberlains were in service of Khonsu. Consequently, when talking about temple personnel in a broader sense, I am reluctant to use regularly terms such as “clergy” or “priesthood”; where possible, I prefer to use “servants” or “personnel”. I consider that the latter terms give a more realistic view of what might have been the service of the god Khonsu. However, it is true that there are numerous functions exclusively connected to the ritual sphere, as well as individuals that held non-ritual offices for other gods but performed ritual duties on behalf of Khonsu; an appropriate designation referring to these individuals may be “priest”.

Regarding priestly categories and grades, the function performed is what differentiates one priest from another. Notwithstanding this fact, most of the time, duties behind titles are difficult to grasp, which brings us back to another traditional problem with respect to the functioning of the temple. Additionally, in the Late

\textsuperscript{70} Blackman 1918\textsuperscript{2}: 117.
Period, many titles seem to have become markers of status rather than real functions.

The two main categories of priests that composed Egyptian temples were: *hm-ntr* priests, literally “God’s Servants” and often translated as “Prophet” or simply “Priest”; and *w aborted* priests or “Pure Ones”. The first title was the most usual one and, by the New Kingdom, even a hierarchy of *hm-ntr* priests seems to have been developed within the major temples: a High *hm-ntr* priest of a god –who deputised for the king in the temple services and that regularly was appointed to his office by him–, below which there were Second, Third and Fourth *hm-ntr* priests. For example, the *hm-ntr tpy, 2-nw, 3-nw and 4-nw* of Amun are highly attested and studied\(^{71}\); we will also find some of these categories present among Khonsu’s personnel.

On the other hand, *w aborted* priests have been traditionally understood as a lower rank of officiants below the *hm-ntr* priests. This idea comes from the assumption that *hm-ntr* priests performed rituals inside the *sanctum sanctorum* –and they were, subsequently, in contact with the statue of the god–, while the *w aborted* priests had a restricted access to the temple. However, as stated by J.-M. Kruchten\(^ {72}\), *w aborted* priests in Karnak were particularly involved with processional images, while the *hm-ntr* priests dealt with cult images; therefore, apart from a certain degree of hierarchy between these priestly classes, the distinction between both kinds of officiants lies in the rituals they performed. Moreover, the study of the daily temple liturgy from Karnak also shows the existence of differences regarding time on duty, remuneration, spheres of activity and expertise between these priests\(^ {73}\).

\(^{71}\) See, for instance, Broekman 2000 and 2010.

\(^{72}\) Kruchten 1989: 251-254.

\(^{73}\) Gee 2004.
example, an initiation or induction process seems to separate a $hm\text{-}n\text{tr}$ priest from a $w^b$ priest, who was simply trained.

Additionally, the status of “initiated” was given to an $it\text{-}n\text{tr}$ or “God’s Father” too. In later times, this title –held by high-ranking priests in the Old Kingdom– denoted a position in-between the $hm\text{-}n\text{tr}$ and the $w^b$ priests. However, some scholars deem that the requirement of an initiation made an $it\text{-}n\text{tr}$ equal in status to a $hm\text{-}n\text{tr}$ priest.

As concerns the Theban TIP, these three priestly titles are the most commonly held among the individuals in service of Khonsu. Other titles denoting special administrative or religious functions appear to a minor extent. Scribes of the Temple of Khonsu, Lector Priests or Overseers of the Divine Offerings are part of this complex institution, which also had some female priestesses who performed services on behalf of Khonsu.

Since the Old Kingdom, there were women holding priestly positions. However, in the New Kingdom and thereafter their presence seems to be reduced mainly to certain positions. The distinguished God’s Wife of Amun and the $\text{št}'\w'\text{yt}$ or Songstresses of the same god were the most common titles held by women. By the TIP, the title of $\text{št}'\w'\text{yt}$ of Amun was held by most of Khonsu’s female servants\textsuperscript{74}; while the priestesses attested were mainly different kinds of Nurses as well as God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child, an aggregated analysis of all of them provides clues that ensure a better understanding of this cult during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty.

To conclude these brief comments on the priests and temple administration, it is necessary to mention how titles were acquired. Even though the sovereign

\textsuperscript{74} As stated by S. L. Onstine in her PhD thesis, there was a “Disproportionate increase in the number of women who held the $\text{št}'\w'\text{yt}$ title between the time of the late 20\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty and the middle of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty” (2001: 81). This fact is noticeable when looking at the female servants of Khonsu.
usually assigned high rank offices, hereditary transmission is well attested at many periods of dynastic history; and it is precisely during the TIP when a striking inheritance of priestly offices occurred. This phenomenon occasionally occurs within Khonsu’s personnel and, in some dynasties, it is evidenced by the proclamation of lengthy genealogies in which members of a family passed on titles from one to another. However, specific cases must need further analysis and no scheme of succession can be made for several offices, as will be seen below.
1.3. Collecting the Sources:

The Prosopographical Database (PDB)

The first step once the research topic was demarcated consisted in deciding how to collect the enormous amount of biographical and genealogical information that I had to cope with; how to unite all kinds of data required to make a complete analysis of Khonsu’s personnel in a coherent manner. Accordingly, I decided to develop a prosopographical database (PDB) to suit my research needs and help answer the questions previously formulated; the software used is FileMaker Pro 13 Advanced.

Instead of a PDB of servants of Khonsu, I opted for a collection of materials or monuments on which the priests of Khonsu are mentioned; that means, I have a complete dossier of the available inscribed sources where men and women who held positions within Khonsus’ hierarchies are recorded. Coffins, papyri and statues provide us with names, titles or family connections. However, the person who owned a monument was not necessarily the servant of Khonsu referred to on it; occasionally, some relative or an external person mentioned in the inscription was the actual priest of Khonsu. This meant that no officials of Khonsu would be omitted, even if they were not the actual owners of a tomb, funerary object or statue.
Another reason for this choice was a very common phenomenon occurring during the whole TIP: the constant repetition of some recurrent proper names. As a result, it is sometimes extremely difficult to identify if, for instance, two different objects which belonged to similarly named persons were actually owned by the same individual or if there existed two separate individuals with the same name, and even maybe the same titles. In that case, a PDB as a collection of owners would be ineffective because it would force us to solve these problems of identity in advance, while collecting the data; nevertheless, it is precisely during the course of the research that some of these issues may be addressed.

The best way to understand this indispensable instrument, which is an essential part of this dissertation, and how it works, is analysing its fields in a visual way. For this purpose, the first entry of the PDB is used as an example (PDB Figure 1):
There is an identification record for each of the documents where one or more Khonsu’s servants are attested, that means, for each one of the PDB’s entries.
Every document receives an ID number (ID-Doc) given by the order of creation. Its corresponding catalogue number (ID-Catalogue) and its current location are essential to easily identify the monument, as well as the type of document, material, provenance and chronology. In addition, there is a field of notes in which I usually record, for instance, different nomenclatures of the object, noteworthy details, comments made by certain scholars or even, if known, the family to which the owner of the monument belongs (PDB Figure 2).

**PDB Figure 2: Document’ section of the main screen**
Consideration should be given to the number of monuments that attest positions held on behalf of Khonsu. Since one individual might own more than one coffin or many ushabtis, the total number of monuments in the PDB would not indicate the number of officials who owned them. Sometimes it is impossible to confirm whether these titles were or were not recorded in all the ushabtis from the same set; and even if the first option may be the most likely one, it would not make sense to create individual records for each one of the figurines. In any case, it is remarkable that an office performed on behalf of Khonsu was inscribed on an ushabti, which provides minimal titulary because of the extremely reduced writing space.

On the other hand, when looking at the PDB it is noticeable that, apart from coffin ensembles, among the documents recorded there are few mummy-covers, inner and outer coffins, lids and cases. The outer coffins from Bab el-Gasus were separated from their inner counterparts from the same ensemble as part of the extraction process; this resulted in some mistakes in the reconstruction of the ensembles themselves. Some outer coffins received a different number in the Journal d’entrée than the corresponding inner coffins. Although every separate part of the coffin ensemble was given a number in the Catalogue General, some objects did not receive CG-numbers. Moreover, a number of coffins were given as a gift to foreign governments and, later on, other objects were sold to foreign collections too\(^\text{75}\). These factors are essential to understand how difficult it is to establish a single criterion for recording funerary assemblages. Consequently, depending on my access to the information as well as the publication of the coffins and the particular characteristics of the ensembles, I can be more accurate in indicating on which component or components of the ensemble the title related to Khonsu was

\(^{75}\) See Niwinski 1999: i-ii.
inscribed. However, in line with the above, it is not crucial for my research to know, for instance, if Khonsu’s function or functions were recorded on both inner and outer coffins instead of on one or another.

Each DB document is linked with its corresponding owner, whose ID number is given by the order of creation (ID-Owner). There are fields for the transcription of the owner’s name, as well as for its transliteration form and its hieroglyphic form; this ensures the identification of the individual even though the reading of his or her name may be problematic. Additionally, I also added a field for nicknames and other names; this is useful, for instance, in this case, where Ahaneferamun (DB Own. 1) is also known as Pakharu (see PDB Figure 3).

PDB Figure 3: Owner and owner’s titles sections of the main screen
When a DB owner held titles related to any of the forms of the god Khonsu, I record them and include their transliteration form; each title also has an associated ID number (ID-tit-Owner) (PDB Figure 3). While it is true that 97 different titles have been compiled for the whole TIP, some of them are variants of the same function or titles involving the three gods of the Theban Triad, as we will see.

Moreover, if the document provides us with genealogical data including another servant of Khonsu, I add them to the relatives section. Each relative who was part of Khonsu’s personnel receives an ID number (ID-relative) (see PDB Figure 4).

PDB Figure 4: Relatives and relatives’ titles section of the main screen

The family relationship between a relative and the owner is also indicated, as well as their titles. In this regard, when a family connection between two individuals is not completely confirmed, I usually indicate it by adding a question mark. Besides, if a recorded relative possesses a document of his own in which his functions related to Khonsu are inscribed, his ID-Owner is also indicated in this
That is the case of the chosen example, where \textit{DB Own. 1}’s son is also the owner of a coffin ensemble (\textit{DB Own. 2} and \textit{DB Doc. 3}).

It is also important to have in mind that, occasionally, the owner of a document may not be a servant of Khonsu himself. However, if recorded on the PDB, his document necessarily offers information about one or more members of Khonsu’s personnel. Consequently, a relative or another person mentioned in its inscriptions were servants of this god; both would be recorded in the section for relatives.

To make this tool more effective and visually appealing, the use of genealogical trees becomes essential. If any published diagram fits my needs, I do not hesitate to add it to the PDB; if not, I create it myself. The sources are mentioned in the references section; in the above example the genealogical tree comes from an article of K. Jansen-Winkeln\footnote{Jansen-Winkeln 2008: 51 Fig. 1.} (see PDB Figure 5).
In general, this is the basic structure of the PDB: a group of individuals and their corresponding funerary ensembles and monuments that provide us with biographical and genealogical information related to Khonsu’s cult and service. Nevertheless, taking exclusively these data into account offers a very narrow perspective about the role played by these individuals during the 21st Dynasty and by the priestly institution or institutions themselves. Therefore, there is a need to analyse the links between these individuals and other Theban priesthoods. For this reason, another field is intended for collecting both a list of the other preserved
monuments owned by the DB owner and the string of offices held by the DB owner and his relatives recorded\(^7\) (PDB Figure 6).

The number of funerary objects, statuary and/or stelae owned by an individual –of course, the ones preserved, which for sure do not reflect one hundred per cent ancient reality– as well as how many of them record his functions on behalf of Khonsu’s are indicative of, for instance, the importance of those positions compared to others. The whole titulary of an individual may also provide some information about the Theban cultic sphere and its internal organisation. This

\(^7\) As regards the list of titles, I usually cite two different publications: Naguib 1990 and Jansen-Winkeln 2007\(^1\). In the first case, and although I make changes, add new titles or adapt their transliteration, I follow S.-A. Naguib’s corpus of priest and priestesses of Amun for the 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty. However, when I referred to K. Jansen-Winkeln’s book, I only use his collection of hieroglyphic inscriptions to identify the owners’ titles; he does not provide any list of functions.
compilation of prosopographical information was intended as the first stage in a
wider process of analysis and interpretation. However, it could also be valuable to
other students and scholars in prosopographical studies. My own research has its
limits, therefore, this comprehensive biographical collective dossier gives rise to
future interpretations and scientific analysis from different points of view.

To conclude, the PDB also contains plates to illustrate the objects under
study, as well as a section of bibliography, which is not intended to be exhaustive
but rather to refer to the publications that were useful for creating the entries (see
also PDB Figure 6 above).

Due to space limitations, and even though one can perfectly have an overall
picture of each one of the DB entries just looking at the main screen
(PDB Figure 1), the PDB is designed so that there are 5 secondary screens. The user
can access these by clicking on the corresponding tab located at the top of the home
screen (PDB Figure 7).

**PDB Figure 7: Access to the secondary screens**

![PDB Figure 7](image)

This way, one can look for some specific data by sections: Document, Owner, Genealogy, Plates and References. The advantage of this layout is that it
allows the display of some information and details that, even already gathered,
cannot be seen properly on the main screen (PDB Figure 8).
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PDB Figure 8: Plates (secondary screen) of DB Own. 38 and detail of one of the plates
The “Owner” secondary screen (PDB Figure 9) becomes also a basic tool when analysing the prosopographical materials in a more efficient and effective way. In the upper-right corner of the screen there is bottom that opens a list of the DB documents owned by a person.

PDB Figure 9: Owner (secondary screen) and detail of the list of the DB documents
As mentioned above, each DB document is related to its owner, while the same individual can be the possessor of several DB documents. Having in mind that the ID numbers for both documents and owners are given by order of creation, and in consequence they depend on the order in which I have found them and recorded them, the documents owned by an individual are not necessarily consecutive in the PDB. Therefore, this section easily shows how many monuments one person owns; of course, those are only the ones where one or more members of Khonsu’s hierarchies are mentioned.

The link to access to the online version of the PDB is: www.maseducacion.es/thesis. It enables a general and clear understanding of this tool and the results of my PhD research without depending upon owning FileMaker Pro 13 Advanced. Additionally, even though the server that hosts the online version entails limitations on the use of transliteration fonts, all the PDB records are annexed to the thesis to facilitate their consultation: see PDB (Printed Version).
2. THE SERVANTS OF KHONSU AND THE 21ST DYNASTY

The most distinctive attribute of the 21st Dynasty (c. 1069-945 BCE) is the fragmentation of Egypt in two political entities that ruled individually: a line of kings settled in Tanis and who reigned in Lower Egypt, in parallel to a line of military commanders and HPAs at Thebes who governed Upper Egypt.

Despite this duality, the government seems to have remained stable during this period. There is evidence of seven northern kings –Smendes I, Amenemnisut, Psusennes I, Amenemope, Osorkon “the Elder”, Siamun and Psusennes II– and nine rulers of the south –Payankh, Herihor, Pinudjem I, Masaharta, Djedkhonsiudefankh, Menkheperra, Smendes II, Pinudjem II and Psusennes III. Although the succession of the first two HPAs has been traditionally considered a problematic matter, both sequences are widely accepted. However, numerous controversies persist about the chronology of the 21st Dynasty.

The copious sources of information that characterised the New Kingdom vanish with the arrival of this dynasty, and the contemporaneous materials sometimes enable different, and even opposing, interpretations. In this regard, K. Jansen-Winkeln establishes a comprehensive summary of evidence and arguments for the historical reconstruction in his recent article “Relative
chronology of Dyn. 21”; and even though not all scholars have accepted all his premises, I follow his synthesis to contextualize my research.

Notwithstanding the apparent diarchy, certain rulers tried to retain prerogatives from one another: Herihor, Pinudjem I and Menkheperra assumed, to differing extents, certain attributes and titles reserved for a king; while some Tanite kings such as Psusennes I and Amenemope occasionally bore the title of HPA. Moreover, in some cases, members from both spheres of power were related by blood or marriage. Excluding Herihor, eight of the nine HPAs belonged to the same lineage, which was also linked to some northern rulers: Smendes I seems to have been the father-in-law of Pinudjem I, who was the father of the king Psusennes I; additionally, Psusennes II might have been king and HPA in Thebes – as Psusennes III – at the same time. The following genealogical tree summarises these connections (see Genealogical Chart 1).

78 Jansen-Winkeln 2006. Although my research does not focus on in-depth chronological and historical issues, Dodson 2012 must be noted as a recent proposal for an alternate model for the chronology and genealogy of the TIP.
79 For a discussion about the statement that Psusennes II served contemporaneously as king (II) and High *hm-nfr* priest (III), see Dodson 2009.
During the first half of the 21st Dynasty, the previously mentioned use of royal attributes by some HPAs coincided with a lack of records of the northern kings at Thebes. However, this situation changed in the second half of the dynasty. From the reign of Amenemope onwards, family connections between both halves of the country are not recorded, neither adoption of royal prerogatives by any HPA; however, it is true that Pinudjem II, son of Menkheperra, stressed his descent from Psusennes I, i.e., his relationship with the royal family. The Tanite
kings are documented at Thebes, and even though their ancestry is unclear, it is possible that Amenemope, Osorkon and Siamun belonged to a single lineage.

K. Jansen-Winkeln suggests that a possible explanation for these events could have been a change in the political structures with Amenemope; nevertheless, given the absence of conclusive evidence, a possible shift of power to a different royal family or branch is a hypothetical suggestion. The difficulty in proposing a historical reconstruction is a common issue in the study of this period; the paucity of information draws a complex milieu generating uncertainties about the length of reigns and pontificates, co-regencies or ancient dating-systems.

In this regard, this problem concerns not only the highest levels –kings and HPs– but equally affects dignitaries’ sphere, making it difficult to give a coherent idea about the order of succession and the relations between the priestly and governmental office-bearers.

With respect to the elite, the royal tombs of Tanis, located inside the precinct of Amun’s temple, provide some materials about very few courtiers connected to the Tanite kings80. However, the main source of information for dignitaries and priests consists of the late 21st Dynasty burial assemblages from the Theban caches and intrusive burials of the bay of Deir el-Bahri81.

The Royal Cache (TT 320), cleared by E. Brugsch in 1881, was the first great discovery; besides the coffins containing several royal mummies dated from the 17th Dynasty to the end of the New Kingdom, some of the members of the Theban ruling elite also reposed there. Ten years later, G. Daressy discovered an

80 See section 2.2.2. for those individuals connected to the service of Khonsu in Tanis.
81 Apart from the earliest publications, such as Maspero 1889, Daressy 1900, 1907 and 1909, or Winlock 1931, for an overview about the history of the major discoveries of the Theban caches and the elements of their funeral furniture, see: Niwinski 1984, 19881: 7-37 and 19891: 47-59.
intact tomb that contained an enormous find of 254 coffins and numerous minor funerary objects of priests and priestesses of Amun: the so-called Bab el-Gasus cache or Second Cache. In addition, MMA 60 and MMA 65 (TT 358) –the Tomb of the Three Princesses and Tomb of Merytamun respectively–, discovered by the expedition of the Metropolitan Museum of Art led by H. E. Winlock (1911-1931), provide additional information for my research.

During the TIP, both royal and private mortuary practices changed. Richly decorated tombs were no longer being made and the contents of the funerary equipment underwent a transformation; either by the transference of the bodies to secondary interments or a different attitude to the dead, it is a fact that grave goods appear to have been generally reduced. The contraction of the funerary equipment became widespread. Nevertheless, the simple ownership of funerary ensembles was not a decisive sign of social status among the individuals buried in these collective interments, the Theban elite. It was the quality of the execution of these funerary goods and their details which marked the difference in status between these priests, who were buried side by side in the same tomb.

An optimum elite burial assemblage was normally composed of: a set of anthropoid wooden coffins, that is, an inner coffin, an outer coffin and a mummy-cover; two scrolls of funerary papyri, usually entitled as Book of the Dead and Amduat papyri; as well an ushabti box with ushabti figures and an Osiris statue, generally used as a papyrus-sheath for the Book of the Dead manuscripts. Despite this simplification, the rich iconographic repertoire used on the coffin-ensembles and papyri reveals a transposition and enrichment of ancient religious concepts at this time; texts and images, even though condensed into a limited space, assist the

---

82 For an overview of the main changes in burial practice during the TIP, see: Taylor 2010.
deceased’s passage to the afterlife. Moreover, as far as the prosopographical study is concerned, the inscriptions from the funerary objects confirm the identity of the deceased by attesting the names and titles of their owners.

The caches from Deir el-Bahri are evidence of a deliberate attempt to gather the burials of the Theban Amun priests into secondary groupings. These mass burials housed both lower and upper class priests and officials in service of Amun, who represented an special elite segment of society associated with the Karnak temple: from the mentioned HPAs and their family members to lower-rank priests and songstresses. Consequently, the close association of the individuals buried in these caches with the powerful State of Amun is confirmed. Furthermore, and even though these objects contain only limited biographical and genealogical information, most of their members performed other functions for several different deities, a subject worthy of further consideration.

In this regard, the god Khonsu, together with Mut, plays an important role. As S.-A. Naguib remarks\(^{84}\), during the 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty the area of Deir el-Bahri –not the temple of Hatshepsut itself– became a kind of priestly necropolis of the personnel in service of Amun, but also of Mut and Khonsu of Karnak. And although the priesthood of Amun was the defining feature among most of the persons buried there, the existence of servants of Mut and Khonsu among these Amun priests means that the funerary goods from Deir el-Bahri provide the main evidence for the study of Khonsu’s personnel during this dynasty as well.

On the other hand, from the 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty onwards, a large body of texts on temple statuary and private inscriptions and graffiti proclaim lengthy genealogies of as an effort to legitimize the holding of sacerdotal and official

---

\(^{84}\) Naguib 1990: 111-112.
functions within a family. They claim the illustrious background of an individual and his lineage; priests and officials referred to the offices held by their ancestors claiming those offices for themselves. Nevertheless, with few exceptions, 21st Dynasty funeral equipment does not provide many genealogical details. This state of affairs should not be seen as evidence for a decline in respect for ancestors, but as a consequence of a reduction in the abundance of surviving evidence\textsuperscript{85}. Given the partiality of the source material and the limited biographical and genealogical information existing, reconstructing long genealogies of priests or functionaries becomes a difficult task during this period; an issue that must be taken into account for the analysis of Khonsu’s servants: no scheme of succession can be made for many of their offices by this time.

Notwithstanding the limits of this research, a meticulous examination of the materials dated to the 21st Dynasty enabled me to identify a number of individuals connected to the cult and temple administration of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and Khonsu the Child. In addition, the compilation of the biographical and genealogical information –scarce though it is– suggests certain patterns of behaviour of these personnel, composed by both men and women. These crucial matters are proposed and argued in the following pages, where Khonsu's servants are analysed in accordance with the functions that they performed.

\textsuperscript{85} Bierbrier 1975: 45 and 2006: 43.
2.1. \textit{w\textsuperscript{r}b} PRIESTS, GOD’S FATHERS AND SCRIBES

OF THE DOMAIN OF KHONSU AND SERVANTS OF THE
THEBAN TRIAD

The first group subject of study is composed of twenty-three\textsuperscript{86} men who performed priestly and administrative offices connected to Khonsu; they were mainly \textit{w\textsuperscript{r}b} priests, God’s Fathers and Scribes (see Chart 1\textsuperscript{87}). At first sight, these titles are associated with significantly different functions and, consequently, cannot be regarded as an homogeneous group of offices. However, these god’s servants have certain features in common that make it logical to include them in a single aggregate.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{86} Chart 1 includes twenty-four male individuals; even so, throughout these pages, I always refer to twenty-three men instead of twenty-four, excluding \textit{DB Own 143} from my analysis. This is because, although his title and possible date would make him part of this group, the unknown provenance of his bronze statue as well as its features and possible aim (see Taylor 2007: 76-78) considerably differ from the rest of materials. In this regard, the pyramidions of \textit{DB Own 134} and 135 may also be regarded cautiously; however, their titles, as well as the style and ductus of their inscriptions make the difference, meanwhile no more titles could help as far as \textit{DB Own 143} is concerned.

\textsuperscript{87} It is necessary to bear in mind that the charts of this dissertation use only part of the information included in the PDB and, consequently, for further details about owners, documents, bibliographical references and so on, the PDB itself must be consulted.
Chart 1: \(\text{w}^{\text{ř}}\) priests, God’s Fathers and Scribes of Khonsu during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nsy-\textit{lnn}</td>
<td>•(\ddot{s} \text{$} \text{$Hsb imy-}\textit{r} \text{k}\textit{3} \text{n pr 'Imn-} \text{R}' \text{$nw ntrw Mwt }\text{Hnsw} \text{w}^{\text{ř}}\text{b; it-ntr mry; sš }\text{$Hw-} \text{ntr n Mn\textit{tw-}R' nb Wst; sš }\text{$Hw-ntr n Mn\textit{tw-}R' nsw ntrw; sš wšh htp-ntr n ntrw nbw }\text{Sm'w Mhw -Incense-} \text{bearer}</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ramesses XI (Late 20\textsuperscript{th} D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>\textit{Pz-n-nst-tswy}</td>
<td>•\textit{it-ntr n Hnsw} •(\ddot{s} \text{$wšh htp-}\textit{ntr n 'Imn Mwt }\text{Hnsw} \text{it-ntr n 'Imn-R' nsw ntrw; sš n pr 'Imn; sš wšh n ntrw nbw Wst}</td>
<td>A. 11 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Menkheperrra (Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>\textit{Pz-iri-\textit{sḥrw}}</td>
<td>•\textit{it-ntr n Hnsw}</td>
<td>\textit{it-ntr n Mwt wrt nbt 'lšrw; it-ntr n 'Imn; tṣy bsnw m pr Mwt; sš (')}</td>
<td>A. 13 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Menkheperrra (Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>\textit{Hnsw-m-} \textit{rnp}</td>
<td>•(\ddot{s} \text{š pr }\text{Hnsw} \text{w}^{\text{ř}}\text{b n 'Imn; sš }\text{šnw n pr 'In-} \text{hrt-Św sš R'; sš }\text{šnw n pr Hn m nb Kbhw; sš }\text{šnw (n) pr Wsīr nb sbdw; sš }\text{(s)rnp rwd }\text{s }\text{n pr }\text{sš nsw n }\text{Kš}</td>
<td>A. 120 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Pinudjem II (Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>\textit{Di-\textit{Hnsw-}\textit{iry}}</td>
<td>•\textit{w}^{\text{ř}}\text{b n hšt n }\text{Hnsw}</td>
<td>\textit{it-ntr n 'Imn-R' nsw ntrw; sš m pr 'Imn; sš nsw}</td>
<td>A. 49 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Pinudjem II (Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Own. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Khonsu titles</td>
<td>Other titles</td>
<td>Provenance (documents)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ns-p₂-nfr-ḥr</td>
<td>*wbsd n Ḥnsw</td>
<td>it-nṯr n ḡmn-Rˁ nsw nṯrw; it-nṯr n ḡr; sš nṯr n pr ḡmn; imy-r nṯrw n pr ḡmn.</td>
<td>A. 117 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ns- QLatin- (nb)-nst-tw\textsuperscript{y}w; Gswt-sšn (B) (DB Own n.141)</td>
<td>*it-nṯr n Ḥnsw</td>
<td>wbsd n ḡšt n ḡmn-Rˁ nsw nṯrw; it-nṯr n ḡmn; sš sḥnw n p₂ ḡm-nṯr tpy n ḡmn-Rˁ nsw nṯrw; sš sḥnw n pr ḡmn</td>
<td>A. 139 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>p₂-di-lmn</td>
<td>*wbsd n Ḥnsw</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nfr-ḥtp</td>
<td>*wbsd n ḡšt n Ḥnsw m Wšst Nfr-ḥtp</td>
<td>sš sḥnw n pr Ḥnsw sš nṯrw n pr Ḥnsw</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Middle 21\textsuperscript{st} D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Servants of Khonsu and the 21st Dynasty

#### 2.1. wḥ priests, God’s Fathers and Scribes of the Domain of Khonsu and Servants of the Theban Triad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7           | Ns-pr-nbw | • it-nfr n Ḥnsw
   • it-nfr n Ḥnsw m Wsst Nfr-ḥtp | it-nfr n ‘Imn-R’
   nsw ntrw; it-
   nfr n Mwt; sš
   ḫwt-nfr n pr
   Mwt wrt ḫsrw;
   sš n ḫṣ ḫrt wrt
   ḫmr ḫtyt n ‘Imn;
   ṭž
   mḥ-ḥb n nb.f;
   ḫmr-Ḥ ḫmr n Ḥmr
   ḫwty ḫtyt st
   wr | A. 142
   Bab el-Gasus | Second half 21st D |
| 10          | Ḥnsw-m-hb | • it-nfr n Ḥnsw
   • Ḫmr-nfr n Ḥnsw-R’ | it-nfr n ‘Imn-R’
   nsw ntrw; it-
   nfr n ‘Imn;
   sš
   ḫḥb n pr ‘Imn;
   sš n pr ‘Imn | A. 106
   Bab el-Gasus | Second half 21st D |
| 29          | Ps-di-Ḥnsw | • it-nfr n Ḥnsw m Wsst Nfr-ḥtp
   • ḫḥw n Ḥnsw
   • ḫḥw n nb Bnt | it-nfr mṛy-nfr;
   -Priest of
   Ḥmr
   -Priest of
   Amun; God’s
   Father of Mut;
   Scribe of
   Divine
   Offerings of
   the Amun
   Domain; God’s
   Servant | Unknown | Second half 21st D |
| 13          | Bṣk-n-Mwt | • it-nfr n Ḥnsw m Wsst Nfr-ḥtp | wḥ b ‘Imn-R’
   nsw ntrw; sš
   ḫtp-nfr n pr
   ‘Imn | Unknown | Late 21st D |
| 26          | Śd-Ḥnsw | • ḫmr-Ḥ ḫmr (? n Ḥnsw m Wsst Nfr-ḥtp | it-nfr n ‘Imn-R’
   nsw ntrw; sš
   n ‘Imn-R’ | A. 52
   Bab el-Gasus | Late 21st D |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ns-Imn</td>
<td>*it-nṯr n Hnsw</td>
<td>it-nṯr n 'Imn-Rˁ; it-nṯr n Mwt</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Late 21st D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>'Imn-msyw</td>
<td>*it-nṯr n Hnsw</td>
<td>it-nṯr n 'Imn-Rˁ nsw nṯrw</td>
<td>Assasif</td>
<td>Second half 21st D.-early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pš-di-Mwt</td>
<td>(son of DB Rel. 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>End 21st D-early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Ns-Imn</td>
<td>*ss hwt-nṯr n Hnsw</td>
<td>mṛy-nṯr</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>End 21st D-early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ns-pš-hr-'n</td>
<td>*w'b n Hnsw</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. 35 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>21st D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Šḏ-sw-Hnsw</td>
<td>*ss pr Hnsw</td>
<td>hṛy pdty/ hṛy pdtyw</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>21st D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First of all, I would like to make a clarification about this group of individuals. Although the owner of the Papyrus 601 from the Archaeological Museum of Zagreb (DB Own. 32/Doc. 44) was initially included in this group, further considerations excluded him from my research. He was entitled as \( \text{w}^b \) priest of Khonsu and dated to the late 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty or early 22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty by A. Niwinski; however, this author possibly misinterpreted the reading of the

---

\(^{88}\) The DB entry of this individual is marked in red to be differentiated from the rest of the entries.

\(^{89}\) Niwinski 1989: 376.
owner’s theophoric name, which contains the name of Khonsu. The name of this god is written on the vignette of the papyrus at the beginning of the owner’s name, directly after the title of \( w^b \) priest\(^90 \) (see Figure 1); even though the individual is only referred to as a \( w^b \) priest of Amun on the papyrus, the vignette disposition might have lead to the erroneous assumption about his connection to the service of Khonsu. Because of this reason, he is still recorded on the DB, while he cannot be considered a \( w^b \) priest of Khonsu but a servant of Amun.

---

\(^{90}\) Uranic 2005:360 n. 9.
Excluding *DB Own. 143*, these twenty-three servants of Khonsu are attested by thirty documents, mainly elements of funerary equipment. This corpus belongs to twenty-two members of the Theban elite, while the remaining individual is the father of *DB Own. 14* (*DB Rel. 16*). Consequently, only a single document (*DB Doc. 21*) seems to attest a priestly title of Khonsu transferred on genealogical lines. However, as mentioned above, it is necessary to bear in mind that, giving the nature of the source material, the absence of genealogical details is a common issue for this period.

In the 21st Dynasty, the major offices of the priesthood of Amun and the one of High Priest of Ptah at Memphis were all hereditary; even though it is true that the royal right was, at least theoretically, exercised in these appointments. Besides, the existence of additional biographical references on some of the documents studied may evidence the likely hereditary transmission of priestly offices among some individuals of the Theban elite. In this regard, the ancestors of *DB Own. 28* provide a remarkable example; although they were not related to Khonsu’s service, their connection to the service of Amun as ḫmwy-ntr and ḫmwy-ntr 4-nw during the first half of the 21st Dynasty and for four generations should be noted. However, the supposition of hereditary transmission for some offices connected to Khonsu’s service cannot be proved as long as further evidence will have been revealed.

Except for six documents whose provenience is unknown –*DB Own. 23, 22, 27, 29, 13* and 14–, the rest of the available monuments come from the Theban necropolis, the funerary objects of Bab el-Gasus cache being particularly significant (see Table 1).

---

91 See n. 86 above.
The predominance of materials from Bab el-Gasus determines the date of these personnel in the second half of the 21st Dynasty; however, except for a few mummy-braces and bandages, no specific dates are provided. Based on the analysis of the type of coffins, papyri or other funerary objects, Chart 1 presents Khonsu’s servants in a chronological order in the most accurate way possible, while quite frequently a precise dated framework remains uncertain.

On the other hand, what can be deduced from the available source material is that only DB Own. 17, 16, 9, 12, 18, 7, 10 and 6 possess more than one funerary equipment.

---

92 Some of these objects bear texts which contain the name of a HP, the figure of the regnal year of the king ruling at the moment of the production of the linen, or even stamps with the names of the reigning king and the HPA in office in Thebes at the moment of the burial: Niwinski 1988: 15-16. For a more detailed information about this topic, see Kitchen 2004: 411-416.

93 For the DB Documents’ chronological information (including the dates provided by all the dissertation’s Charts) see, among others: Niwinski 19881 and 19891; Jansen-Winkeln 20071; and Aston 2009. In this regard, it is necessary to keep in mind that, generally, the dates given are linked to the monuments themselves; consequently, they might be subsequent to a DB Owner’s tenure of office.
object. In this sense, there must be considered that I usually treat a coffin ensemble as a single document despite the fact that it is generally composed of an inner coffin, an outer coffin and a mummy-cover; the analysis will not vary significantly depending on which elements of the set include Khonsu’s titles. Nevertheless, certain cases require a different treatment.

When a funerary reuse occurred, which seems to have been a heterogeneous and common practice during the 21st Dynasty, it is necessary to examine the different elements of the coffin ensemble to identify the usurper and the original owner. This is, for instance, the case with DB Own. 26, whose set of coffins was reused by a Songstress of Amun, although his title related to Khonsu seems to have been preserved only on the lid of an inner coffin (DB Doc. 38).

To quote another example, DB Own. 10 might provide insight into the difficulties that arise when analysing certain reused documents. His titles related to Khonsu’s service appear in his Book of the Dead papyrus (DB Doc. 16), his shroud (DB Doc. 17) and his ushabti box (DB Doc. 202). Nevertheless, a coffin-ensemble (Cairo CG 6002-4), an anonymous papyrus (Cairo JE 95644) and a set of ushabtis also belong to him. The mentioned set of coffins was usurped by him from Ns-p3-nfr-hr, who was most likely wḥb n ḫst n Mwt and šš. Consulting E. Chassinat’s publication of the coffins, it seems that the offices connected to the service of Khonsu were performed only by DB Own. 10, and that they were not recorded in the inscriptions of the coffins. However, the titles held by both individuals vary

94 See section 1.3. above.
95 A recent study on this complex phenomenon is presented in: Cooney 2012.
97 Aubert 1998: 86 doc. 34.
98 Chassinat 1909: 3-11.
depending on the publications\(^9^9\). In this case, it is possible to suggest that both men’s titles might have been blended with each others already at the time of the reuse or by some scholar, although sometimes it is impossible to be certain about matters of this kind.

On the other hand, *DB Own. 18* presents a further challenge: the usurper of at least part of his coffins was also a priestess of Khonsu (*DB Own. 141\(^1^0^0\)*). It is true that the distribution of their coffins between the Cairo and the Leiden Museum is uncertain\(^1^0^1\); however, resorting to E. Chassinat’s publication\(^1^0^2\), it seems that only Cairo CG 6011 –the case of the outer coffin– includes the functions performed on behalf of Khonsu by both individuals. Consequently, this document was recorded twice on the PDB, once per person (see *DB Doc. 28* and \(200\)), even though both records refer to the same object.

The aforementioned owners of more than one funerary object were all buried in Bab el-Gasus cache, a fact that possibly guaranteed the survival of a more complete funerary equipment. Nevertheless, only *DB Own. 17, 9, 18, 7 and 10* have more than one funerary object recording their functions connected to the service of Khonsu. Quite often the full complement of an individual’s titles is drawn from a variety of sources, so it is difficult to find a single inscription encompassing all an individual’s titles.

\(^9^9\) Niwinski 1988\(^1\): 132 doc. 150 and 1989\(^1\): 256 CAIRO 7 and 276 CAIRO 65; Naguib 1990: men 75 and 94 ; Aubert 1998: 86 doc. 34; and Jansen-Winkeln 2007\(^1\): 190 doc. 100.
\(^1^0^0\) For more information about this female, see Chart 4 below.
\(^1^0^1\) K. Jansen-Winkeln already has pointed it out (2007\(^1\): 190), and consulting other publications, as Niwinski 1988\(^1\) (doc. 85 and 228 of pages 119 and 146 respectively) or Aubert 1998 (doc. 38 of page 90), these doubts seems justified.
\(^1^0^2\) Chassinat 1909: 36-41.
It is safe to assume that each individual was represented by his most important titles, his favourite position or maybe the one he held at his death. Widely differing motivations could have influenced a person in his choice; however, the available evidence is inconclusive and usually frustrates attempts to seek meaningful criteria. In this respect, it is hard to know which ones were the motivations of these men to include their Khonsu functions in certain elements of their funerary equipment or to omit them. However, it should be noted that most of them held other titles besides the ones which connected them to Khonsu’s service.

In this regard, God’s Father, w‘b priest and scribal titles such as Regulation Scribe of a Temple, Temple Scribe or Scribe of the Divine Offerings for certain deities usually appear in conjunction\textsuperscript{103}. Furthermore, these individuals were not merely w‘b priests, God’s Father and/or Scribes of Khonsu, they usually performed similar duties on behalf of Amun and/or Mut\textsuperscript{104}. Looking at the grouping of titles, the jointly held tenure of functions associated with the service for various gods of the Theban triad become a recurrent pattern of behaviour. This feature must be taken as a benchmark to understand the personnel under study. Illustration of this fact are, for instance, \textit{DB Own. 31}, who accumulated the offices of \textit{it-ntr n Imn}, \textit{it-ntr n Mwt} and \textit{it-ntr n Hnsw}, or \textit{DB Own. 12}, who was a Royal Scribe and Scribe of the Temple of Amun, God’s Father of Amun and \textit{w‘b n hzt n Hnsw}.

Beyond what could be considered a set of functions related to the gods of the main Theban triad, some individuals had a special connection with particular priestly roles or even with different deities\textsuperscript{105}. For instance, the presence of a God’s

\textsuperscript{103} Other priestly and administrative offices are attested, they are nevertheless not so recurrent. See, for instance, \textit{DB Own. 16, 11, 7, 112, 45, 134} and 135.

\textsuperscript{104} Except for \textit{DB Own. 22, 27, 112} and 45, who were only servants of Khonsu, the individuals of Chart 1 exercised priestly or administrative functions on behalf of Amun or Mut, or for both of them.

\textsuperscript{105} See \textit{DB Own. 9, 7, 6, 134} and 135.
Father of Maat (DB Own. 6), a *hm-ntr* priest of Thot (DB Own. 7) or a Scribe of the Temple of Khnum at Thebes (DB Own. 9) should draw our attention.

The mention of a priori foreign gods in prosopography could indicate that, at a particular period, an organised cult of these deities was established in the Theban area\textsuperscript{106}. A. M. Blackman already suggested this possibility regarding the above-mentioned servant of the goddess Maat\textsuperscript{107}. However, besides the existence of different local cults in Thebes, other reasons might explain the presence of, for instance, Abydene titles at Thebes.

Although from the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty the Theban dominance over the rest of Upper Egypt seems proven, the connections between Abydos and Thebes remained constant and marked by a strong component of religiosity. Theban visitors to Abydos, dedications made by Theban rulers, the tenure of important offices at Abydos by Thebans or local priests that might have held Theban names, prove this fact\textsuperscript{108}.

In this sense, it is obvious that DB Own. 9 and 135 had close ties with this geographical area. The first, buried in Bab el-Gasus, was Scribe of the Temple of Osiris at Abydos and of Onuris-Shu at Thinis, besides servant of Amun and Khonsu. On the other hand, DB Own. 135, a God’s Father of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, was Scribe of the Treasure of the Temple of Osiris as well as Second and Third *hm-ntr* priest of Osiris\textsuperscript{109}. The pyramidion which attested the latter individual

\textsuperscript{106} For instance, for a recent study about the cult of Osiris at Thebes during the I millennium it is necessary to consult Coulon 2010.

\textsuperscript{107} Blackman 1918: 25.

\textsuperscript{108} For the different connections between Thebes and Amun’s priesthood and Abydos during the TIP, see Leahy 1990.

\textsuperscript{109} Leahy (1990: 167) entitled him as a *hm-ntr* priest of Onuris, instead of Osiris. However, according to Rammant-Peeters (1983: 50) and examining his Plate XXVIII 83, it seems more likely that this individual was *hm-ntr* priest of Osiris.
(DB Doc. 189) supposedly comes from Thebes based on the titles recorded on it\textsuperscript{110}. However, it is reasonable to consider an Abydene provenance based on the representation of the triad Osiris-Isis-Harsiese on it, together with the fact that this kind of monument is quite common at Abydos\textsuperscript{111}.

As a consequence, we might consider that local priests might have held Theban titles, that the Theban triad was worshipped at Abydos, or even that a burial in Abydos might have attracted some Thebans. Nevertheless, due to the diversity and ambiguity of these data, this piece of evidence remains difficult to assess, as A. Leahy stated\textsuperscript{112}. Likewise, the relationship between Theban priests –including some of Khonsu’s servants– and Abydos must be taken into account.

On the other hand, a single appearance of the titles $k\beta h w\ n\ Hnsw$ and $k\beta h w\ n\ nb\ Bnnt$ during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty is remarkable (see DB Own. 29). A handful of men were Libationers of Khonsu during the whole TIP. However, it is during the 25\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty that this title occurs more frequently; indeed, the close connection between its holders and the priesthood of the Theban god Montu during the Kushite rule was not common before\textsuperscript{113}.

Besides being servant of Amun, Libationer and God’s Father of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep, DB. Own 29 was also $h\acute{s}y$, translated as “favoured/praised/beloved” or “singer”\textsuperscript{114}. This musical duty is attested until Ptolemaic times among

\textsuperscript{110} Rammant-Peeters 1983: 50.

\textsuperscript{111} Leahy 1990: 160.

\textsuperscript{112} Leahy 1990: 167-168. In this regard, a mention should also be made to a group of ushabtis from Abydos; they belonged to an individual attached to the cult of Amun and Khonsu, the God’s Father of both Theban deities Panecherhem (DB Own. 137). He is not included in Chart 1 because of his provenance.

\textsuperscript{113} See Chapter 4 for a brief comment on this topic.

\textsuperscript{114} Onstine 2001: 13-16.
male priests\textsuperscript{115}, even though the role played by some females is more significant in quantitative terms. The female Singers of Mut were common, but there were only a few $\text{hsywt}$ of Khonsu, as will be discussed below; furthermore, no male singers of Khonsu are attested during the TIP\textsuperscript{116}.

Whereas the above-mentioned titles refer to the main form of Khonsu, Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep, some individuals from Chart 1 performed duties for other manifestations of this god too. In this respect, the role played during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty by the servants of Khonsu the Child must be highlighted.

Only a limited number of servants connected to this priesthood during the whole TIP are attested, and the greatest number of them date to the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty. The members of his female priesthood played a crucial role as far as the legitimacy of the Southern rulers is concerned. Titles such as $\text{mnct}$ and $\text{hnmtt} \ n \ Hnsw \ p\text{-h}rd$ denoted a lower status of priestesses under the supervision of the $\text{mwt-n\text{-}tr} \ n \ Hnsw \ p\text{-h}rd$\textsuperscript{117}. In this regard, it is remarkable that $\text{DB Own. 134}$, $\text{w}^\text{c} \text{b}$ priest and God’s Father of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, also took part in this hierarchy: he was $\text{imy-r} \ mn\text{ct}yw \ n \ Hnsw \ p\text{-h}rd$ –even though there is no evidence of any male Wet-nurse of Khonsu.

H. Kees already suggested that this individual was the first Overseer of the Wet-nurses attested, a title which passed to the Family of Ankhpakhered later on\textsuperscript{118}. Moreover, he is also a unique example of a Feeder of Khonsu the Child during this

\textsuperscript{115} Naguib 1990: 232-235.

\textsuperscript{116} The sole example of a male titleholder who performed this kind of musical duty on behalf of Khonsu is $\text{Dd-Hnsw.\text{-}iw.\text{-}f-n\text{-}nh}$ (A), dated back to the early 22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty and who was $\text{hsy} \ r\text{-}s \ n \ nb \ Bmnt$. For a $\text{hsy} \ n \ Hnsw$ dated to the New Kingdom, see: Rammant-Peeters 1983: 45; for other men who performed this kind of musical duty, see, among others $\text{DB Own. 24, 1, 2, and 20}$ (Chart 2 below).

\textsuperscript{117} Vide infra: section 2.2.1.2.

\textsuperscript{118} Kees 1959: 67. See also p. 143 and Chapter 4.
period, while this position related to child gods seems to become quite common from the 21st Dynasty henceforth\textsuperscript{119}.

Similarly, servants of minor manifestations of Khonsu are rare during the TIP. Nonetheless, \textit{DB Own. 112}, who was \textit{sš ḥwt-ntr n Ḥnsw pꜣ-ỉt-šṛrw}, proves the existence of a scribal personnel of Khonsu \textit{pꜣ-ỉt-šṛrw} at Thebes by the end of the 21st Dynasty or the beginning of the 22nd Dynasty, besides his already known presence at Tanis\textsuperscript{120}. Thus, either as part of the triad of Khonsus –in which case the temple mentioned in the title might have been a sanctuary within the temple of Khonsu itself\textsuperscript{121}– or as an independent deity, there existed a place of worship and an established cult of this oracular deity at that time\textsuperscript{122}.

Returning to the commonalities between this group of servants, it is possible to suggest that they belonged to the same priestly level on the basis of the functions that they performed. In addition to their connection with Khonsu and the other members of the Theban triad, their titles were not related to the high level of the temple hierarchy. In this regard, with the exception of \textit{DB Own. 10}, there are no \textit{ḥm-ntr} priests of Khonsu among these individuals; moreover, there are not \textit{ḥm-ntr} priests of Amun and Mut either\textsuperscript{123}.

Apparently, there exist no clear differences between \textit{DB Own. 10} and the rest of the individuals. It is little wonder that he was also God’s Father of Khonsu,

---

\textsuperscript{119} Three stelae of the Serapeum attested two other Feeders of Khonsu the Child dated to the 22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty: \textit{DB Own. 84} and \textit{85}. In addition, for later examples of this duty on behalf of various child gods, including Khonsu, see Laurent 1984: 152-156.

\textsuperscript{120} Posener 1968: 403-404.

\textsuperscript{121} See Bohleke 1997: 162.

\textsuperscript{122} For a brief study of this god, see p. 23-25.

\textsuperscript{123} As previously mentioned, there are a \textit{ḥm-ntr} priest of Thot (\textit{DB Own. 7}) and a Second and Third \textit{ḥm-ntr} priest of Osiris (\textit{DB Own. 135}); however, these examples seem exceptions.
God’s Father of Amun and Scribe of the Domain of Amun; further, his funerary goods (see *DB Doc. 16, 17 and 202*) are comparable with other servants’ equipment. However, the form of the god with whom he was associated, Khonsu-Ra, may be a key to this distinction; he seems to be the only male servant of this form of this god at Thebes for this period\(^\text{124}\).

Serving as a *ḥm-nṯr* priest, traditionally seen as an initiated priest above *wr*b priests and even God’s Fathers, might have been restricted to a certain rank of dignitaries. Looking at the available data for this Dynasty, it is possible to find a few *ḥm-nṯr* priests of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. However, their titles and status differ from what we see for the individuals from Chart 1, as will be seen in the next section.

To sum up, it could be suggested that this group of individuals seems to have been part of the same level of temple hierarchy of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. The fact that they held lower administrative and priestly offices connected to Khonsu and to Amun and Mut are meaningful features. Given the proximity between the temples of these gods and the aforementioned grouping of titles, it is very likely indeed that the personnel of Khonsu cannot be entirely divorced from the servants of Amun and Mut.

Karnak complex incorporates several buildings, the temple of Amun being the principal and largest one; however, the complex dedicated to his son, Khonsu, Ptah and Montu’s temples or the nearby temple of his wife, Mut, should not be neglected. The inclusion of separate sanctuaries in Amun’s complex might have brought them under the supervision of his priesthood, so that they would not rival

\(^{124}\) For this form of Khonsu: Degardin 1992 and 2000. See also: *DB Own. 41* for an example of this title at Tanis; *DB Own. 38*, who was God’s Mother of Khonsu-Ra Lord of Thebes; and *DB Own. 52*, a *ḥm-nṯr priest* of Khonsu-Ra dated to the beginning of the Libyan Period.
his supremacy at Thebes, which was indeed indisputable during the 21st Dynasty. Thus, the intrinsic relationship between the gods of the Theban triad appears to have determined the Theban temple organisation itself.

On the other hand, besides the joint tenure of services as wḥḥ, it-nṯr or šš on behalf of various gods of the triad—or even of all three gods—the existence of certain titles which involve Amun, Mut and Khonsu simultaneously might reinforce this idea. *DB Own. 23* –šš ḫḥtb implicitly r kš n pr ḫmn-Rc nsw nṯr ḫnw— and *DB Own. 17* –šš ḫḥtp-nṯr n ḫmn Mwt ḫnw— are outstanding examples of it.

In this regard, a further nine individuals bearing influential civil and priestly titles involving Amun, Mut and Khonsu provide insight into this matter (see Chart 2).

**Chart 2: Other functionaries servants of Amun, Mut and Khonsu during the 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Swty-mṣyw</td>
<td>ḫḥm r kswt n mnw nbw n ḫmn m ḫpt-swt Mwt ḫnw nsw nṯr Wṣt nbw nṯr Ṣmḥw Mḥw</td>
<td>ḫḥw ḥḥy ḫḥw m ḫpt-swt; ḫḥw ḥḥy ḫḥw; šš ḫḥt-nṯr m ḫpt-swt; ḥḥy sšw ḫḥt-nṯr n ḫmn-Rc; ḥḥy sšw ḫḥt-nṯr n ḫmn ḥḥy ḫḥw; ḥḥy sšw ḫḥt-nṯr n pr ḫmn-Rc nsw nṯr; ḥḥy ḫḥw Ṣwtyw sšw ḫḥw n pr-hḥd n pr ḫmn-Rc nsw nṯr</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Smendes (Early 21st D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Servants of Khonsu and the 21st Dynasty
2.1. wḥḥ priests, God’s Fathers and Scribes of the Domain of Khonsu and Servants of the Theban Triad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sr-Imn</td>
<td>•`my-r kꜳw n mnh nbw wrw n 'Imn Mwt Hnsw</td>
<td>wꜳ n 'Imn-R° nsw nfrw; wꜳ n ḫst n 'Imn; wꜳ n ḫst n Mwt; wꜳ n ḫm n pr 'Imn; 'my-r nfrw n pr 'Imn; 'my-r ḫh n ḫm ndw šps ḫz n 'Imn; 'my-r mSA; ḫsy ḫz m ḫh 'Imn; ūmn nfr n 'Imn-R° (Hpr)</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Early 21st D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Hnsw-nsyw</td>
<td>•`my-r kꜳw n mnh nbw n 'Imn Mwt Hnsw</td>
<td>it-nfr n 'Imn-R° nsw nfrw; it-nfr mry 'Imn m lpt-ḥwt; it-nfr; šš ḫwt-nfr n Mwt; šš ḫwt-nfr ḫhw innt nb n 'Imn; ḫsy ḫz sS ḫḥy m Wst 'Imn; 'my-r ḫwt-nbw n 'Imn; ḫrty sSwtyw sSw n pr-hd n pr 'Imn</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Early-middle 21st D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ḫs-nfr-'Imn/Pš-ḥṣrw (father of DB Own. 2)</td>
<td>•ḫry-sšt3 m pt ts dwit n pr 'Imn Mwt Hnsw</td>
<td>wꜳ ḫrt ḫt (? n 'Imn m lpt-ḥwt (or ḫrt n 'Imn); it-nfr mry n 'Imn; ḫry-ḥbt ḫry-tp n 'Imn; sm m pr R°; ḫsy ḫz m ḫh 'Imn; ūmn nfr n 'Imn; wnw pt m lpt-ḥwt</td>
<td>A. 115 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Menkheperra (Middle 21st D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. The Servants of Khonsu and the 21st Dynasty

### 2.1. $\text{w}^{b}$ priests, God's Fathers and Scribes of the Domain of Khonsu and Servants of the Theban Triad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Ps-di-Imn</em> (son of DB Own. 1)</td>
<td>• $\text{hry-sštš} m \text{'Imn Mwt Hňsw}$</td>
<td>$\text{w}^{b} \text{'wy m 'lpt-swt;} \text{it-nty mry n 'Imn m st.f 'spst;} \text{it-nty mry 'lnpw rnt tr.f;} \text{it-nty;} \text{hry-hht hry-tr n 'Imn nn.f;} \text{wr m nsaw n R' 'lm m Wbst;} \text{mnsaw;} \text{tmt n 'št;} \text{hşy 's m rř 'Imn;} \text{hşy n hşyw m-bşh Šw n niwt.f Wbst;} \text{hm-nty n 'Imn m sš 2-nw;} \text{wnw pt m 'lpt-swt;} \text{hry-sštš m pt tš dwst m sš 2-nw}$</td>
<td>A. 114 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Pinudjem II (Middle 21st D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Imn-nwt-nht</em></td>
<td>• <em>imy-hnt n 'Imn Mwt Hňsw</em></td>
<td>$\text{w}^{b} n 'Imn; \text{hry w}^{b}; \text{w}^{b} (n) pr 'lnpw; \text{it-nty;} \text{hry-hht n 'Imn;} \text{imy-hnt n nb tšwy m hwt.f;} \text{hry-sštš (n) pr 'Imn}$</td>
<td>A. 81 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Pinudjem II and Amenemope (Middle 21st D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>Ps-di-Imn</em></td>
<td>• $\text{hry-sštš n nsw hwt-nbw n 'Imn Mwt Hňsw}$</td>
<td>$\text{w}^{b} \text{šşy hšt n 'Imn-R' nsw ntrw;} \text{w}^{b} \text{ šşy sk n 'Imn m 'lpt-Swt;} \text{it-nty n 'Imn-R' nsw ntrw}$</td>
<td>A. 93 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Pinudjem II and Amenemope (Middle 21st D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>Imn-m-pr-Mwt</em></td>
<td>• <em>hry-sštš m 'Imn Mwt Hňsw</em></td>
<td>$\text{w}^{b} \text{šşy n hšt 'Imn;} \text{w}^{b;} \text{it-nty n 'Imn-R'} \text{ nsw ntrw;} \text{it-nty mry m 'lpt-Swt;} \text{hşy 'šş;} \text{wnw pt m 'lpt-swt;} \text{hry-sštš n nsw hwt-nbw n pr 'Imn}$</td>
<td>A. 93 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Middle 21st D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Own. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Khonsu titles</td>
<td>Other titles</td>
<td>Provenance (documents)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Imn-htp</td>
<td>•it-ntr n Hnsw</td>
<td>•it-ntr n Hnsw m W3st Nfr-htp</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Middle-late 21st D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the priests of Chart 1, the men from Chart 2 did not hold high priestly offices. *DB Own. 24, 1* and *2* were *hm-ntr* priests of Amun, however, all of them performed *wḥ*b and/or *it-ntr* duties in Thebes, and only *DB Own. 15* seems to have had a closer relationship with Khonsu’s hierarchy—even though, once again, the sequence of titles repeats itself: he was God’s Father of Amun, God’s Father of Mut and God’s Father of Khonsu. Nevertheless, giving special attention to their responsibilities towards the Theban triad and considering the different role that they might have played in the temple hierarchy and administration, I preferred to not include them in Chart 1.

Although there is evidence of duties performed for a non specific group of deities among the corpus that I have compiled, such as “all Theban gods” or “all gods of Lower and Upper Egypt”¹²⁵, the existence of titles attesting functionaries

---

¹²⁵ See, for instance, *DB Own. 23, 17* or *6*, who as *sśw wśḥ htpt-ntr n ntrw nbw* might have borne the highest office in charge of distributing the offerings to the altars of all the gods.
with obligations to the three deities of the Theban triad might suggest the existence of a very close connection and certain shared duties between the personnel concerned.

According to C. Traunecker126, common titles involving the three gods of the Theban Triad were, for instance, Scribe of the Golden Palace, Master of Secrets or Chamberlain. The individuals and titles collected in Chart 2, which includes some of these functions, denote that, during this dynasty, there were spheres within the cult organisation where the servants of Amun, Mut and Khonsu acted jointly, where they operated as a single institution.

Looking at Chart 2, the existence of recurrent offices shared by these functionaries allows us to further define two different sets of individuals:

1) **Overseers of the Works of the Monuments dedicated to Amun, Mut and Khonsu: DB Own. 25, 24 and 47**

All three men were Overseers of the Works of the Monuments of Amun, Mut and Khonsu. They were most likely Theban dignitaries –even though the provenance of their funerary objects is unknown– and dated to the early 21st Dynasty; therefore, it might be suggested that they developed their careers during the pontificates of Herihor and Pinudjem I. These HPAs focused their efforts on the Karnak precinct and the worship of its gods; additionally, both rulers were recorded as active builders and restorers in Thebes and were responsible for the decoration of

the temple of Khonsu\textsuperscript{127}. However, on the basis of their titles and the remaining evidence, no further link between the Khonsu temple and these three functionaries can be suggested.

Even though they were not part of the high echelons of the religious sphere, these three individuals fulfilled priestly duties in Thebes as \textit{w}\textsuperscript{r}b priests and God’s Fathers, while their secular titles seem more relevant.

A. Gasse\textsuperscript{128} already emphasised the important role played by \textit{DB Own. 24} within the administration of the temple, as well as the careful production and the iconographical richness of his funerary goods. Apart from his religious duties, which he probably acquired precisely due to his civil functions, his title of Overseer of the Recruitment along with the one related to the works done for the Theban triad are the most prominent ones\textsuperscript{129}. Moreover, this author already pointed out the similarities in rank between him and \textit{DB Own. 47}\textsuperscript{130}. Further, besides the analogy between their coffin decorations (\textit{DB Doc. 35} and 79, respectively), a pattern of behaviour appears when looking at their titulary, which, on the other hand, shows that \textit{DB Own. 25} shared certain titles –and possibly rank– with both of them too.

Both \textit{DB Own. 25} and 47 were in charge of the documents of the Treasury of Amun by holding the title of Head Archivist of the Treasury of the Domain of

\textsuperscript{127}As mentioned, for instance, in Taylor 1998: 1144 or in Jansen-Winkeln 2006\textsuperscript{1}: 226.

\textsuperscript{128}Gasse 1982-1983.

\textsuperscript{129}Because of the use of military labour for public works, it seems that, from the New Kingdom onwards, the official responsible for public works used to be part of the military sphere. According to A. Gasse (1982-1983: 57), \textit{DB Own. 24} was initially responsible for the recruitment and then became in charge of the Theban constructive works. In this regard, the mention of this owner as \textit{imy-r mšr} in his coffin ensemble might support this idea (see Jansen-Winkeln 2007\textsuperscript{1}: 255 for the inscriptions); however, \textit{DB Own. 25} and 47 did not hold any military positions apparently, and both of them were also Overseers of the Works of the Monuments of Amun, Mut and Khonsu.

\textsuperscript{130}Gasse 1982-1983: 58.
Amun-Ra –ḥry ssntyw sšw n pr-ḥd n pr ḫmn-R ṣ  nsw ntrw\textsuperscript{131}. Additionally, their large amount of scribal duties within Amun’s and Mut’s temples must be noted; these functions include sš n nšw ḫwt-nbw n ḫmn Mwt ḫnsw, title borne by DB Own. 47, who was also imy-r ḫwt-nbw n ḫmn. The coincidences between these three dignitaries seem reasonable, and their functions as imy-r kṣwt n mnw nbw and sš n nšw ḫwt-nbw of Amun, Mut and Khonsu might support the hypothesis of ties existing between the servants of the main three Theban gods in Karnak.

On the other hand, except for the wife of DB Own. 25 and the wife and daughter of DB Own. 47—all of them Theban priestesses—, their monuments do not attest more relatives; as already seen, this fact is usual for the Theban priesthood during this period.

2) Masters of Secrets: DB Own. 1, 2, 3, 19, 20 and 15

Whilst the individuals from the first category were charged with various building works, the common similarity between these six persons is their office of Masters of Secrets\textsuperscript{132}, either of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, of the Domain of Amun, and/or in Heaven, on Earth and in the Duat.

Moreover, and even though not all of them bore this title followed by the addition which includes the three gods of the triad, everyone was involved in the service of Amun, Mut and Khonsu in some way. The recurrent functions of wḥ priest and Gods’ Father of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, as well as the titles of mššw n

\textsuperscript{131} For this title, see: de Meulenaere 1978 and Payraudeau 2014: 261.

\textsuperscript{132} In Balanda 2009, instead of “Master of Secrets”, this title is translated as “Expert” or “Master of Ceremonies”.
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\textit{Ḥnsw m Wȝst} and \textit{imy-ḥmt n ỉmn Mwt Ḥnsw} (bore by \textit{DB Own. 1} and \textit{3}), suggest their close ties to Karnak temple’s organisation.

It is uncertain whether some offices were held at the same time or sequentially; besides, it is difficult to know why some titles seem to belong structurally together. Similarly, the status and duties performed by certain titleholders are often not very clear and one might wonder if those are designations for real offices or mere epithets that could be conferred upon certain priests. In this regard, and even if it is one of the most frequently found titles, the title \textit{ḥry-sštš} has presented a number of problems.

It could be assumed that, from the Old Kingdom to the New Kingdom, this title applied to officials who performed certain functions requiring special expertise. In addition, from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom to the New Kingdom, the office of \textit{ḥry-sštš} was largely transferred from a centre of administration around the person of the monarch to the temples\textsuperscript{133}. In this regard, the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty, which includes assignments for the gods of the Theban triad and their temples and monuments (\textit{DB Own. 1, 2, 3, 19} and \textit{20}), do not seem out of place. Thereby, according to these qualifying descriptions of the Masters of Secrets, the direct connection between these functionaries and the temple seems to continue during this period.

Citing S. Z. Balanda\textsuperscript{134}, “Another significant occurrence of the word šštš comes to us from passages seemingly referring to a written job description of the \textit{ḥry-ḥbt}”. During the Old Kingdom, the duties of the Master of Secrets relate to ceremonies involving the reading of sacred writings; this includes an \textit{ḥry-ḥbt ḥry-}

\textsuperscript{133} See Balanda 2009: 328-334.
\textsuperscript{134} Balanda 2009: 323.
sššt3, an official who was in charge of reading the words of the sacred writings during the reign of Sahure\textsuperscript{135}. Despite the chronological gap, it may not be necessarily coincidental that \textit{DB Own. 1, 2, 3,} and \textit{15} were entitled as Lector Priests of Amun at this time.

On the other hand, as mentioned by G. Broekman\textsuperscript{136}, the titles of Master of Secrets and Opener of the Doors of the Sky in Karnak occurred more than once in combination. In addition to \textit{DB Own. 1} and \textit{2,} both members of the Pakharu family\textsuperscript{137}, and \textit{DB Own. 20,} this title combination was held by two other individuals not included in the PDB: the Superintendent of the Cattle of the roof-temple of Ra in the Temple of Amun, Second, Third and Fourth ḫm-ntr priest of Amun Tjanefer (A) –father of \textit{DB Own. 5} and son-in-law of the HP Menkheperra–, and the Fourth ḫm-ntr priest of Amun Nesamun (v)\textsuperscript{138}.

From the initial years of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty until the reign of Sheshonk I, eight generations of members of the Pakharu family were Masters of Secrets. However, the appellation that includes Amun, Mut and Khonsu is only attested with regard to the previously mentioned individuals. In fact, this designation was only inscribed on their coffin ensembles and on one of their shrouds (\textit{DB Doc. 1, 2} and \textit{3}), not on their papyri or ushabti boxes. In this respect, and even if the aforementioned title combination is limited to \textit{DB Own. 1} and \textit{2,} the office of Door Opener might have most likely been inherited by other members of this lineage as well; although it is

\textsuperscript{135} Balanda: 2009: 333.
\textsuperscript{136} For this combination of titles: Broekman 2011.
\textsuperscript{137} For the information about this family, see: Jansen-Winkeln 2008: 51-53 and Broekman 2011: 97-98 and 106-107.
\textsuperscript{138} See Bierbrier 1979: 49-50.
true that their not-yet-found funerary equipment could provide evidence of this matter.

Both titles are attested separately too. During the Libyan Period, the designation for the persons in charge of the opening of the shrine of Amun in Karnak occurs, for instance, in the Nebnecheru family, which was connected to the service of Khonsu at that time\textsuperscript{139}. This function was undoubtedly held in high esteem, as it was frequently recorded on statues as well as on funeral goods by a large number of individuals from different Theban families\textsuperscript{140}. Further, it might have possibly been borne by several individuals at the same time. This fact would not be surprising taking into consideration the large number of functionaries who might have been in charge of the daily cult of Amun; there must have existed the possibility of taking turns.

Nevertheless, the title of \textit{hry-sš$t3} is not attested on any known monument either during the 22\textsuperscript{nd} and 23\textsuperscript{rd} Dynasties nor for the 25\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty; Amenemope, buried in the TT A.18, seems to have been the very last Master of Secrets. As suggested by G. Broekman\textsuperscript{141}, this simultaneous abolition of the office of Master of Secrets and the sudden simplification of the decorative program of the coffins that took place during the initial years of Osorkon I might be viewed as another measure to curtail the power and political influence of the Theban priesthood\textsuperscript{142}. This fact

\noindent\textsuperscript{139} Three members of this well-known Theban family were Fourth \textit{hkn-ntr} priests of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep during the Libyan Period: \textit{Nbr-ntrw} (iii), \textit{Ns-r-Imn} (viii) and \textit{Hr} (ix) (see Chapter 4).

\noindent\textsuperscript{140} See Broekman 2011:105, 114 and Appendix III.

\noindent\textsuperscript{141} Broekman 2011: 98 and 110.

\noindent\textsuperscript{142} For other considerations about the reduction in quantity and the deterioration of quality of the Theban priests’ funerary ensembles corresponding to the rule of the new kings of the 22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty, see: Swart 2007.
would evidence the social standing reached by the holders of this position and their significant role played within the administration of the temple of Karnak.

On the other hand, it is necessary to pay attention to the reuse of the high-quality Cairo coffin ensemble JE 29706 (DB Doc. 30 and 31), which affects two men of this group of high ranked individuals. These coffins, originally produced for DB Own. 19 in the early years of Pinudjem II, were later usurped by DB Own. 20, who belonged to the same wealthy class.

Even though certain variations are attested, the same group of titles was held by both of these two people, so it could be assumed that the usurper probably erased the owner’s name and replaced it with his own. However, evidence from DB Own. 19 only remained on a section of the lid of his inner coffin (DB Doc. 30), and DB Own. 20’s name and titles occur throughout the whole inner coffin and mummy-cover (DB Doc. 31). As a result of this reuse, the offices that both of them performed seem a little confusing when consulting different publications.

In this respect, based on A. Niwinski’s book on 21st Dynasty coffins, DB Own. 19 is referred to as it-ntr nsw ḥwt-nbw n ‘mn Mwt Ḥnsw, another title which seems to have involved the entire Theban triad. However, the more accurate facsimile published by A. Niwinski himself suggests that this office was not part of his collection of titles, and that he was, instead, Master of Secrets of the Golden Precincts of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, as well as God’s Father of Amun143.

It is also probable to think that the combination of the titles Master of Secrets and Opener of the Doors of the Sky in Karnak might have occurred in DB Own. 19, as it is in the case of his coffin’s usurper. Henceforth, the two owners

of JE 29706 (DB Own. 19 and 20) must be added to the list of functionaries in which this title combination is found\textsuperscript{144}.

Moreover, considering the individuals and duties mentioned above, it is clear that certain titles passed from father to son during several generations in the hands of some Theban families –as in Pakharu’s family. However, occasionally, there also existed certain titleholders, not related to each other by family, who performed the same grouping of functions. In this regard, the transfer of a title to an individual who shares the status with the former official who held it might be a factor taking into account, as can be suggested for the Fourth \(h\text{m-nfr}\) priests of Amun Tjanefer (A) and Nesamun (v)\textsuperscript{145} or DB Own. 19 and 20.

Initially, I became aware of the individuals in Chart 2 because the god Khonsu was mentioned in their titles. However, the overall analysis indicates that these are not titles exclusively borne by servants of this god; they might have denoted special administrative and religious functions related to the whole triad and the Karnak cultic sphere.

Looking at the title of Master of Secrets, there exist variants of it where the three gods of the triad are not mentioned, while all titles seem to have involved the performance of the same or very similar functions. Accordingly, one might have the impression that the appellation “of Amun” was, to a certain extent, equivalent to the Theban triad itself; that the designation “of Amun” might have been a simplified form to reference “Amun, Mut and Khonsu”. Even though understanding the differences between titles’ variants or being able to discern individual’s choices is almost impossible, this designation may indicate that the personnel of Khonsu and

\textsuperscript{144} G. Broekman (2011) did not mention either of them: DB Own. 19 or DB Own. 20.

\textsuperscript{145} While it is true that a family relationship between these two individuals it is also likely. For some details about this assumption, see: Broekman 2011: 96 and n. 22.
Mut were subjected to the powerful priesthood of Amun and to his leading role in the Thebaid. The Theocracy gave relevance to Mut and Khonsu as consort and heir of Amun, but this union could easily be subordinated to Amun’s representative role; idea that also accords with the location of Khonsu temple inside Amun’s precinct.

I think that the presence in titles of Amun, Mut and Khonsu all together or as well as attested as part of separate offices that usually occurs jointly –see, to that effect the \textit{wr} \textit{b} priests, God’s Father and Scribes from Chart 1– is not a coincidence. A cultic sphere differentiation must have existed when, for instance, \textit{DB Own. 22}, \textit{27}, \textit{45} and even \textit{143}, were only remembered as servants of Khonsu through their remaining funerary goods. In addition, Scribes (\textit{DB Own. 23} and \textit{17}), Masters of Secrets (\textit{DB Own. 1, 2, 19} and \textit{20}), one Chamberlain (\textit{DB Own. 3}) and one Great Favoured (\textit{DB Own. 24}) of Amun, Mut and Khonsu were attested; meanwhile \textit{wr} \textit{b} priest and God’s Father’s functions for Amun, Mut and/or Khonsu are clearly recorded separately.

A priest possibly might have several offices and incomes in different temples\textsuperscript{146}. Therefore, it can be suggested that some individuals performed duties on behalf of the gods of the triad separately, in connection to the different cultic areas and sanctuaries; while the subordination of the different domains inside Karnak to Amun’s administration seems undeniable. Once they reached a certain degree of initiation and after being trained for the rituals that they were supposed to perform, it is not unexpected that some of them served in different precincts of the temple, possibly on a rotational basis. In addition, there might have been specific areas within the cult organisation where some servants of Amun, Mut and Khonsu acted jointly, where they probably operated as a single institution.

\textsuperscript{146} te Velde 1995: 1735.
A number of servants was required to address the cultic requirements of the renewed and expanded temple of Khonsu at Karnak. Because of the rotation basis, it to be expected to find more than one individual developing the same function simultaneously. Consequently, functionaries and priests of Khonsu might have surpassed the number attested by the available evidence; it is therefore difficult to reconstruct sequences of holders associated with the service for Khonsu. However, the data presented in Charts 1 and 2 not only point at a significant number of servants who constituted the lower and middle echelons of a cult that gained popularity by the end of the New Kingdom, but it also supports the idea of a correspondence between the personnel of Amun, Mut and Khonsu; that means, it might prove that their duties overlapped in certain contexts and that there existed a lively traffic of priests and functionaries throughout Karnak temples and sanctuaries.

On the other hand, apart from the God’s Fathers, the w'=b priests and the different types of Scribes of Khonsu—such as sš pr Ḥnsw, sš nfrw n pr Ḥnsw and sš sḫnw n pr Ḥnsw—, one might expect to find a different type of servants of Khonsu during the 21st Dynasty, including leading and high-ranked priests and administrators. In this regard, the next section takes into account the remaining sources that attest other servants of Khonsu and go in depth into different aspects of his personnel.

---

147 The priests were divided into four groups or gangs of service, now known by their Greek designation, phyle. However, it is necessary to mention that no reference to the service on phyles is attested within this group of individuals, while evidences of this kind of organisation is documented in several titles for the subsequent dynasties.
2.2. **The Highest Levels: From Thebes to Tanis**

Besides the more than thirty male occupants of minor priestly positions and scribal and administrative duties within the Khonsu hierarchy, the source material also attests a number of individuals who might have played a further important role as part of Khonsu’s sacerdotal and administrative personnel\(^{148}\). The inscriptive and archaeological evidence provided by the grave goods of this new group of elite individuals suggests that they shared certain characteristics that considerably differ from the ones of Khonsu’s servants analysed before (Charts 1 and 2). Moreover, among these personnel, both men and women are attested, and they were all tied in some way or another to the cult of the Theban triad, mostly in Thebes but also in Tanis.

By the beginning of the 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty, Egypt was split in two with the legitimate lineage of kings ruling from Tanis and the HPAs establishing their own line at Thebes. With the political powers having moved north, the cults of the southern regions enjoyed increasing significance even in Tanis. In this regard, many individuals of this group of title-holders connected to the cult of Khonsu were affluent or at least prominent individuals who were directly, or indirectly, associated with the HPA’s family and the Tanite sovereigns.

\(^{148}\) We cannot forget that the grouping of titles and funerary equipment from Charts 1 and 2’s individuals suggest that most of them were part of a middle or even high Theban elite; while it is true that they were not involved in high-ranking positions within Khonsu’s priestly organisation, which we may expect to find when having in mind, for instance, the developed hierarchy of *ḥm-nṯr* priests of Amun.
It is not coincidental that men and women of the entourage of the ruling class took part in what I think were the uppermost levels of Khonsu’s hierarchy. This fact points to some form of connectedness playing a role in the acquisition of such positions. In addition, the rise in importance of the child gods of the divine triads, the so-called *mammisiac* religion and its consequent influence in cult practices will be some of the key factors taken into account in this section. Subsequently, it is necessary to analyse these Theban and Tanite servants of the different forms of Khonsu, as well as to make a distinction between what seem to be two coherent groups of clergy: the male and female servants.
2.2.1. The Family of High ḫm-ntr Priests of Amun
and the Theban Milieu

If one looks at the prominent Theban priesthood of Amun and its hierarchy\(^\text{149}\), one might expect to find leading officers serving the god Khonsu as well as Second, Third and Fourth ḫm-ntr priests during the TIP. Additionally, as mentioned in the Introduction of this thesis, the owner of the Ramesside tomb TT 25, ḫmn-m-ḥb, was ḫm-ntr tpy n Ḥnsw, and his wife was ḥrtyt wrt ḫḥrt n Ḥnsw\(^\text{150}\). However, as already pointed out by G. Broekman\(^\text{151}\), and corroborated by my own research, this function is neither attested for the 21\(^{\text{st}}\) Dynasty –nor for the entire TIP; and it is well into this dynasty when there is evidence of two individuals who bore the title of ḫm-ntr 3-nw n Ḥnsw m Wśst Nfr-ḥtp, being both of them connected with important Theban families, one of those with ties with the HPA’s lineage. Moreover, as the administrative sphere is concerned, there was not one single ḥṛṣ sśw ḫwt-ntr n pr Ḥnsw or ḥṛṣ sśw n pr Ḥnsw attested neither, who might have been in charge of the Scribes of the Khonsu Temple\(^\text{152}\).

On the other hand, what is certain is that few individuals related to the powerful HPA’s family were serving Khonsu as God’s Fathers and ḫm-ntr priests; this second title has been traditionally seen as a priest above wṣb priests and God’s

\(^{149}\) See, for instance, Broekman 2000 and 2010, besides works as: Kees 1958 and 1964; Bierbrier 1975; or Kitchen 2004.

\(^{150}\) See p. 8.

\(^{151}\) Broekman 2011: 105.

\(^{152}\) See Payraudeau 2014: 268-269.
Fathers in status. And Herihor himself was the only ruler of this period occupying a post within Khonsu’s personnel; he, who used the Khonsu temple to display his claim of kingship, was $imy\text{-}r\ k\text{\krt}\ w\text{r\ m\ pr\ }Hnsw$. Additionally, some of the women of the ruling family were Stewards and $hmt\text{-}ntt$ priestesses of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep, as well as God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child.

Even though these fairly high dignitaries are not very significant in number, analysing them individually within their historical context provides some keys to understand their role as part of the Khonsu hierarchy, and also as part of the Theban and Karnak priesthood.
# 2.2.1.1. Male Servants

Chart 3: Servants of Khonsu among the male member of the family of the HPA and other Theban elite families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 142         | *Hry-Hr* | *imy-r k3wt wr m pr Ḥnsw* | -Civil titles: *iry-p’t ḫ3ty-c*; *iry-p’t ḥry tp tswy; mḥ ib c’z n nb tswy; mḥ ib c’z n nṯr nfr; smr c’z m rs dr.f; ṭṣy ḫw ḫr wnmy (n) nsw; sš-nsw; imy-r nīwt; ṭṣy; sš-nsw n Kš; imy-r ḫ3swt ṣṣy; ḥrp šm’tw t3 mḥw; imy-r k3wt mnh nbw n ḫm.f; imy-r šnwty n pr-c’z*
-Military titles: *imy-r ṭšm’tw t3 mḥw; imy-r mš’ wr; imy-r mš’; ḫ3wynty ḫt n3 mš’ n Kmt (r) dr.s; ḫ3wynty*
-Sacerdotal titles: *ḥm-nṯr tpy n ḫmn-R’*; Nb ṭr ḫht | Temple of Khonsu, Karnak | Ramesses XI-Herihor (Late 20th D.-early 21st D.) |
| 21          | *Ps-šd-Ḥnsw* | *ḥm-nṯr n Ḥnsw* | *ss-nsw n ḫt.f?* | Temple of Khonsu, Karnak | Ramesses XI-Herihor (Late 20th D.-early 21st D.) |

(father of DB Own. 21?)

(son of DB Own. 142?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8          | Hri  | • it-ntr n Hnsw  
                        • hm-ntr n Hnsw  
                        • hm-ntr n lnpw Hnsw | it-ntr n Mwt; hm-ntr n ’Imn-R’ nsw ntrw; hm-ntr n ’Imn (nb) nswt tsyw; hm-ntr n Hwt-hr nbt ’Im n Wst; hm-ntr n Sth n spst(?), imy-r hżst; hm-ntr n Sth; nb ḫwt wrt m Wst | A. 143 Bab el-Gasus | Pinudjem II (Middle 21st D.) |
| 5          | Mn-hpr-R (B) | • it-ntr n Hnsw  
                        • hm-ntr 3-nw n Hnsw m Wsst Nfr-htp | hm-ntr 3-nw n ’Imn-R’ nsw ntrw; wr m3zw R’ ’Im m Wst; stm m zḥt nḥḥ; imy-r ḫw n pr R’ ḫwt pr ’Imn | A. 147 Bab el-Gasus | Siamun |
| 140        | Ns-pɔ-kɔ-šwty (ii)  
                        (father of DB Own. 50 and grandfathe r of DB Own. 51) | • hm-ntr 3-nw n Hnsw m Wsst Nfr-htp | it-ntr n ’Imn-R’ nsw ntrw; hm-ntr n ’Imn-R’ nsw ntrw; hm-ntr n lmn-hpt pɔ wɔs; hm-ntr n Wsir n W-pkr; sš shnw n pr ’Imn-R’ nsw ntrw; sš nsw sšm nfrw; stm n t3 ḫwt Wsir-ms’ç-R’ Sp-n-R’ n pr ’lmn; imy-r mš’ t3 st mry Dḥwyty; rwḍ’ ç’ | TT 320 | Year 10<sup>th</sup> of Siamun |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB Rel. 72</td>
<td>Ps-(di-H\text{Hsw}) (i)(\text{Hsw}) (B)</td>
<td>mry-ntr; wnw (\text{lpt-swt}); s(\text{s nfrw n pr lmn/it-ntr mry-ntr}; wnw pt m (\text{lpt-swt}); s(\text{s m}(\text{3} ) t (\text{3} ) (r) (\text{dr.f;} imy-r m(\text{3} ) t (\text{3} ) st mry D(\text{hwty})</td>
<td>Cache of Karnak</td>
<td>Late 21st D.-early 22nd D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I(\text{mn-m-int}) (i)</td>
<td>hm-ntr (\text{3-nw n Hnsw m W(\text{st Nfr-(\text{h(\text{p})}})</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Early 22nd D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Own. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Khonsu titles</td>
<td>Other titles</td>
<td>Provenance (documents)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Rel. 71</td>
<td>Bsk-n-Hnsw (ii)</td>
<td>•hm-ntr Hnsw wgs-hfw</td>
<td>mry-ntr; wnw pt m ’lpt-swt; sš nfrw n pr 'lnn</td>
<td>Cache of Karnak</td>
<td>Early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Hr (E)</td>
<td>•hm-ntr Hnsw-R c nb Wsst</td>
<td>it-ntr mry-ntr/it-ntr n 'Imn; wnw pt m ’lpt-swt; sš htp-ntr n pr 'lnn</td>
<td>Cache of Karnak</td>
<td>Early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Dd-Dḥwty. lw.f-ḥn (i)</td>
<td>•hm-ntr 3-nw n Hnsw m Wsst Nfr-ḥtp</td>
<td>hm-ntr n ‘Imn-R c nsw nfrw; hm-ntrw 3-nw n ‘Imn-R c nsw nfrw; hm-ntr 4-nw n Mwt; wr mtšw n ‘Imn-R c n ‘lnnw rsi; hm-ntr 4-nw n Mwt nbt ḫsrw; hm-ntr n Mntw nb Wsst ḫrty-ih ‘lnnw-smfšw; hm-ntr n ‘lnn-ḥtp p2 wbs; hm-ntr n Wsir n W-pkr; hm-ntr n Dḥnty Ps-wdyt; sš nsw mšš n t3 ṭ dr.f; sš; imy-r mšš; imy-r ḫw n pr R c tp ḫwt pr ‘Imn; imy-r nfrw; sšm t3 rsi; ḥn-nsw; rwd ‘s</td>
<td>Thebes and Karnak temple</td>
<td>Shoshenk I (Early 22nd Dynasty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initially, I expected to find out that some of the southern rulers might have borne the title of High ḫm-ntr priest of Khonsu or some other office which might indicate a high rank status within this hierarchy. However, and considering the available sources, Herihor (DB Own. 142) is the only one who held a title connected to Khonsu’s service: Great Overseer of the Works of the Domain of Khonsu. In fact, this title, which was the reflection of his building and restoring role at the temple\(^1\), was only recorded on a lintel located at its hypostyle hall (DB Doc. 203). Although it seems to be preserved only once, and no more offices connected to either cultic or secular contexts link Herihor with Khonsu’s service – while it is true that the only sacerdotal title borne by him was the one of ḫmr-ntr n tpy n ḫmn-Rc nsw ntrw–, the Khonsu temple remains of paramount importance for him and his family.

\(^1\) The great significance of his role as a builder and restorer is noticeable when looking at the royal titles, which refer constantly to his constructions in Karnak and the benefits derived from them: Lull 2006: 96.
Herihor was the first Theban pontiff to adopt kingship, displaying royal attributes and titles inside the Karnak enclosure, mainly inside this temple\textsuperscript{154}. Its wall decorations are of particular importance for the understanding of the history at that time. The inscriptions there show a chronological development of Herihor’s titles, progressing from HPA in the hypostyle hall to king in the forecourt, where Ramesses XI was completely absent. Furthermore, regarding Khonsu’s priestly hierarchy, these walls evidence that, besides Herihor, some members of his lineage were also servants of Khonsu.

In this regard, the long-time-asserted filiation between Herihor and Payankh must be mentioned. In the scene of the procession of Herihor’s family, carved on the west wall of the portico of the Khonsu temple\textsuperscript{155}, he appeared to have had no fewer than 19 sons\textsuperscript{156}. The first prince, due to a copying error, has been identified with the HPA Payankh; consequently, for a long time, Herihor was considered his father and predecessor. In addition, the offices of the first son of Herihor carved on the same scene have been incorporated into the titles hold by the HPA Payankh: besides the King’s Bodily Son, Chief Steward of Amun, $hmn$ priest of Mut, $hmn$ priest of Amun, Overseer of Horses of the Lord of the Two Lands and Leader\textsuperscript{157}, a lacuna has been reconstructed as $hmn$ priest of Khonsu\textsuperscript{158}.

This error has been corrected thanks to the copies made by the Epigraphic Survey, and the first son of Herihor seems to have been called Ankhefenmut, instead

\textsuperscript{154} Even though K. Kitchen (2004: 251) stated that the Herihor’s kingship was more impressive than it was in reality, this idea seems now rejected by several scholars; for a recent discussion of this topic, as well as for the controversial dating and order of the first HPA, see James and Morkot 2010.

\textsuperscript{155} Khonsu I: plate 26.

\textsuperscript{156} Taylor 1998: 1146.

\textsuperscript{157} Khonsu I: xi and 11-12

\textsuperscript{158} For this identification as well as for the connection between Payankh and Khonsu’s cult, see, for instance, Chevereau 1985: 7 and Kitchen 2004: 252.
of Payankh; he must probably be identified with the like-named individual involved in the procession of the barks of the Theban triad and Amunet toward the Khonsu temple\textsuperscript{159}. Additionally, the traces following the title of h\textit{m}-n\textit{tr} priest of Mut do not support either the reading h\textit{m}-n\textit{tr} n H\textit{nsw}\textsuperscript{160} as a title borne by the first son of Herihor (Figures 2 and 3).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png}
\caption{Ankhefenmut, first son of the family procession; the lacuna, where the title h\textit{m}-n\textit{tr} n H\textit{nsw} was formerly reconstructed, is marked in yellow (\textit{Khonsu I}: plate 26 columns 3-4)}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{Ankhefenmut besides the bark of Mut taking part in the procession (\textit{Khonsu I}: plate 44 columns 10-12)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{159} \textit{Khonsu I}: x-xii and 13 n. d.

\textsuperscript{160} See \textit{Khonsu I}: 13 n. c.
As a result, neither Payankh nor Ankhefenmut were servants of Khonsu. Nevertheless, a male individual, at least represented in one of two aforementioned processions, was unquestionably in service of this god. $Pz-\text{s}\ddot{d}-\text{Hns}w$ (DB Own. 21), the priest next to the bark of Khonsu involved in the procession visiting the Khonsu temple (DB Doc. 32), was $\text{hm-ntr}$ priest of Khonsu (Figure 4). Likewise, the ninth son of Herihor, who had the same name, appears in the family procession without mentioning any office on behalf of this god (Figure 5). There is not conclusive evidence to equate DB Own. 21 to this ninth prince with absolute certainty, as suggested in the publication of the Epigraphic Survey\textsuperscript{161}. It is however not unreasonable to assume that some of the descendants of Herihor might have been servants of Khonsu and, if that would be the case, they might have been priests of certain rank and might have played an important role within the temple hierarchy, as DB Own. 21 possibly did.

\textsuperscript{161} Khonsu I: xi n. 9.
While it is true that the presence of male members of Herihor’s lineage among Khonsu’s personnel is not proven, his principal wife and one of his daughters (DB Own. 38 and 39 respectively) were both priestesses of Khonsu (see Chart 4 below).

The sinecures of most of the wives and daughters of the HPAs included functions involving the three gods of the Theban triad as well as Khonsu the Child; as will be seen, Khonsu’s female personnel deserve a separate section for discussion. However, the case of these two elite women, who lived during the transitional period between the 20th and 21st Dynasties, serves to introduce some of
the features and patterns of organisation shared by the components of this female priesthood.

The queen Nedjemet (DB Own. 38) is considered a key figure on this Egyptian political milieu, who seems to have been a link between the families of both Payankh and Herihor162. Besides the restoration of the title “Greatest Chief of the Sacred Musical Troupe of Amun”163, her role as a wife of a king, mother of a king and sister of a king was unique. Her funerary goods provide a series of high-rank offices that connect her with the service of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and Khonsu the Child (see DB Doc. 57 and 58); likewise, besides the Karnak enclosure, those documents witness the royal prerogatives that Herihor acquired164.

Even though Nedjemet’s offices connected to Khonsu’s cults are not recorded in any of her representations within the Khonsu temple, once again, its wall decorations are a recurring source of information concerning her daughter (DB Own. 39), T3-št-sbkt, besides being šmʾyt n ‘Imn and hryt špswt, was entitled as wrʾ ĥnrt n ḫnsw on two different scenes of the temple: a scene where she attends how her mother carries an infant before the shrine of the goddess Mut (DB Doc. 161), as well as the famous scene of the family procession, where she is the first princess (DB Doc. 196).

162 For a genealogical reconstruction and the controversial relationship between Herihor (DB Own. 142), Nedjemet (DB Own. 38) and Payankh: Taylor 1998. For recent outlines of the different hypothesis and proposals concerning this topic, see Lull 2006: 81-89, Dodson 2012 32-38 and Palmer 2014.


164 For instance, DB Doc. 58, in particular the part of her funerary papyrus BM EA 10541, depicts Herihor wearing an uraeus and his name was enclosed in two cartouches, as well as Nedjemet’s name.
S.-A. Naguib states that, from the end of the 19th Dynasty, the title *wrt ḫnrt* was borne exclusively by women from the high echelons of society and married to high priestly rank dignitaries. In this concern, their relationship with a specific cult depends on the offices performed by their husbands. By using the example of *DB Own. 5*’s parents—who were, among other relevant offices, ḫm-nṯṛ 3-nw n ḫmn, ḫm-nṯṛ n Mnṯw, and *wrt ḫnrt n ḫmn n sṯ 3-nw* and *wrt ḫnrt n Mnṯw nb Wṣst* respectively—it is suggested that the women who were *wrt ḫnrt* of a deity might have occupied the same dignity as their husbands on behalf of that deity; moreover, sometimes, they might have taken their husbands’ place within its cultic ritual.

The case of *DB Own. 39* must be mentioned in that regard, although it is unknown who was her husband. There existed certain ḫmw-nṯṛ n ḫnsṯw (see Chart 3) during the 21st Dynasty; however, and even though considering that one of them might have been *Tṣ-ṣt-sbkt*’s husband, it is impossible to state who might have been. While it is true that *DB Own. 21* was contemporaneous with her, and that both of them are attested only by their representations at the Khonsu temple, this impression is a mere conjecture.

On the other hand, and although I am currently aware of female servants belonging to different hierarchical ranks and bearing various positions within Khonsu’s hierarchy, the title *wrt ḫnrt n ḫnsṯw* is attested during the whole TIP only at this time. Furthermore, there is not evidence of the existence of *smwṯywt n ḫnsṯw* in

---

165 See Naguib 1990: 201-205.
166 See below, when discussing *DB Own. 5*.
167 S.-A. Naguib (1990: 205) connects this office with Gautsoshen’s (*DB Own. 5*’s mother) affiliation to the HPA’s family too, because she was daughter of the HPA Menkheperra.
Thebes, who might have been the subordinates of the \textit{wrt \emph{hmrt}}; nor are \textit{\emph{hnrwt n Hnsw}} attested\textsuperscript{169}.

However, one woman bore a title indicative of a ranking system among the Songstresses of Khonsu, although the document which attested her comes from Tanis (\textit{DB Doc. 74}): \textit{DB Rel. 63}, the daughter of \textit{DB Own. 42} (Chart 5), was \textit{hryt \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt n Hnsw m Wst Nfr-\textit{\textit{htp}}}}. More concrete evidence for the existence of an organisation of Songstresses of Khonsu is lacking for the whole TIP; nevertheless it makes sense that if this group was in existence, they might have been organised along similar lines as, for instance, the \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt}} of Amun\textsuperscript{170}.

Additionally, it should be noted here the case of the Singer of the Theban triad and King’s Daughter \textit{\textit{Na}}\textit{wny} (\textit{DB Own. 34}), whose royal father’s identity has been debated at length but reached no agreement. As postulated by A. Niwinski\textsuperscript{171}, this servant of Amun, Mut and Khonsu might be the daughter of Herihor and the \textit{\textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{yyt n ‘Imn Tnt-b\textit{\textit{hnh}}}} –a possible daughter of Ramesses XI\textsuperscript{172}; however, Smendes and Pinudjem I’s paternities have also been proposed\textsuperscript{173}.

Referring to the aforementioned famous scene of Herihor’s family procession and looking at the damaged name of the third princess, the same scholar

\textsuperscript{169} Instead of \textit{\textit{hnrwt}} and \textit{\textit{hnywt}}, as previously, from the 19\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty the secular subordinates of the \textit{wrt \textit{hmrt}} seem to have been the \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt}}. See Naguib 1990: 201-202.

\textsuperscript{170} For an in-depth analysis of the role of the \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt}} in Ancient Egypt, see Onstine 2001. During the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty, while the \textit{\textit{hs}}\textit{\textit{ywt}} use to belong to he cult of Mut, the \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt}} mostly belonged to the one of Amun; in p. 49 n. 31, this author states that the \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt n Mwt}} were surprisingly rare, and gives a reference for one \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt}} for the whole Theban triad dated to this period (her DB #120). However, and looking at Niwinski 1988\textsuperscript{1}: 111 Doc. 44, that assumption may have been a mistake. This individual, \textit{\textit{Hnw-t\textit{\textit{swy}} C}} (corresponding to my \textit{DB Own. 36}, was probably not a \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt n ‘Imn Mwt Hnsw}}, but a \textit{\textit{sm}}\textit{\textit{ywt n ‘Imn}} as well as a \textit{\textit{mwt-ntr n Hnsw}} (see Chart 4).

\textsuperscript{171} \textit{Inter alia}: Niwinski 1979: 54, 1985: 83, 1988\textsuperscript{1}: 161 Doc. 316 and 1989\textsuperscript{1}:47 Doc. NEW YORK 13.

\textsuperscript{172} Aston 2009: 202.

\textsuperscript{173} See Aston 2009: 202 for the discussion about these three possibilities.
suggests a likely identification between her and *DB Own. 34*\textsuperscript{174}. In this concern, instead of being read as “...en(wer)u...”\textsuperscript{175}, the three preserved signs in column 43 may have formed the name of *N\textsuperscript{3}wny* (see Figure 6). Nevertheless, regardless this piece of evidence may or may not be considered an epigraphic proof of Herihor’s paternity, or even beyond whoever *N\textsuperscript{3}wny* ‘s father might have been, it is interesting that –in line with the general trend– one of the princesses of the early 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty performed musical duties on behalf of Amun, Mut and Khonsu jointly.

Figure 6: On the left, Herihor’s third daughter of the family procession (*Khonsu I*: plate 26 column 43); on the right, A. Niwinski’s suggested reconstruction of the signs in column 43 from the same scene (Niwinski 1985: 83 Fig. 2)

\textsuperscript{174} Niwinski 1985: 83.

\textsuperscript{175} *Khonsu I*: 12.
Leaving aside the immediate circle of the HPA Herihor and the initial years of this dynasty, a son of the HPA Menkheperra, **DB Own. 8**, held offices in the service of Khonsu as part of his panoply of priestly titles, which included Amun and Mut too—a feature shared with the individuals in Charts 1 and 2. He was listed as *hm-ntr* priest of several gods, including Amun, Khonsu, Anubis and Khonsu\(^\text{176}\), Hathor or Seth, as well as *it-nfr* of Mut and Khonsu.

Just like the latter individual and **DB Own. 38** and **39**, who were connected with certainty to the southern ruling family, the principal wife (**DB Own. 138**) and some female descendants of the HPA Menkheperra were also servants of this god (Genealogical Chart 2). As a result, three sisters or half-sisters of **DB Own. 8\(^\text{177}\)** were part of Khonsu’s female personnel and held different offices within this cultic hierarchy: **DB Own. 36, 35** and **4** (Chart 4 below). Additionally, Henuttauy (A) (**DB Own. 37**), the wife of Pinudjem I, was Steward of the Domain of Khonsu, *hmt-ntr* priestess of Khonsu and God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child (see Chart 4 too). Consequently, it is not disputed that the family of Menkheperra reached considerable influence in Thebes.

---

\(^{176}\) In A. Niwinski’s (1988: 119 Doc. 83) as well as in K. Jansen-Winkeln’s publications (2007\(^1\): 188-189), besides the title *hm-ntr n ḫnszw*, **DB Own. 8** also bore the title *hm-ntr n ḫnw ḫnszw*. It gives the impression that the presence of Anubis and Khonsu in combination has not been interpreted as a syncretic deity; for instance, S.-A. Naguib (1990: Doc. 87) transcribes it as *hm-ntr n ḫnw, ḫnszw*, and A. Niwinski itself designates this individual as “Prophet of Anubis and Khons” (1979: 54).

\(^{177}\) Since there is evidence of the existence of a large number of Menkheperra’s children, it is being suggested that not all of them were born by the same mother. As a consequence, according to A. Niwinski, **DB Own. 8, 4** and **35** were possibly born by a second wife of the HPA Menkheperra (1979: 55).
Genealogical Chart 2: Some of the descendants of the HPA Menkheperra connected to Khonsu’s service. Partly based on Niwinski, 1979: Table IIA
During the first years of the 21st Dynasty, the families who had held the most important offices in Thebes during the Ramesside Period were deprived from them. The new rulers, the Theban HPAs, managed to get their relatives appointed to those significant and lucrative offices in Thebes and Upper Egypt, including the Theban posts of Second, Third and Fourth *hmn-nt* priests of Amun. Moreover, members of the southern ruling house widely spread their net in Thebes by acquiring benefits from all three gods of the triad, including Khonsu’s service, as already outlined.

However, from Menkheperra onwards, the key-offices of Second, Third and Fourth *hmn-nt* priests of Amun were held by men of other notable Theban families, whose links with the HPA’s family were by marriage, and not by descent. Menkheperra’s decision to solve local notables complaints about the tenure of the most influential posts in Thebes on the hand of the HPA’s family resulted in the increasing influence of old Theban priestly families: from then on, they managed to obtain anew the highest offices of Amun’s *hmn-nt* priests hierarchy. Nevertheless, Menkheperra’s family immense political and economic power did not vanished after his efforts of reconciliation with the Theban elite; as K. Kitchen suggests, he did not restrict his family’s hold on the range of Upper-Egyptian benefices, it seems that it occurred quite the contrary. Additionally, he bound those lineages to himself by intermarriage. This changed situation will be of great importance to a better understanding of the Theban community and the organisation and development of

179 Kitchen 2004: 260-261, 276-277. See also Dembitz 2010 for evidence of Menkheperra’s attempt to win the support of lower or middle class priesthood and the officials of the temple of Amun at Karnak.
Khonsu’s personnel itself, because the reappearance of elite groups in the Theban priestly and administrative domains affected Khonsu’s personnel too.

Serving as a ḫm-nṯr priest might have been restricted to a certain rank of dignitaries. As referred to under H. te Velde’s work about Ancient Egyptian religion, the head or "regulator" of a phyle was normally a “Prophet”, while the other priests were mostly ḫb priests\textsuperscript{181}. On the basis of the available data, this idea has to be taken into consideration to understand Khonsu’s personnel during the first half of this period. In fact, \textit{Ps-šd-Ḥnsw} and Ḥrt (\textit{DB Own. 21} and \textit{8}) were very close in some way or another to the HPA. Either by their role performed in the Khonsu temple or by their family links and run of titles, both ḫm-nṯr priests of Khonsu seem to belong to a major category of servants of this god; their rank in society and within Khonsu’s hierarchy differ from the one of the already mentioned Scribes, Gods’ Fathers and ḫb priests of Khonsu (Charts 1 and 2).

It is then likely to think that, so far, these elite individuals might have formed the highest echelons of Khonsu’s male priesthood by holding ḫm-nṯr priest offices –presumably a fairly sacerdotal high-ranking post within Khonsu’s domain– and probably being in charge of a lower grade of servants. Nevertheless, there is indicative evidence of a ranking system or hierarchy among the ḫm-nṯr priests of Khonsu themselves, although it is necessary to wait until the second half of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty to find an officer part of this hierarchy: \textit{DB Own. 5}, another descendant of the HPA Menkheperra –one of his grandsons–, was entitled as \textit{ḥt-nṯr n Ḫnsw} as well as ḫm-nṯr 3-nw n Ḫnsw m Wzst Nfr-ḥtp on his coffin ensemble and on his Book of the Dead papyrus (\textit{DB Doc. 7} and \textit{8}).

\textsuperscript{181} te Velde 1995: 1734.
In this regard, DB Own. 5’s parents, who occupied some of the most influential priesthoods of Karnak, may be seen as an example of trend described above. H. Kees already drew the attention to the marriage alliance between Gautsoshen (A), Menkheperra’s daughter and wrt ḫnrt of Amun and Montu, and one of the members of the local elite, the Fourth ḫm-nṯr priest of Amun Tjanefer (A), son of the Fourth ḫm-nṯr priest of Amun Nespaherentnut.

Besides serving as ḫm-nṯr priest of Montu and Khnum, Tjanefer eventually became Third ḫm-nṯr priest of Amun, Superintendent of the Cattle of the Roof-temple of Ra in the Temple of Amun –according to C. Traunecker, he might have succeeded his father to both offices– and Second ḫm-nṯr priest of Amun. On the other hand, Tjanefer bore the title combination “Master of Secrets” and “Opener of the Doors of the Sky in Karnak”, as did the set of influential individuals listed in Chart 2, who were mainly dated to the second half of the 21st Dynasty as well; he was also wr mḥw m ṭm m ṭwst and stm m ṣḥt nḫh, as DB Own. 2 and 15 (Chart 2).

The several posts that Tjanefer occupied were split up among his two sons: Menkheperra (B) (DB Own. 5), who additionally obtained the functions of God’s Father and Third ḫm-nṯr priest of Khonsu, inherited the title of Third ḫm-nṯr priest of Amun and some other functions; while the title of Fourth ḫm-nṯr priest of Amun passed to Pinudjem (A). In addition, Menkheperra (B)’s daughter

---

183 She was also nḥt pr, ẖmṯt n ẖmn and ṣḥty n ḫt n Mwt. For her titulary, see her funerary goods listed in Jansen-Winkeln 2007: 108.
184 A. Niwinski (1979: 55) suggested that he could have been another son of the HPA Menkheperra. For a quite recent overview about the discussion of this matter, see: Lull 2006: 209-211.
185 G. Broekman (2011: 95) states that this title is frequently found in combination with the title of Third ḫm-nṯr priest of Amun.
186 See Traunecker 1993: 91-93.
(DB Own. 141)\textsuperscript{187}, who did not perform high offices within Amun, Mut and Khonsu’s priesthood, was connected to all three cults.

Although the influence of this family seems unquestionable, at a certain point, the leading offices of Amun borne by its members passed to what would become the most important Theban lineages during the 22\textsuperscript{nd} and 23\textsuperscript{rd} Dynasties\textsuperscript{188}. In this regard, the title of Third \textit{hm-ntr} priest of Khonsu also changed family: by year 10\textsuperscript{th} of Siamun, Nespakashuty (ii) (DB Own. 140) occupied this post, possibly consecutively to Menkheperra (B).

Nespakashuty’s family\textsuperscript{189} was of crucial importance during the Libyan Period; its members already held the titles of General and Chief Inspector –\textit{imy-r mšr} and \textit{rwḥ s} – during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty. However, it seems to have risen into prominence with DB Own. 140, who was one of the officials entrusted with the reburial of the New Kingdom royal mummies: Nespakashuty (ii) and a \textit{hm-ntr n ‘Imn-Rc nsw nTrw} called ‘nh$q-f-n-Imn were present at the transfer of Ramesses I, Sethos I and Ramesses II from Sethos I’s tomb. His affiliation to Khonsu’s hierarchy is documented by the dockets inscribed upon the chests of the royal coffins (DB Doc. 197, 198 and 199), where his sequence of titles seems quite complete and his father’s name, Bakenkhons (i), is attested too\textsuperscript{190}.

On the other hand, he took part in the burials of the HPA Pinudjem II and of his wife Nesikhons, where he was referred to as God’s Father of Amun, General,

\textsuperscript{187} The assumption about \textit{DB Own. 141} being the daughter of \textit{B Own. 5} and great-granddaughter of the HP Menkheperra is largely derived from the fact that girls in ancient Egypt often were named with the names of their grandmothers. In addition, her coffin, also from Bab el-Gasus and dated back to Pinudjem II’s or Psusennes pontificate because of its style, was gilded, fact that suggests hers belonging to the HPA’s family: Niwinski 1979: 55. For this owner, see Chart 4.

\textsuperscript{188} See Bierbrier 1975: 60-99.

\textsuperscript{189} Bierbrier 1975: 60-67.

\textsuperscript{190} Černý 1946.
Scribe and Chief Inspector in two different inscriptions. Although the office of Third ḥm-nṯr priest of Khonsu was not recorded when the burial of Pinudjem took place—three days later than the removal of the royal mummies,—DB Own. 140 was probably a senior official who was part of Khonsu’s personnel by the 10th year of Siamun. Moreover, he passed this office related to Khonsu’s service on to his descendants.

During the early 22nd Dynasty, Nespakashuty’s son and grandson (DB Own. 50 and 51 respectively) inherited Nespakashuty’s offices, and acquired other high-ranking titles such as Fourth ḥm-nṯr priest of Mut or Superintendent of the Cattle of the Roof-temple of Ra in the Temple of Amun. In addition, they were listed as Third ḥm-nṯr priests of both Amun and Khonsu on DB Doc. 84, 85 and 101. Although the position of Amuneminet (i) (DB Own. 50) as Third ḥm-nṯr priest of Amun has been questioned, Djeddjehutyiuefankh (i) (DB Own. 51) was definitely ḥm-nṯr 3-nw n ḫm-nṯr 3-nw n ḫnsw. Along with an expected connection between the HPA and an assumed ḥm-nṯr tpy n ḫnsw position, one may take for granted that the offices of Third ḥm-nṯr priest of Amun and of Khonsu were usually held jointly. Even though Nespakashuty (ii) himself was not Third ḥm-nṯr priest of Amun, this was the case for DB Own. 5, 50 and 51; consequently, according to the available evidence, the

---

191 For these two hieratic graffiti of TT 320, see: Jansen-Winkeln 2007: 118 doc. 20 and 141-142 doc. 33.
192 Černý 1946: 29.
194 For several generations, the members of this family held an important office at Abydos, they were ḥm-nṯr n ḫm-nṯr 3-nw n ḫnsw. See Leahy 1990: 166-167 and p. 66-68 above for other Theban with Abydene titles.
existence of some sort of connection between this position and the Amun service’s counterpart may be suggested.

As proposed by M. Bierbrier, it is possible that some of the titles of Menkheperra (B) passed to the prominent family of Nespakashuty because of a relationship between Nespakashuty (ii) and him. Moreover, it seems that, at some point, the title of Third ʿhm-nṯr priest of Amun was claimed and recovered by this prominent lineage. It does not matter if the recovery of the office occurred with DB Own. 50 or DB Own. 51, if this recovery was promoted through royal patronage or whether they acquired this function as an honorary title. More important, it certainly appears that the position of Third ʿhm-nṯr priest of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep was inherited by the different generations of members of Nespakashuty’s family.

This lineage, of remarkable length and variety, whose members served in distinguished military offices and subsequently rose in the Theban priestly hierarchy, seems to have been extended to the early 25th Dynasty. Even at that time, a family stela of the nbt pr Taka (DB Doc. 167/DB Own. 118) still remembers the service that one of her ancestors, DB Own. 51, performed on behalf of Khonsu; besides, DB Own. 50 and 140 are also remembered as mī nn of the former. Even though Djeddjehutyiuefankh (i)’s titles are garbled since he is called Second ʿhm-nṯr priest of Khonsu and Scribe of the Temple of Osiris, instead of Third ʿhm-nṯr priest of Khonsu and ʿhm-nṯr priest of Osiris, it nevertheless indicates the importance of

---


197 M. Bierbrier (1975: 64 and 67) suggested that the recovery of this title may have been related to DB Own. 51’s marriage alliance with the royal family.

198 See Jansen-Winkeln 20062.
this notable member of the family and the high esteem conferred by his service to the cult of Khonsu and Osiris$^{199}$.

On the other hand, besides DB Own. 5, 140, 50 and 51, the available materials do not attest other individuals holding this title from Khonsu’s hierarchy during the whole TIP$^{200}$. However, it is necessary to mention another document that evidences this function, which dates back to the reign of Osorkon I and whose owner’s name is not preserved: the Karnak Priestly Annals fragment No. 35 (DB Doc. 81) (Figure 7).

Figure 7: DB Doc. 81, Karnak Priestly Annals fragment No. 35 (Kruchten 1989: 131)

---

$^{199}$ See Leahy 1990: 166-167 for the Abydene cultic connexions of the members of this family. He considers them an example of higher level personnel in the hierarchy of Osiris.

$^{200}$ A possible exception is the block statue Cairo CG 42209 of the Fourth $hm$-$ntr$ priest of Amun Nakhtefmut (A). However, this is the only evidence of Nakhtefmut bearing this title and its reading seems uncertain (see, for instance, Bierbrier 1975: 82 and el-Sayed 1984-1985: 338-339), while the offices related to Khonsu’s service that he undoubtedly occupied were: $hm$-$ntr$ 2-$nw$ n $Hnsw$ m Wsst $Nfr$-$htp$, $hm$-$ntr$ n $Hnsw$ wts-$h$-$w$ and ss $s$m$h$+$t$ r $Bnn$. See Chapter 4.
Looking at the set of functions listed on lines 2 and 3 of Figure 7\textsuperscript{201}, it is easy to find connections with the offices performed by the aforementioned Third \textit{hm-nTr} priests of Khonsu \textit{DB Own. 50} and \textit{51}, who were \textit{hm-nTr} priests of Mut, Montu and Amun, as most likely the subject of this incomplete inscription.

Even though the chronology is not without its challenges, \textit{DB Own. 50} seems to have belonged to the same generation as Shoshenk I, and \textit{DB Own. 51} might have been a younger contemporary and son-in-law of the same ruler; he might have lived into the last decade of his reign\textsuperscript{202}. In this regard, \textit{DB Own. 51} would be a more adequate candidate for the identification with the individual mentioned in the Priestly Annals, who might have held office by the reign of Osorkon I, Shoshenк’s son and successor.

Having in mind that the Vizier Nespakashuty (iii/A) (\textit{DB Own. 63}\textsuperscript{203}) was most probably Djeddjehutyiuefankh (i)’s younger son and bore none of the hereditary titles of his line—even though he preserved his family’s importance by acquiring the office of vizier, which he passed on to his son—, it is reasonable to think that those high priestly offices might have been inherited by an older son of his, as proposed by some scholars\textsuperscript{204}. Therefore, and even without any certainty, the individual to which \textit{DB Doc. 81} refers could likely be identified either with \textit{DB Own. 51} itself or his supposed eldest son.

\textsuperscript{201} J.-M. Kruchten (1989: 131) reconstructed and translated these lines as follows: ... de Mout] la Grande, Dame de l’Ichérou, troisième prophète de Khonsou-dans-Thèbes Néferhotep, prophète de Montou, Maître de Ioun[yt, ...] d’Amon, troisième prophète de Khonsou [...]


\textsuperscript{203} Although he has no apparent connexion with the Khonsu personnel, his statue \textit{DB Doc. 101} records the title of Third \textit{hm-nTr} priest of Khonsu for his father, \textit{DB Own. 51}.

\textsuperscript{204} See, for instance, Bierbrier 1975: 60 genealogical tree, 64-65 and 67.
Apart from the already analysed members of Nespakashuty’s family who were Third *hm-ntr* priests of Khonsu, a collateral branch of this lineage provides more information about the personnel of this god during the 21st and early 22nd Dynasties\(^\text{205}\) (Genealogical Chart 3). Even though the block statue from the Karnak Cache that attests those other individuals dates to the reign of Osorkon I –see *DB Doc. 82*–, the genealogy goes back further in time, in particular, to the time of a younger brother of Nespakashuty (ii).

**Genealogical Chart 3:** The members of the family of Nespakashuty connected to the service of the god Khonsu. Based on Broekman 2011: Table 1

\(^{205}\) For these individuals as part of the Nespakashuty’s family: Bierbrier 1975: 66-67. Additionally, see Jansen-Winkeln 2003 for an in-depth analysis of their extended genealogy.
The ancestors of the wife of Nespaherenhat (DB Own. 49) lived during the 21st Dynasty and exercised scribal and priestly functions in Karnak, including the office of hm-ntr priest of Hnsw wts-hfw206; the relationship between them and a secondary form of Khonsu that might have been related to Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep is indicative. Moreover, it seems that DB Rel. 72, 71 and 73 – respectively grandfather-in-law, father-in-law and son of Nespaherenhat, i.e., a brother, a nephew and a son of a great-niece of Nespakashuty (ii)– continued occupying military offices as Nespakashuty’s (ii) direct descendants, although they performed lower rank offices.

So, as suggested by M. Bierbrier207, the careers of both brothers run parallel, even though this secondary branch of the family belonged to a less exalted sphere. It is precisely their belonging to this important Theban lineage that seems to have made possible the connexion of these functionaries with the service of Khonsu; hence, for instance, Ankhefenkhonsu (I) (DB Rel. 73), besides the functions that he inherited from his father’s side, was hm-ntr n Hnsw wts-hfw as his forebears on his mother’s side.

In this regard, another descendant of the family of Nespakashuty needs to be considered when talking about the Khonsu priesthood: the hm-ntr Hnsw-Rˁ nb Wsst

---

206 For this god, see p. 23-24 and Posener 1969: 377.
Hor (E) (DB Own. 52). He was quite likely another son of DB Rel. 72 and, consequently, another nephew of Nespakashuty (ii)\textsuperscript{208}.

It is remarkable that most of the direct descendants of Bakenkhonsu (i) were part of the Khonsu personnel. From the late 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty, the members of the principal branch of this family managed to acquire a series of important priestly titles within the \textit{hm-nfr} hierarchy of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, among other Theban gods. Simultaneously, even though connected to the Amun temple as well, the highest priestly offices borne by the younger brother of Nespakashuty and his descendants seem to have been the ones related to Khonsu. While Nespakashuty (ii) (DB Own. 140), his son (DB Own. 50) and grandson (DB Own. 51) hold such a high office within the temple hierarchy as Third \textit{hm-nfr} priest of Khonsu, Nespakashuty’s brother (DB Rel. 72), their nephews (DB Rel. 71 and DB Own. 52) and the son of his great niece (DB Rel. 73) were part of these personnel as well, albeit at a lower rank. They were \textit{hm-nfr} priests, but their service to secondary forms of the god and their run of titles might suggest a lower social status with respect to the main line of the lineage.

As already mentioned, with Menkheperra, Smendes II and Pinudjem II, prominent Theban families linked by marriage to the ruling house seem to have occupied the Theban key-posts of Second, Third and Fourth \textit{hm-nfr} priests of

\textsuperscript{208} The statue of Nesperherenhat Cairo CG 42189 (DB Doc. 82) attributes to his grandfather-in-law the name of Padikhonsu (iii). M. Bierbrier (1975: 67) proposes that Padikhonsu (iii) must have been a younger brother of Nespakashuty (ii), and that Ankhefenkhonsu (B), the father of Hor (E) (DB Own. 52), should be possibly considered another son of Bakenkhonsu (i). In this regard, K. Jansen-Winkeln (2003: 221) already suggested that Ankhefenkhonsu (B) might be the most likely identification for the father of Bakenkhonsu (ii), as well as he considers Ankhefenkhonsu (B) himself the father of Hor (E) (Eaton-Krauss & Jansen-Winkeln 2001: 2); it is however G. Broekman who assumes this identification and materialised it in a genealogical tree (2011: 100 and Table 1). Following this idea and with the intention of encompassing the diversity of the sources, I prefer to denominate DB Rel. 72 as “Padikhonsu (iii)/Ankhefenkhonsu (B)” instead of using a single identification for this brother of Nespakashuty (ii).
Amun. Moreover, from this time on, those local officers held also similar rank
titles within Mut and Khonsu’s personnel, positions not recorded by the available
sources so far.

Menkheperra (B) \(\textit{DB Own. 5}\) must be seen as an initiator of this new
situation where the accumulation of high offices within the priestly hierarchy of
Mut and Khonsu by the Third and Fourth \(\text{hm-nt}_r\) priests of Amun becomes quite
common. The high-ranking office of Third \(\text{hm-nt}_r\) priest of Khonsu, borne by him
and by aforementioned members of Nespakashuty’s family, was not previously
attested. And even though \(\textit{DB Own. 5}\) and \(\textit{140}\) belong to the 21st Dynasty, the other
members of the family of Nespakashuty included in Chart 3 lived and held tenure
during the 22nd Dynasty.

It is clear that the socio-political situation certainly affected the cultic
organisation of the Theban clergy. In this regard, and besides being also the
response to overcome the practical needs of a renewed temple and cult, the
increasing number of servants devoted to Khonsu –Charts 1, 2 and 3– might have
been fuelled by political needs. The greater importance attained by certain local
elite families by the end of the 21st Dynasty seems to have been connected to the
existence of a well-developed \(\text{hm-nt}_r\) priests hierarchy within Khonsu’s personnel;
while it seems that the members of the HPA’s family proved to be very influential in
the domains of Khonsu and Mut until such a time.

Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that, for both the hierarchies of
Mut and Khonsu, the number of functionaries remains limited; reconstructing
complete sequences of successive Second, Third and Fourth \(\text{hm-nt}_r\) priests of Mut
or Khonsu is not feasible due to the available data, as referred to by

G. Broekman\textsuperscript{210}. However, the methodical compilation of servants of Khonsu, including lower and middle ranked functionaries and female servants, increases our current state of knowledge providing some consistent hypothesis about the Theban priesthood’s functioning.

The sources poorly evidence high-ranking functionaries in the priesthood of Khonsu during the whole TIP; even so, it makes sense that the figure of a \textit{hm-n\textsuperscript{tr} tpy n H\textit{nsw}} would have rivalled the authority of the HPA in ideological terms. On the other hand, it may be consistent that the ordinary \textit{hmw-n\textsuperscript{tr}} priests of Khonsu attested before the appearance of the title of Third \textit{hm-n\textsuperscript{tr}} priest, although few in number, enjoyed certain wealth and status within a personnel basically composed of \textit{wr\textit{b}} priests and God’s Fathers. However, it is also reasonable to suggest that the appearance of Third \textit{hm-n\textsuperscript{tr}} priests of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep at one point is probably more than a mere coincidence caused by an incomplete material record.

The subordination of Khonsu’s hierarchy –and probably Mut’s– to Amun’s administration would explain why the head of this institution appears not to have even existed, or why the high functionaries are poorly attested. During the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty the authority of the HPA might have conflicted with other positions of power, maybe higher cultic roles were not even conceivable at Thebes. Nevertheless, leading functions such as Second, Third and Fourth \textit{hm-n\textsuperscript{tr}} priest of Khonsu developed during the Libyan period, Menkheperrra (B) and Nespakashuty (ii) being forerunners of this tendency. It is likely that, by this moment, one of the aforementioned concessions made by the HPAs to some elite families was precisely the tenure of new offices occupying the high echelons of Khonsu’s and even Mut’s personnel; additionally, it is more than reasonable to

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{210} Broekman 2011.}
assume that an increase in temple personnel was closely bound up with its internal working needs.

The giving of high-rank offices could be seen as a political manoeuvre to favourably influence certain families; not only the giving of titles but the emergence of new functions must be analysed within the same context. Conversely, the acquisition of privileges and offices must be perceived as a potential threat to the current authority too. A more independent elite which needed to be under control is a crucial factor, while rises and declines inside the families, hereditary offices, alliances, marriages and so on must also be taken into account when talking about functionaries and temple personnel.

Khonsu’s cult and temple organisation appear to have been subject to some changes depending on the political situation at Thebes. Consequently, the increasing importance attained by some Theban families was reflected in a well-developed hierarchy of sacerdotal servants of Khonsu.

Even though the Libyan rulers first tried to recover the control of the south by restraining the power of the Amun clergy, their policies culminated in a de facto fragmentation of Egypt. In this respect, besides Nespakashuty’s family, the other prominent Theban lineages—which also date back to the final years of the 21st Dynasty—managed to control the key posts of the clergies of Amun, Mut and Khonsu: individuals belonging to Nakhtefmut’s family were $hm\text{-}n\text{tr} \ 2\text{-}nw \ n \ Hnsw$, while some members of the family of Nebnecheru managed to inherit the title $hm\text{-}n\text{tr} \ 4\text{-}nw \ n \ Hnsw$. Khonsu’s personnel was augmented and diversified when the influence from the north waned in Thebes, or else, when certain Theban families were favoured by the Libyan rulers. Accordingly, the creation of priestly functions and the distribution of these between the most notable lineages—mainly connected
to the priesthood of Amun—continues a trend already familiar by the second half of the 21st Dynasty.

On the other hand, it should not be overlooked that most of Khonsu’s servants—including the women, as will be discussed below—usually perform functions on behalf of the three main Theban gods; these people might have provided occasional or intermittent services on a rotational basis inside different temples at Karnak. In this regard, proposing the existence of some overlaps in duties within the cults of Amun, Mut and Khonsu is not a fanciful idea. Moreover, the existence of a hierarchical organisation within the clergies of the theocratic state of Amun and of close links between different personnel performing duties at Karnak needs to be considered as well. Khonsu’s and probably Mut’s personnel were rather probably subordinated to Amun’s clergy, while in the ideological hierarchical system there is no doubt that Amun-Ra stays always at the top.

Even though the scope of this dissertation does not permit an in-depth discussion about onomastics and nomenclature\textsuperscript{211}, it needs to be mentioned that political and religious circumstances, as for instance the influence of a local cult, certainly determine the composition of proper names. In this concern, theophoric names were extremely popular in all periods of Egyptian history, including the TIP. In the Theban area, many names refer to the Theban triad. Looking at the PDB, names with the elements Amun, Mut or Khonsu make up almost 66 percent of the individuals from Charts 1 to 3 (30 of the 44 men): 14 examples include Amun, 13 Khonsu and only 3 Mut as part of their names. Indeed, private names with Khonsu, such as Ankhefenkhonsu, Nesikhonsu, Padikhonsu or Djedkhonsuiuefankh, became

\textsuperscript{211} For a recent reflection on ancient Egyptian personal names, including examples where Khonsu is involved, and a comprehensive biography, see Vittmann 2013\textsuperscript{1} and 2013\textsuperscript{2}.
quite popular from the end of the Ramesside Period, concurrently with the construction of sanctuaries for this deity in Thebes\(^{212}\).

This strong connection between the servants of the Theban triad appears to be proven when one looks at Charts 1 and 2. Similarly, holding offices within the service of the three gods of the Theban divine triad in combination is a defining feature of the individuals connected to the highest levels of Khonsu’s priestly male hierarchy (Chart 3). On the whole, while this can be interpreted as a deliberate promotion of the god Khonsu, it must not be divorced from his closest companions: Amun and Mut.

In any case, Khonsu’s cult gained popularity and quickly amassed a priesthood, containing both men and women. The cult of the child-god –either individually or integrated into a triad– was probably promoted by the human reflection of the divine family, the family of the HPA at Thebes, with legitimisation purposes; so, they might have considered Khonsu in Thebes and Khonsu the Child as two sides of the same coin. Besides the undoubted leading role of Amun’s hierarchy, from the Ramesside Period, the child in the divine family triads and the role of the mother-child relationship started to attract increasing attention, announcing the beginning of the mammisiac religion. The growth of priests and officials in service of Khonsu from the 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty should be examined as part of this background.

In keeping with this idea, in terms of female personnel, the titles of the HPAs’ wives and daughters and the cultic role of some few lesser-elite women on behalf of Khonsu and Khonsu the Child merit special attention.

\(^{212}\) See Gasse 1988: 194-197. Additionally, a study focused on the Libyan Period wooden funerary stelae notes that theophoric names which mention the deities of the Theban triad abound in Thebes from the 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty onwards: Saleh 2007: 175-181.
2.2.1.2. Female Servants

The proven prominence of elite Theban women in the archaeological record and their wider inclusion in cultic roles by the 21st Dynasty was closely attached to the Karnak complex. However, even though most of these women played an active role in Amun’s hierarchy, they were also members of the nearby temples staff.

There is evidence that the legitimacy of the Theban HPAs was, to a certain extent, transmitted by their women: their mothers, sisters, wives and daughters. By holding certain sacerdotal titles, they reinforced their family’s economical and political power. Simultaneously, as part of the Sacred Musical Troupe of Amun or being qualified as God’s Wives, they embodied the feminine principle and performed the functions of mother of the heir in a mythical sphere complementing their husband’s duties ritually; in addition, they provided HPAs and kings with the suitable heir213.

On the other hand, apart from these high-ranking females, the increasing number of subalterns has been interpreted as a strategy to strengthen the power of Amun’s priesthood: the involvement of more personnel in its hierarchy—in particular, the songstresses in service to Amun214—might have been a way to

213 See, for instance, Naguib 1990: 181-185, 210 and 244-248. The whole book is a crucial reference for the Theban female personnel of Amun during the 21st Dynasty.

214 The extensive work done by S. L. Onstine in her dissertation (2001) demonstrates how the organisation of the ṣmrywrt might have worked and how pervasive this title and the cult of Amun became in Thebes by this time.
reinforce the HPA’s political power, a way to use women’s position to their own advantage\footnote{Onstine 2001: 81.}

In this context, where elite and lesser elite sectors of society played a crucial role as far as the Amun hierarchy's legitimacy is concerned, it is not only Amun’s personnel which underwent certain changes. The florescence of the variety of feminine priestly titles in the early TIP also affected Mut and Khonsu’s female servants. In this regard, as some few women performed, for instance, the function of \textit{hsyt n p3 \textasciitilde 3 n Mwt}\footnote{See Naguib 1990: 234-235 and Onstine 2001: 15. In this regard, some of Khonsu’s female servants (Chart 4) were also Singers of the Choir of Mut: \textit{DB Rel. 63} and \textit{DB Own. 4, 141} and \textit{113.}}, the sources also provide evidence for the existence of a female cult of Khonsu based on the run of titles of seventeen women (see Chart 4).

Even though for the male personnel I decided to make a distinction between the higher-levels of Khonsu’s personnel (Chart 3) and the lower ones (Charts 1 and 2), because of the nature of the female personnel itself as well as the more manageable amount of data, I determined on not dividing the women into two separate charts. Therefore, all the women attested by the material record are included in this section, though it is dedicated to the highest Theban dignitaries devoted to Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and Khonsu the Child.
### Chart 4: Female servants of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and Khonsu the Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38          | Ndm†t         | • mwt-nfr n Hnsw p3-hrd  
• mwt-nfr n Hnsw m W3st Nfr-htp  
• mwt-nfr n Hnsw  
• mwt-nfr n Hnsw-R n W3st | hrty wrt hnr n 'lnn-R nsw nfrw; hsr t st n 'lnn m W3st; hrty mn wrt n W3st;  
nbt pr; hrty špsw; iypitt; wrt hsrw; hmr tswy; nbt tswy; hmr-nsw wrt n nb tswy;  
mwr-nsw nst k3 nht; mwr-nsw nb tswy; stt mwr-nsw | TT 320                  | Late 20th D.- early 21st D. (Pinudjem I) |
| 39          | Ts-št-sbkt    | • wrr hnr n Hnsw                                                             | šmfrt n 'lnn;  
hrty špsw; stt-nsw                                                                 | Temple of Khonsu, Karnak | Late 20th D.- early 21st D. |
| 34          | N3wny         | • hsr n nbw W3st 'lnn Mwt Hnsw                                               | šmfrt n 'lnn-R nsw  
nfrw; hsr t st nsw nbw W3st;  
nbt pr; hrty ttwt; stt-nsw | TT 358                  | Early 21st D. (Pinudjem I)  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 37         | $H_{nwt-t3wy}$ (A)  
(mother of DB Own. 44) | • $mwt-ntr n$ $Hnsw$ $p3-hrd$  
• $mwt-ntr n$ $Hnsw$ $p3-hrd$ $ct$ $wr$ $tpy$ $n$ $'lmn$  
• $hm-t-ntr n$ $Hnsw$ $m$ $W3st$ $Nfr-htp$  
• $ct$ $n$ $pr$ $n$ $Hnsw$ $m$ $W3st$ $Nfr-htp$  
• $h$t$t$ $ct$ $n$ $nbw$ $W3st$ $'lmn$ $Mwt$ $Hnsw$ | $dwst$ $Hwt-Hr$; $hrtyt$ $tpy$ $n$ $'lmn-Rc$; $hm-t-ntr$ $n$ $'lmn-Rc$; $hm-t-ntr$ $n$ $Mwt$ $wr$ $nbt$ $'Isrw$; $hm-t-ntr$ $n$ $'In-hrt-Sw$ $3$ $Rc$;  
$ct$ $n$ $pr$ $n$ $Mwt$ $nbt$ $'Isrw$  
$hsyt$ $ct$ $n$ $'lmn$ $m$ $W3st$;  
$hrtyt$ $m'tw$ $n$ $Mwt$ $nbt$ $'Isrw$;  
$nbt$ $t3wy$;  
$hm-t-nsw$ $wr$;  
$hm-t-nsw$ $wr$ $tpy$ $n$ $hm.f$  
$nb$ $t3wy$;$mwt$-$nsw$;  
$mwt$-$nsw$ $wr$ $n$ $nb$ $t3wy$;  
$mwt$ $n$ $hm-t-nsw$ $wr$ $nbt$ $t3wy$;  
$mwt$ $n$ $hm-t-nsw$ $tpy$ $n$ $'lmn$;  
$mwt$ $n$ $p3$ $hm-t-ntr$ $tpy$ $n$ $'lmn$;  
$mwt$ $n$ $p3$ $imy-r$ $ms'$ $wr$ $n$ $'Smw$ $M Höhe$;  
$mwt$ $n$ $dwst-ntr$ $n$ $'lmn-Rc$ $nsw$ $ntrw$;  
$sst-nsw$ $n$ $ht.f$ $mr.f$;  
$sst$ $hm-t-nsw$ $wr$ | TT 320 and NRT III, Tanis | Early-middle 21st D.  
(Menkheperra) |
| 44         | $Mwt-n_dmt$  
(daughter of DB Own. 37) | • $mwt-ntr n$ $Hnsw$ $p3-hrd$  
• $mwt-ntr n$ $Hnsw$ $p3-hrd$ $ct$ $wr$ $tpy$ $n$ $'lmn$  
• $hm-t-ntr n$ $Hnsw$ $m$ $W3st$ $Nfr-htp$ | $wr$ $hm-t-ntr$ $n$ $'lmn-Rc$  
$nsw$ $ntrw$;  
$hm-t-ntr$ $2-nw$ $n$ $'lmn-Rc$ $nsw$ $ntrw$;  
$hm-t-ntr$ $n$ $Mwt$ $wr$ $nbt$ $'Isrw$;  
$ct$ $n$ $pr$ $Mwt$ $wr$ $nbt$ $'Isrw$  
$nsw$ $nbt$ $t3wy$;  
$hm-t-nsw$ $wr$ $tpy$ $n$ $hm.f$;  
$sst-nsw$;  
$snt-nsw$ | NRT III, Tanis | Amenemope |
| 138        | $'1st-m-hb$ (C)  
(mother/stepmother of DB Own. 36, 35, 4 and 8) | • $mwt-ntr n$ $Hnsw$ $p3-hrd$ | $hrtyt$ $wr$ $hm-t-ntr$ $tpy$ $n$ $'lmn-Rc$;  
$sst-nsw$ | NRT III, Tanis | Menkheperra |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB Rel. 63</td>
<td>ḫnty-Mwt-pz-nfr</td>
<td>•ḥnty šnwty n Ḥnsw m Ṭsr Nfr-ḥtp</td>
<td>šnwty n ḫmn-R n ṭsrw; ḫnty n p3 ṣṣ n Mwt wrt nbt ḫsrw; mnʾt-nsw</td>
<td>NRT V and Tanis</td>
<td>Psusennes I/ Amenemope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ḥnwty-t:Anyy (C)</td>
<td>•mwt-nfr n Ḥnsw</td>
<td>wrt ḫnty n ḫmn-R; šnwty n ḫmn-R n ṭsrw. nbt pr; ḫnty špswt</td>
<td>MMA 60</td>
<td>Psusennes II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ḫst-m-ḥḫ (D)</td>
<td>•mwt-nfr n Ḥnsw pḥ-mdrd</td>
<td>ḫnty wrt ḫnty tpyt n ḫmn-R n ṭsrw; ḫmt-nfr n Mwt wrt nbt ḫsrw; ḫmt-nfr n Nḥḥt; ḫmt-nfr ḫn-ḥṣt-Ḥw-s3-R; ḫmt-nfr n Mnḥ ḫw ḫst n ḫḥtyw; ḫmt-nfr n ḫr nb ḫdw; ḫmt-nfr n Ṭsr ḫw ḫst n sḥdw; ḫmt-nfr n ḫḥw-Ḥw nb ḫs; ḫmt-nfr n ḫmn-R nb ḫw-rw; ḫst n pr Mwt wrt nbt ḫsrw; ḫnty špswt</td>
<td>TT 320</td>
<td>Pinudjem II/ Psusennes III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḫrt-Ḥmn  (F)</td>
<td>•mnʾt Ḥnsw pḥ-mdrd</td>
<td>šnwty n ḫmn-R n ṭsrw; ḫnty n p3 ṣṣ n Mwt wrt nbt ḫsrw; nbt pr</td>
<td>A. 71 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Psusennes III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Servants of Khonsu and the 21st Dynasty
2.2. The Highest Levels: from Thebes to Tanis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>&quot;$3w-t$-ššn (B), who usurped the coffin ensemble of Ns-ʱm-(nb)-nst-t3wy (DB Own.18) (daughter of DB Own. 5)&quot;</td>
<td>• $hmt n Hns w p3-ḥrd$</td>
<td>$smt n ʰm-R' nsw nṛrw; ḥsy n p3 ʰṬ n Mwt; nbt pr; ḥṛyt tiwt$</td>
<td>A. 139 Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Pinudjem II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>• $mn' t Hns w p3-ḥrd$</td>
<td>$smt n ʰm-R' nsw nṛrw; nbt pr; sš n ḥm-ḥṛt ṭpy$</td>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td>Late 21st D. (Psusennes II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>$Dd-Mwt$</td>
<td>• $hmt n Hns w p3-ḥrd$</td>
<td>$smt n ʰm-R' nsw nṛrw; $smt n pr ʰmn; nbt pr.$</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Second half 21st D.-early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$T3-n dém-Mwt$</td>
<td>• $hmt n Hns w p3-ḥrd$</td>
<td>$smt n ʰm-R' nsw nṛrw; nbt pr$</td>
<td>Late 21st D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Ns-$Hns w$</td>
<td>• $hmt n Hns w p3-ḥrd$</td>
<td>$smt n ʰm-R' nsw nṛrw; nbt pr$</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Late 21st D.-early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Ns-$Hns w$</td>
<td>• $hmt n Hns w p3-ḥrd$</td>
<td>$smt n ʰm-R' nsw nṛrw; ḥsy n p3 ʰṬ n Mwt wrt nbt 'lṣrw; nbt pr$</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Late 21st D.-early 22nd D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>$Dl-Mwt-r-iwdw$</td>
<td>• $mn' t Hns w p3-ḥrd$</td>
<td>$smt n ʰm-R' nsw nṛrw; $hsy ḫr ʰmmt W3st; nbt pr$</td>
<td>Late 21st D.-early 22nd D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When analysing the officers who formed the highest echelons of the male personnel, the spouses and daughters of Herihor and Menkheperra were already referred to due to their service to Khonsu and Khonsu the Child; as with the men, they performed duties on behalf of the gods of the Theban triad. The joint assessment of all the individuals and titles from Chart 4 shows that, the already mentioned Nedjemet, Tashetsobeket, Henuttauy (C), Istemkheb (D) or Meretamun (F) –DB Own. 38, 39, 36, 35 and 4 respectively– were part of a coherent and hierarchical group of female clergy in existence during the 21st Dynasty; therefore, an in-depth study of this set of women is required.

Despite the fact that all the priestesses in Chart 4 were women from the elite classes, looking at their titles, the existence of priestly levels among them seems clear. In this regard, in order to draw a first visual differentiation between them, the wives of the HPAs and kings –who a priori coincide with the highest positions within this organisation– are identified by an orange-coloured pattern in the chart. Additionally, those women linked to the HPA’s family but not holders of the title (ḥrty) wr ḫnrt (tpyt) n ʿlmn are distinguished by a lighter orange colour; while the other attested servants of the different forms of Khonsu remain in white.

Looking at their strings of offices, the one of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, which was borne by six women –DB Own. 38, 37, 44, 138, 36 and 35–, is worthy of attention (Genealogical Chart 4).
Genealogical Chart 4: 21st Dynasty Superiors of the hnr₄t of Amun (Naguib 1990: 155) with the God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child circled in orange

While no HPA was directly connected with the service of Khonsu by any sacerdotal title, as discussed above, the only six individuals who for certain fulfilled this function were (hryt) wrt hnr₄t (tpyt) n ‘lmn; that means, they were mothers of a HPA and/or a God’s Wife, daughters of a HPA or king and probably a (hryt) wrt
ḥnrt (tpyt) n ʾlmn, and wives of a HPA. As the female counterparts of their husbands, the wives of HPAs and kings, such as the earthly embodiment of Mut and as part of their various core religious functions, ritually performed the role of mother of the divine heir of Amun.

The title “God’s Mother” is already attested during the 18th Dynasty. Besides being an epithet used by certain goddesses, and despite the uncertainty regarding its meaning, it seems to designate a sacerdotal function when applied to high-ranking women. Therefore, these mwt-nṯr, who were not necessarily royal mothers, most likely evoked a cosmogonic maternity in certain ritual contexts.

With the establishment of the southern theocratic government and concurrently to the development of child-deity theologies, it was Queen Nedjemet (DB Own. 38) who instituted this office connected to the Theban cult of Khonsu the Child. Worshiped as a son of Amun, this child god was integrated into the Theban theological system; he became prominent in temple cult and private devotion and a group of clergy was built around him. Nevertheless, this development can hardly be seen as a casual fact; the political and ideological changes occurring by the

---

217 For a study of this institution and its members: Naguib 1990: 132-207; an outline of its main characteristics can be found in p. 182-183 and 203-205.

218 Naguib 1990: 77-80.

219 S.-A. Naguib (1990: 209-210) provides a list of God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child –some of them with question marks–, but I did not find evidence for the attribution of this title to all the women mentioned there. In Chart 4, I only included the ones whose identification seems clear, as explained on the following pages. In this regard, for instance, and even though Nesikhons (A) has been considered a God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, I reviewed her case and decided not to include her in the PDB. On the other hand, the titles of Henuttauy (C) (DB Own. 36), who was only wrt ḥnrt n ʾlmn and was not apparently mother of any HPA, were re-examined too resulting in her addition to my corpus.

220 Naguib 1990: 208. For an earlier date of this title, see Roth 2009: 5.

I millennium BCE, as well as the pursuit of legitimacy by the new rulers of Egypt, must be considered as decisive factors\textsuperscript{222}.

As stated by A. Forgeau, the popularity of child deities might be seen as a consequence of the Theban clergy’s desire to “Substituer à l’image historique de l’enfant roi celle d’un dieu-enfant immuable”\textsuperscript{223}. The cult of the divine-heir/child-god –who replaces the royal-child with the beginning of the birth doctrine and becomes the guarantor of the continuity of legitimate royal and hereditary succession–, was probably another of the multiple strategies used for legitimisation purposes by the southern rulers.

In this context of assimilation between the king –or even the HPA– with the child of the divine triad, the popularity of Khonsu the Child within the cultic sphere does not seem out of place; as S.-A. Naguib suggests, “Dès la période ramesside, la popularité grandissante du culte de Khonsou l’enfant Ḥnsw-pḥ-ḥrd annonce lés débuts d’une doctrine de la naissance et l’expansion du culte du dieu-enfant”\textsuperscript{224}. However, it is true that, in line with the pluralism that defines ancient Egyptian mentality, his cult cannot be divorced from the devotion to Amun, Mut and Khonsu as members of the triad. As well as the building-works of the Khonsu temple and the increasing number of his servants, which must be seen as evidence of a deliberate promotion of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep’s cult, the worship of Khonsu the Child –mainly connected to women by this time– must also be seen as part of this same polity.

\textsuperscript{222} For an insight into the development of god-child theologies, see: Forgeau 2002: 8-9 and 2010; and Budde 2010.

\textsuperscript{223} Forgeau 2002: 8.

\textsuperscript{224} Naguib 1990: 207-208.
The main post held by these six women was their leading position within the ḫnrt of Amun. The assignment of both priestly functions –(ḥṛṭ) wrt ḫnrt (tpyt) n ʾlmn and mwt-nṭr n ḫns ḫḥrd–, which has been seen as a kind of package, seems to have taken place once they give birth to an heir or heiress. Moreover, it is also suggested that, as for the title of Greatest Chief of the Sacred Musical Troupe, that of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child was jointly held by the two co-wives of the HPA 225. In this regard, and although for the role of Superior of Amun’s ḫnrt both statements seem doubtless, the statement regarding these God’s Mothers needs to be treated with a degree of caution.

The expansion of the cult of the Theban triad into Tanis and the family links between both parts of the country meant that, for instance, the Queen Mutnedjemet (DB Own. 44) was also mwt-nṭr n ḫns ḫḥrd after her mother, the wife of Pinudjem I, Henuttauy (A) (DB Own. 37)226. In addition, the office passed to Psusennes’ daughter, the princess Istemkheb (C) (DB Own. 138), who was also Menkheperra’s wife; Henuttauy (C) (DB Own. 36) and Istemkheb (D) (DB Own. 35), two daughters of Menkheperra and wives of Smendes II and Pinudjem II respectively, were also God’s Mothers of Khonsu.

The wife of Smendes II, Henuttauy (C) (DB Own. 36), was not classified as God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child either by K. Kitchen227, J. Berlandini228 or S. A. Naguib229. It is true that she was only Chief of the ḫnrt of Amun and not apparently mother of any HPA or God’s Wife; however, returning to A. Niwinski’s

225 For this idea, see Naguib 1990: 182-183 and 209-211. See also Montet 1951: 101-102.
226 Besides Henuttauy’s funerary goods from the Royal Cache (DB Doc. 52-56), DB Doc. 60 is the only evidence that attests her title of mwt-nṭr n ḫns ḫḥrd in Tanis.
228 Berlandini 1979: 102-103.
publication on 21st Dynasty coffins, the title of *mwt-ntr* of Khonsu is assigned to her (Figure 8). This assumption is also adopted by the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York) –the institution that hold the mummy board of the ensemble–, in whose webpage this title is given to Henuttauy.

Moreover, S. Onstine also missed this sacerdotal function and entitles *DB Own. 36* as *šmꜣyt* of Amun, Mut and Khonsu. Even though it is a mere conjecture, assuming that the author did not have access to the original coffins and did not find any *šmꜣyt* title for the three Theban gods on them, the misreading of A. Niwinski’s titles (Figure 8) would be a possibility for the attribution of the function of Songstress of the whole triad to Henuttauy (C).

---

230 Niwinski 1988: 111 Doc. 44.

231 Regarding the reading of this title, it is necessary to have in mind that the honorific transposition of sign R8 from Sir A. H. Gardiner list (Gardiner 1957) does not always occur. As an example, see for instance K. Jansen-Winkeln’s hieroglyphic texts about the coffin ensemble (*DB Doc. 47*) and the funerary papyrus (*DB Doc. 49*) of Istemkheb (D) (*DB Own. 35*), where the order of signs R8 and G14, as part of the title God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, is both reversed and non-reversed: Jansen-Winkeln 2007: 183-184.

232 [http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&pos=1](http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&pos=1)

233 Onstine 2001: #120.
On the other hand, the case of the ḫryt wrt ḫnrt tpyt n ḫmn Nesikhons (A) – daughter or Smendes II and co-wife together with Istemkheb (D) (DB Own. 35) of Pinudjem II– is different from that of DB Own. 36.

The tomb group consisting of the burial assemblages of Pinudjem II, his two wives and his daughter was one of the most complete recovered from the Royal Cache. The earliest set of coffins of Istemkheb (D) (DB Doc. 48) was usurped by Nesikhons, who was chronologically Pinudjem’s second wife and who nevertheless died in the 5th year of Siamun, before DB Own. 35 herself. Some of the titles recorded on this coffin ensemble might have been performed by both women, as the highest-rank within the ḫnrt of Amun for certain; however, when looking at different publications, several doubts remain about the distribution of their functions. And even though Nesikhons has been considered a God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, this statement needs to be revised.

As far as DB Doc. 48 is concerned, B. Gunn remarked that the titles on these coffins are exclusively related to their original owner: DB Own. 35. As a result, Nesikhons should not be considered holder of any of the listed functions that Istemkheb (D) performed on behalf of Khonsu based on DB Doc. 48, including the position of God’s Mother; nevertheless, Nesikhons was, according to the rest of her funerary goods, among other roles, sz-nsw n Kš and ḫmt-nṯr priestess of

---

235 See Niwinski 1988 and 1989 regarding the topic of the two wives of Pinudjem II. In this concern, he states that Istemkheb (D) might have certainly died after year 13 of Psusennes (Niwinski 1988: 230).
238 All the corresponding titles in Chart 4.
different manifestations of Khnum and of Hathor. On this basis, I prefer not to include her in the PDB.

Having in mind these two cases out of six, besides a list of leaders of the Sacred Musical Troupe that exceeds this number, there is not enough evidence to prove that the two co-wives of the HPA were both God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child; neither that this title was only borne by the mother of the heir or heiress, since Henuttauy (C) (DB Own. 36) gave birth to no HPA or God’s Wife known so far. Notwithstanding these facts, it cannot be denied that the fulfilment of this role by the wives of the Theban and northern rulers was particularly significant. They acquired corresponding privilege and status being the mother of a prospective or factual legitimate heir, and also played a major role in the cultic hierarchy of the divine heir, who was precisely the guarantor of the continuity of legitimate hereditary succession.

Khonsu the Child’s pre-eminent position in hereditary succession is sometimes underlined by the use of the epithet “śz wr tpy n ‘Imn”; this occurs in the funerary equipment of DB Own. 37 and 44, where Henuttauy (A) and Queen Mutnedjemet are designated as mwt-nṯr n ḫnswḥr ḥr wr tpy n ‘mn. Furthermore, there are variants of the same title which include only “Khonsu” – DB Own. 38, 36 and 35 – or even once “Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep” and ”Khonsu-Ra” – DB Own. 38 –, instead of “Khonsu the Child”. Considering that the developing cult of this child god was headed by these women, and although several

---

239 See also Gunn 1955: 83-84 n. 4, as well as Kitchen 2004: 275-276.
240 Naguib 1990: 134-135 et seq. See also Genealogical Chart 4.
241 For the case of Nedjemet (DB Own. 38), see Taylor 1998.
242 It is also remarkable that the God’s Wife Maatkara was, mwt-nṯr n ḫr sm-s-tswy, a God’s Mother of another dynastic god different from Khonsu: Naguib 1990: 210.
factors might have been involved when choosing certain variants of a title, the presence of different forms of the god must be contextualised within the same theological and political background.

As J. Berlandini pointed out, the priestly institution of these God’s Mothers “Décèle la prédilection de plus en plus marquée pour les triades divines, image cosmique que reflète la famille royale et pour l’Enfant Divin caractérisé par l’épithète de Pz-ḥrд”\textsuperscript{243}; furthermore, the emergence of this cult at the end of the Ramesside period “Semblait coïncider avec l’expansion de la triade thébaine, l’épanouissement d’un culte rendu aux dieux-enfants par l’intermédiaire de la reine ou de l’épouse du gran-prêtre d’Amon et l’évolution d’une religion mammisiaque”\textsuperscript{244}. In this regard, the prominent cultic role of certain high-elite women on behalf of Khonsu the Child, but also on behalf of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep –i.e., different facets of the same divine entity, although they most likely had independent cultic places and personnel– could be seen as two sides of the same coin. This idea, their dual role, seems supported when looking at the other functions that the God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child performed (Chart 4).

The importance given to this leading position within Khonsu the Child’s hierarchy is reflected, for instance, by the available sources where this title was recorded (see Table 2). Although it is true that coffin ensembles and funerary papyri are the main funerary goods which attest this function, a special mention should be made of objects like shrouds, ushabti boxes, containers or scarabs, where the writing space is substantially reduced and where minimal titulary is provided. However, it is their wide variety of priestly positions which give us a closer insight into the rank that these women occupied: these superiors of Amun’s ḫnrt, the

\textsuperscript{243} Berlandini 1979: 108.

\textsuperscript{244} Berlandini 1979: 103.
feminine equivalent of the title of HPA, had supreme authority over the female personnel of the Theban Estate of Amun, including the servants of Mut and Khonsu.

Beyond Nedjemet’s (DB Own. 38) posts as ḫyty n ḫt n ḫmn n Wst and ḫrty n mnw n Mwt, the titles of Henuttauy (A) (DB Own. 37), such as ḫmtntr priestess of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, Steward of both Mut and Khonsu, Great Singer of Amun, Mut and Khonsu and Chief of the Wet-nurses of Mut, show how widely the ruling Theban house had spread its net within the different cults of the triad. Furthermore, two generations later, Istemkheb (D) (DB Own. 35), whose impressive number of benefices outside Thebes is striking\textsuperscript{245}, was also ḫmtntr priestess and

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Type of documents & Servants of Khonsu \\
\hline
Coffin ensemble & 6 \\
Papyrus & 3 \\
Shroud & 0 \\
Ushabti box & 0 \\
Gold vessel & 0 \\
Gold bowl & 0 \\
Scarab & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Type of documents in which the title of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child appears}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{245} Kitchen 2004: 275. Moreover, A. Leahy states that, for instance, the acquisition of her title of ḫmtntr priestess of Osiris, Horus and Isis in Abydos “Heralds the gradual extension of Theban tenure of important offices at Abydos” (Leahy 1990: 166).
Steward of Mut and Khonsu. In this regard, although there were not High hmntr priest of Khonsu or Mut during the TIP, the stewardships of temples and domains of both gods at Karnak were controlled by some of these women, i.e., by the HPA’s family.

A particular place in the history and genealogy of this Dynasty is taken by the Queen Mutnedjemet (DB Own. 44), DB Own. 37’s daughter and chief consort and sister of Psusennes I. Even though the leading role and cult of the Theban triad in Tanis and its servants is also discussed in section 2.2.2., Mutnedjemet, in the northern capital, held the same priestly benefices as did her Theban counterparts: besides being the head of Amun’s hnr and God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, she was Second hmntr priest of Amun, hmt-ntr priestess of both Mut and Khonsu and Steward of the Domain of Mut. As remarked by K. Kitchen, “This constellation of benefits, based on the cult, temple(s) and estates of Amun, Mut and Khonsu at Tanis, served the same purpose of providing a befitting income for members of the new dynasty as did such ‘plural livings’ for the family of Herihor’s successors in Thebes”246.

Just as Amenemope followed Psusennes’ example and called himself HPA, or Siamun extended the main temple of Amun in Tanis247, it is reasonable to assume that other queens were also devoted supporters of the Theban Amun, Mut and Khonsu248. The same pattern of behaviour followed by the members of the Theban female hierarchy and the lively traffic of higher temple personnel in Karnak might have been reproduced in the northern part of the country.

---

248 For this idea, see Naguib 1990: 179.
On the other hand, the scarce evidence for Istemkheb (C) (DB Own. 138) – entitled on a funerary object of her father as God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child (DB Doc. 192) – may explain why the expected attachment between her and the temple-service of Mut or Khonsu is not attested so far. Along the same line, the premature death of Smendes II might explain why Henuttauy (C) (DB Own. 36) had lesser ranking titles within the hierarchies of the gods of the Theban triad, while the title of God’s Mother of Khonsu as well as those of Songstress of Amun and Flutist of Mut indicate her service to them.

In summary, these six women, as the highest-ranking female members of the ruling household and of the musical-artistic troupe of Amun, were given a special function in the cult of Khonsu the Child and the other gods of the triad, both in Thebes and Tanis. Leaving aside their leading title of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, they also participated effectively in the extension of the Theban triad, as men did. Their central position in the cult of Khonsu in Thebes is evidenced by titles such as ḫmt-nṯr priestesses and Stewards, while there is only one source that attests an individual serving a musical troupe of Khonsu.

As already mentioned, DB Own. 39, a daughter of Herihor and Songstress of Amun, was entitled as wrt ḫnrt n Ḥnsw within the Khonsu temple. The function of ḥryt wrt ḫnrt tpyt n Ḥnsw seems nonexistent even among the wives of the HPAs and sovereigns, who led the same institution on behalf of Amun. In the absence of new data, this fact may be interpreted in the same way as the lack of High Ḫm-nṯr priest of Khonsu for the 21st Dynasty, that means, it might have been seen as an unnecessary title, not in line with Khonsu’s cultic practices or theology, or even inconsistent with Amun’s preeminence.

---

249 See p. 100-102.
Moreover, the biographical and genealogical information does not provide much evidence about the lower/middle female clergy of Khonsu in Thebes, that means, the levels below the ḫmrmt-nṯr hierarchy, which would correspond to the male ṯḥ priests, God’s Fathers, etc. Although women participation in the temple hierarchy was largely based on music-related positions, only DB Rel. 63\textsuperscript{250}, who was ḫḥryt šmrhwty n ḫnsw m ṯwst Ṯfr-ḥtp in Tanis, DB Own. 34, a ḫḥṣýt n nbw ṯwst ḫmn ṭmnt ḫnsw, and Henuttauy (A) (DB Own. 37), who bore the immediate superior status of ḫḥṣýt ḡśt n nbw ṯwst ḫmn ṭmnt ḫnsw, were directly connected with the cult of the god under study; in this regard, it is remarkable that both DB Own. 34 and 37 were Singers for the gods of Theban triad, and not just Singers of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep.

Nevertheless, when looking at the hierarchy of Khonsu the Child a different picture emerges. It seems that two minor positions appear in the material record repeatedly: mn’ṯ and ḫḥmnṯt n ḫnsw ṭȝ-ḥrd.

According to these priestly titles, the cultic practices performed on behalf of Khonsu the Child might have been closely related to the theology of conception, birth and nursing. Even though there is no clear identification of their ritual duties, certain women seems to have mimicked the traditional household roles serving the young god; they were operating within the traditional boundaries of feminine roles ascribed to them\textsuperscript{251}. Therefore, while the wives of the HPAs occupied the upper echelons of this cult by performing the role of the mother of Amun’s legitimate divine heir ritually, when looking at Chart 4, there are both members of the HPA’s

\textsuperscript{250} See p. 102 and section 2.2.2.

\textsuperscript{251} In this regard, R. Fazzini (2002: 360) remarks how a “Chief of Nurses of Isis” from the reign of Ramesses XI was “Depicted suckling a male child who is presumably Horus” in her husband’s tomb. Besides, V. Laurent (1984: 152-156) assigns to male Nurses of child deities tasks such as taking the statue of the god in their arms and cradling it, or even emulating the god’s nourishing.
family and individuals apparently not connected with them among the women serving Khonsu the Child as Wet-nurses and Nurses: \textit{DB Own. 4, 141, 30, 46, 40, 111, 113} and \textit{33}.

As noted by S.-A. Naguib, there were three types of Egyptian female \textit{nourrices} –which I translate as Wet-nurses–, all subsumed under the term \textit{mnrt}\textsuperscript{252}: goddesses designated as \textit{mnrt}, the royal and private \textit{mnrwrt}\textsuperscript{253} and priestesses in the service of child gods. The latter category, which was not exclusive for Theban religious cults, possibly occupied a place complementary to that of the mother to bring up the divine child in ritual contexts. Consequently, they are regarded as subordinates of the God’s Mothers: a group of lower ranking priestesses who might not have been involved in highly significant cultic responsibilities. As noted by F. Daumas\textsuperscript{254}, milk offerings took a prominent position in the cult inside the later \textit{mammisi}; it would make sense that, with the development of the birth doctrine, one of the main duties of both male and female Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child would consist in a similar ritual practice in the sanctuary dedicated to this child god.

The case of Meretamun (F) (\textit{DB Own. 4}) was already referred to by S.-A. Naguib too\textsuperscript{255}. While Henuttauy (C) and Istemkheb (D) (\textit{DB Own. 36} and \textit{35} respectively) were wives of HPAs and heads of Khonsu the Child’s personnel, \textit{DB Own. 4} only performed middling-ranking cultic roles on behalf of the three gods of the triad: besides \textit{šmryt n lmnr-c} and \textit{hsyt n p3 ç n Mwt}, she was a \textit{mnrt n}

\textsuperscript{252} For the analysis of these three categories: Naguib 1990: 225-232.

\textsuperscript{253} \textit{DB Rel. 63}, who performed as a Chief of the Songstresses of Khonsu in Tanis, is a unique example of a \textit{mnrt-nsw} attested by this dynasty (Naguib 1990: 228-229). Although this individual, most likely Wet-nurse of Amenemope, was not directly linked to the cult of Khonsu the Child, the status acquired by the royal \textit{mnrwrt} is relevant to understand her familial position in the northern capital and the important role that she might have played.

\textsuperscript{254} Daumas 1958: 167-206.

\textsuperscript{255} Naguib 1990: 229.
According to A. Niwinski, Meretamun (F) was probably the daughter of Menkheperra by a second wife, and her coffin, which was not gilded, was also stylistically different from the other sets from Bab el-Gasus\(^{256}\); even though she was a member of the HPA’s family, these facts might be interpreted both as a cause and a consequence of her status within the Theban temples personnel.

As also suggested by S.-A. Naguib\(^{257}\), in line with the number of God’s Mothers of Khonsu attested, a larger number of mn‘wt must have been existed. In this concern, just two documents evidence two more mn‘wt n Ḥnsw pꜣ-ḥrd by this time: an anonymous daughter of a HPA\(^{258}\) (DB Own. 30) and a woman called Dimuteriudu (DB Own. 33), both Songstresses of Amun and Singers in Thebes probably in the late 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty.

Some of the already mentioned female servants of Khonsu can be also categorised as Wet-nurses of Mut, personnel which seems subordinated to the institution of the God’s Wives\(^{259}\): DB Own. 38 and 37 were not simply mn‘wt n Mwt, but ḥrywt mn‘wt n Mwt; this title indicates the existence of grades among these female Wet-nurses. In this connection, a similar leading figure within Khonsu’s female hierarchy could be expected too; further, a woman known as Tamit, who belonged to the royal line of the 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty, was imy-r mn‘wt n Ḥnsw pꜣ-ḥrd during the mid or late 8\(^{th}\) century BCE\(^{260}\).

\(^{256}\) Niwinski 1979: 54-55.
\(^{257}\) Naguib 1990: 229-230.
\(^{258}\) According to A. Niwinski (1979: 59), it seems likely that DB Own. 30 might be the daughter of Pinudjem II.
\(^{260}\) See Li 2010: 36 and Record 24.
Tamit was also part of Ankhpakhered’s family, with whose male members the position of Overseer of mnfrw of Khonsu the Child became more extended during the Libyan Period\textsuperscript{261}. Even though these Overseers might presumably be in charge of a group of male Wet-nurses, certain connectedness between male and female servants must be considered. Furthermore, it is true that the existence of female leading figures cannot be excluded for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty, however, in some ritual contexts, these men might have supervised a group of mnfrwt n ḫnsw pš-hrd themselves.

We should always keep in mind that the women about whom we know the most were from the highest social status and represent a small proportion of the entire population. The pattern of increased participation of women in cult in the early TIP spread to the lower elite echelons and resulted in an exponential expansion of duties. While there is little evidence to point out how exactly one would go about obtaining certain titles, sometimes, established family connections and marriages might explain it; such is the case for the wives or daughters of the HPA’s family, or even for the relatives of high-ranking functionaries or members of prominent lineages in Thebes and Tanis.

In this regard, besides the God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child and two of the three attested Wet-nurses, only one other woman from Chart 4 was linked by family ties with the HPA’s family: the daughter of the Third ḫmr-pš priest of Khonsu Menkheperra (B) (\textit{DB Own. 5}), Gautsoshen (B) (\textit{DB Own. 141})\textsuperscript{262}. As with \textit{DB Own. 4} and 30, \textit{DB Own. 141} served on behalf of Amun and Mut as a Songstresses and Singer of the Choir respectively; however, she bore the title ḫmnmtt

\textsuperscript{261} See p. 69-70 and \textit{DB Own. 134} (Chart 1) as precursor of this title, as well as Chapter 4 for the family of Ankhpakhered.

\textsuperscript{262} See p. 108-109.
n Ḥnsw ḫw-ḥrd instead of mn’t n Ḥnsw ḫw-ḥrd. Moreover, there is evidence of four other Nurses who were part of this group of middling grade servants of Khonsu the Child and whose set of titles accord with Gautsoshen (B)’s.

As well as the aforementioned mnwt and DB Own. 141, these Nurses –most likely three hnmṭt and one hnmṭ– performed musical duties on behalf of Amun and are dated to the second half of the 21st Dynasty. There is no proof that they might have inherited their titles and devotion to Khonsu the Child from their mothers. However, their coffin ensembles and papyri provide relevant genealogical information that points to a service performed by their male relatives within Karnak’s hierarchies. Accordingly, DB Own. 46’s husband and sons were wḥ priests, Scribes of the Divine Offerings of Amun and Chief Lector Priests; the father of DB Own. 40 was it-nṯr mṛy, and some relatives of DB Own. 113 were God’s Fathers, wḥ priests of Amun and Scribes of the Divine Offerings of Amun.

Looking at Chart 4, it is easy to recognise the similarities between DB Own. 111 and 113; both shared the same name, performed similar functions within the Karnak enclosure and their funerary ensembles come from Thebes and are dated back to the late 21st Dynasty-early 22nd Dynasty (DB Doc. 158 and 160). In this regard, Neskhonsu is a very common name during the whole TIP and H. de Meulenaere listed them as two separate Nurses of Khonsu the Child263; therefore, and although it might be tempting, there is no evidence for any kind of connection between these two individuals so far.

In addition, it is necessary to mention that A. Gasse264 designates DB Own. 111 as “Chanteuse d’Amonrasonther et dame du harem (ḥnṛt) de Khonsou

263 de Meulenaere 1982: 29 n. 29.
l’Enfant” and places particular emphasis on this specific role within Khonsu the Child’s personnel; she notes that DB Doc. 158 would be a unique attestation of a member of this child-god’s ḫnrt\(^{265}\) (see Figure 9). Further, this author also underlines how little information we have about Khonsu’s clergy, which was precisely one of the main reasons that led me to conduct this research project.

![Figure 9: Vignette from the funerary papyrus of DB Own. 111 (DB Doc. 158) from Gasse 1993: plate XV](image)

\(^{265}\) As already stated, according to the available data, DB Own. 39 would be the only other member of Khonsu’s Musical Troupe for the 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty; however, she was most likely wrt ḫnrt of the main form of the god, Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep.
Whether DB Own. 111 might be considered a ḫnrt or a ḫnut –uncertainties still remain in view of H. de Meulenaere’s and A. Gasse’s aforementioned publications as well as the confusing reading of her title–, the correspondence between the priestly functions performed by Nurses and Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child, and the subsequent correspondence between their rank and position in Egyptian society, is manifested.

Although it may be a basic understanding of the divisions of levels of Khonsu’s female personnel –which would need further refinement in light of additional titles or new knowledge about sacerdotal functioning and positions–, on the basis of the available sources, it is quite reasonable to propose that a category of leading mwt-nṯr n ḫnsw pꜣ-ḥrd, who additionally played an essential role as ḫmt-nṯr priestesses and Stewards of Amun, Mut and/or Khonsu in Thebes, outranked and supervised a lower status of servants composed by mnwṯt and ḫnutwt n ḫnsw pꜣ-ḥrd, who also held musical titles on behalf of Amun and Mut.

While the relationship between the wives of kings and HPAs, the prominent position of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child and the development of the mammisiac religion is clear, this group of lower-ranking personnel may shed some light on this topic too.

In addition to the mammisiac cult of the goddess Isis at Abydos by at least the Ramesside Period, H. de Meulenaere suggested that inscriptionsal evidence attests another mammisiac cult in association with Mut emerging in Thebes in the TIP\textsuperscript{266}. Furthermore, he proposed the southern Karnak Temple A as the logical candidate for a birth-house dated back to the beginning of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty.

\textsuperscript{266} de Meulenaere 1982. See also p. 22-23 and n. 54 above.
Although F. Daumas previously argued against this argument\textsuperscript{267}, prosopographical material along with the temple’s location, orientation and decorations support the identification of Temple A as a \textit{pr-ms}. In this regard, Brooklyn Museum’s Mut Expedition at the site –directed by R. Fazzini– has yielded more relevant data for this interpretation demonstrating the high likelihood of the existence of a birth-house dating back to this dynasty within Mut’s Precinct, while Temple A’s functioning as a \textit{mammisi} during the 25\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty seems already unquestionable\textsuperscript{268}.

Among the written arguments which tend to prove the existence of a Theban \textit{mammisiac} cult of Mut by the time under study, H. de Meulenaere included the appearance of the designation “\textit{Mwt m pr-ms}” in titles\textsuperscript{269} and as a female proper name\textsuperscript{270}. Besides, the attestation of men and women performing priestly titles as \textit{imy-r mn\textsuperscript{r}yw n Hnsw p3-hrd} and \textit{hnmtt n Hnsw p3-hrd} respectively was seen as a reflection of the increasing cult of Mut as a Goddess-Mother.

Concerning H. de Meulenaere’s second argument, he referred to few examples of Overseers of Wet-nurses and Nurses of Khonsu the Child\textsuperscript{271}. The members of Ankhpakhered’s family, which are dated back to the Libyan period, are the individuals underlined by him, not Bennebenshauenu (\textit{DB Own. 134}) –\textit{imy-r}

\textsuperscript{267} See Daumas 1958: 45-54, where he also suggests that Temple A may have been a bark temple of Khonsu the Child.


\textsuperscript{269} de Meulenaere 1982: 28 n. 20. See also Naguib 1990: 53-54, where three female servants of Mut of the \textit{mammisi} are listed, all three from Bab el-Gasus cache: Maachytokebet, who was \textit{hsyt st n pr ms st lp-ib m phr(t) hmwt(t)}; a daughter of Istemkhheb (D) (\textit{DB Own. 35}), Herouben (\textit{DB Own. 139}), was \textit{hnmt-nyr 2-nw n Mwt n pr ms}; and Tashedkhonsu, the \textit{hnmt-nyr n Mwt n pr ms} mentioned by H. de Meulenaere too.

\textsuperscript{270} de Meulenaere 1982: 28 n. 22.

\textsuperscript{271} de Meulenaere 1982: 29 n. 29.
mn\textsuperscript{\textdegree}yw n Hnwsw p3-hrd and \textit{hmnty} n Hnwsw p3-hrd\textsuperscript{272}–, Tamit –\textit{imy-r mn\textsuperscript{\textdegree}wt n Hnwsw p3-hrd}– or our three 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty \textit{mn\textsuperscript{\textdegree}wt} (DB Own. 4, 30 and 33). As regard the Nurses of Khonsu the Child, he cites both Neskhonsus (DB Own. 111 and 113); however, Gautsoshen (B) (DB Own. 141), Djedmut (DB Own. 46) and Tanedjemmut (DB Own. 40) are not mentioned either.

This set of additional prosopographical material must be considered as further written evidence for the emergence of a mammisiac religion during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty at Thebes. As a result, the existence of a cult of Mut as a Theban Goddess-Mother by this time is reinforced, as well as Temple A’s function as an early local birth-house. Moreover, the documentation of 17 women constituting different levels of the personnel of Khonsu the Child and Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep –including both ruling class and lesser elite individuals– draws the attention to the noteworthy role played by the offspring of Amun in the official theology.

Without entering into the assessment of the different natures of Temple A and the analysis of the birth-related scenes, this temple was definitely associated with Khonsu p3-hrd one way or another\textsuperscript{273}, as most likely were his aforementioned servants. Even if Temple A might not have been dedicated to Khonsu the Child, the ritual and cultic connection between him and these women appear to be in accord

\textsuperscript{272} In V. Laurent’s compilation of \textit{hmntyw} (1984: 155), she suggests that the Feeders of child deities were fairly commonly \textit{hm-nfr} priests too. In this regard, DB Own. 134 was not a \textit{hm-nfr} priest, even though he bore many different sacerdotal offices. However, looking at the Serapeum wooden stelae, at least two other \textit{hmntyw n Hnwsw p3-hrd} are attested for the 22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty, being both of them \textit{hm-nfr} priests of different gods, including once of Khonsu the Child: DB Own. 85 and 84, possibly father and son. See Vandier 1966: 69-70 for a brief comment on the Memphite cult of Khonsu; see also DB Doc. 151, another stela from the Serapeum.

\textsuperscript{273} As noted in the article of R. Fazzini and J. van Dijk (2007: 12), “Child-gods often do not have their own temples but are worshipped together with their mothers in a mammisi”. See also Fazzini and Peck 1981: 125 or Fazzini 1996: 115.
with Mut’s presence and importance in the temple as does its function as a mammisi—or as an early mammisi which differs in plan from the later structures—, a type of temple in which the repeating birth of a god was celebrated (see Figure 10).

Figure 10: Aerial view of Mut Precinct from Fazzini 2008: Fig. 1

It seems beyond dispute that Temple A had been a mammisi since the 25th Dynasty, when the temple was completely rebuilt—possibly by Taharqa and Shabaka—and brought into Mut’s precinct. At that time, this structure, which celebrated the birth of Khonsu and of the king himself, identified with this child deity, was devoted to mammisiac royal renewal and justification. As proposed by R. Fazzini, it served as an important Kushite religious and political counterpoint to

274 For the inscriptional material that supports Mut’s presence in Temple A, see Fazzini and Peck 1981: 124.
the Lake Edifice of Taharqa by the sacred lake of the Amun precinct at Karnak, which had strong links to solar-Osirian ideas of divine and royal renewal. Therefore, its growth and inclusion within Mut’s precinct by those Kushite kings is presumably a reflection of the Temple A’s transformation from the Temple of Millions of Years into a structure devoted to divine and royal rebirth.\(^2\)

The germ of Temple A’s new function as an early local birth-house takes its origin further back, to the outset of the TIP. R. Fazzini states that “The rise of both mammisiaci and the solar-Osirian ritual of Djeme began no later than late 20\(^{th}\) Dynasty, which is the time by which Temple A appears to have changed from Temple of Millions of Years of Ramesses II to a mammisi.”\(^3\) As well as the Kushite kings’ attempt to associate themselves with the divine child of Amun and Mut, the influential HPA might probably have pursued the goal of legitimacy by these means among others. Rituals celebrating the birth of a child god, with whom any king could be identified, took place in Temple A; any king could be identified with Khonsu and, hence, any HPA might have proclaimed his right to the Theban rule as the offspring of Amun too.\(^4\)

In this regard, the aforementioned prosopographical evidence is a sound argument to support this idea. The prominent role played by some women from the HPA’s family—tied to the cult of the Theban triad and Khonsu the Child—must be considered part of the evolution of the mammisiaci religion; their leading function as God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child supports the existence of a change in the temple’s significance and a possible theological shifting with the aim of securing a line of succession. Additionally, as well as the noteworthy cultic role of some

---

\(^2\) The Servants of Khonsu and the 21\(^{st}\) Dynasty

\(^3\) The Highest Levels: from Thebes to Tanis

\(^275\) E.g. Fazzini 2007\(^2\): 4-6, 2008\(^1\): 69 n.  7 and 2010: 14.

\(^276\) See Fazzini 2007\(^2\): 4-6 and references.

\(^277\) Naguib 1990: 53-54.
women, R. Fazzini asserted that the evolution of the mammisiac religion before the Late Period resulted in the appearance of females in scenes of types not previously attested, such as: a tomb representation where a priestess is depicted suckling a child, or the one in DB Doc. 161, where queen Nedjemet (DB Own. 38) carries an infant before Mut accompanied by her daughter, DB Own. 39.

To summarise, the female personnel of Khonsu the Child must necessarily be seen in context with the development of the birth doctrine and Temple A’s function as an early mammisi; besides, they were possibly associated with the cult of Mut or Mut from the mammisi in some way. The 17 attested women, comprising head priestesses and women of lower social standings, participated in the official theological culture serving in the priesthood of both male and female deities including Khonsu and Khonsu the Child. They engaged in a political and religious revaluation and promotion of the Theban triad and child gods to reinforce the southern government; these women performed sacerdotal duties for different gods at Karnak, therefore, they took part in the lively traffic that might have existed within its different precincts, cults and hierarchies.

---

278 Fazzini 2002: 360.
279 See n. 251.
280 See p. 100 (DB Doc. 161).
2.2.2. THE NORTHERN COUNTERPART: THE TANITE CULT OF THE THEBAN TRIAD DURING THE REIGN OF PSUSENNES I (C. 1039-991 BCE)

Even though this dissertation is focused on the Theban cult of the different forms of the god Khonsu, the material record forces us to pay special attention to the northern part of the country. By the 21st Dynasty, Tanis was a sort of northern Thebes, whose kings were devoted supporters of Amun; it was both a replica and a rival of Thebes and the Theban Amun, Mut and Khonsu turned precisely into its main deities. Furthermore, the adoption of the title of HPA by Psusennes I—not only before his cartouche but even as a praenomen—, the more concrete evidence of his building-works within the Amun precinct and even his royal titulary\(^\text{281}\) indicate the increasing importance of the Theban triad in Tanis\(^\text{282}\). The great temple, that of Amun, might have been surrounded by different shrines dedicated to Mut and Khonsu too\(^\text{283}\).

\(^{281}\) Psusennes I’s titulary links him directly with Thebes: \textit{k3-nht m-dd-lmn wsr-f3w sh'y-m-\textit{W}st} (Horus name); \textit{wr-mnw-m-lpt-swt nb-phty-wf-t3wy-wsh-nswyt-m\textit{r}-m-pt} (Nebty name); and \textit{Ps-sbs-hf'y-n-niwt} (Birth name). As noted by J. Lull (2006: 145-146), these Theban connotations are not unusual considering that many different kings included Thebes in their names too; however, I think it is important to point this fact out. In this regard, K. A. Kitchen notes that “The new pharaoh followed the imperial style in his titulary, but with a strongly ‘Amunist’, even Theban, tone (2004: 262). This author also states that “Twice, his nomen appears in the form of ‘Ramesses-Psusennes, Beloved of Amun’, while his son, prince Ankhefenmut C, was more fully styled ‘Ramesses-Ankhefenmut’” (Kitchen 2004: 263).


\(^{283}\) Goyon 2004: 53 and Kitchen 2004: 268. In this line, K. Kitchen (2004: 429 n. 35) also suggests that Shoshenk V seems to have built a whole chapel or temple for Khonsu; additionally, the same author provides more examples for the cult of the Theban triad during Ptolemaic times (Kitchen 2004: 429-430). See also Dodson 2012: xx Map 4.
A. Leahy suggested that the temples and cult at Tanis rapidly replicated Thebes’ preeminence and “Provided an alternative venue for the continuation of the cult of Amun, and eliminated dependence on Thebes and its priesthood”284. Without getting into an assessment of the relationships between north and south at that time, at a practical level, those institutions needed personnel; besides the servants of Amun, this situation most certainly affected the servants of Mut and Khonsu too. Within this context, a well-established priesthood of the Theban triad in Tanis is to be expected, including servants of Khonsu in his several forms, as already mentioned in the previous chapters.

In this regard, there exists of course an archaeological bias between north and south; destruction of sites has been far greater in the Delta than in the Thebaid. The private necropolis of Tanis has never been found and the remains are strictly limited to one burial inside NRT III and the reused blocks forming the royal tomb of Shoshenk III (NRT V), which seem to have been part of two or three other groups of elite burials285. Even so, the prosopographical material documents a few servants of Khonsu and Khonsu the Child in Tanis; there is evidence of some members of the royal family and very few courtiers –all of them connected to the Tanite kings in some way, particularly to Psusennes I– who performed sacerdotal duties on behalf of Khonsu.

The female servants attested in Tanis, that is DB Own. 37, 44 and 138 and DB Rel. 63, were already briefly analysed in the previous section and included in Chart 4. The Queen Mutnedjemet (DB Own. 44), wife of Psusennes I, was mwt-ntr n Ḥnsw ps-hrd after his mother, the wife of Pinudjem I, Henuttauy (A)

284 Leahy 1985: 52.
(DB Own. 37), like Psusennes’ daughter, the princess Isetmkheb (C) (DB Own. 138).

DB Own. 37’s exceptional status can be gauged by the quantity of titles she bore and the richness of her funeral furniture from the Royal Cache. A gold vessel of Psusennes I, inscribed for both mother and son, is the only evidence of the Devotee of Hathor Henuttauy (A) remembered as a Khonsu servant in Tanis (DB Doc. 60\(^{286}\)); her title of \textit{mwt-nTr n Ḥnsw} appears inside a cartouche (see Figure 11).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\linewidth]{figure11.png}
\caption{Picture of DB Doc. 60, from Cernival & Yoyotte 1987: 229 fig. 72}
\end{figure}

\(^{286}\) Following D. A. Aston (2009: 41), I am quoting P. Montet’s inventory numbers prefixed by the letter M for easy reference. See PDB.
Her positions as ḫm-t-ntr priestess of Amun, Mut and Khonsu, Steward of both Mut and Khonsu, Great Singer of Amun, Mut and Khonsu and Chief of the Wet-nurses of Mut point to the extent to which the ruling Theban house might have spread its power within the different cults of the triad. Further, and leaving aside the controversy about her genealogy and ramesside lineage\textsuperscript{287}, Henuttauy (A) embodied a connection between the Delta and family of the HPA; she equally reinforced the legitimacy of the southern rulers and enhanced the influence of the Tanite dynasty. In this regard, she played a pivotal role for understanding of the figures of Psusennes I and Queen Mutnedjemet (\textit{DB Own. 44}) and the establishment of the cults of the Theban Amun, Mut and Khonsu at Tanis.

As above mentioned\textsuperscript{288}, as part of the development of the mammisiac religion, the women of the royal and HPA’s families assisted to the growth of the cult of the Theban triad and the child gods. In this regard, Queen Mutnedjemet played a prominent cultic role on behalf of the offspring of Amun and Mut, as God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, but also on behalf of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. Her constellation of benefits was mainly based on the cult of the Theban Amun, Mut and Khonsu at Tanis. \textit{DB Own. 44} was the head of Amun’s ḫmr and God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, as well as Second ḫm-ntr priest of Amun, ḫm-t-ntr priestess of both Mut and Khonsu and Steward of the Domain of Mut in the northern capital. Having in mind the string of benefits held by her Theban counterparts –i.e. the wives of the HPAs–, the resemblances are obvious. Such parallelism in titles between Thebes and Tanis may most likely indicate a similar organisation of the priesthood; while it is true that it also evidences a strong


\textsuperscript{288} See previous subsection and Berlandini 1979: 103.
political statement with regards to the Theban rulers and their influence—beyond the assumed fluid relationships between both halves of the country at that time.

As well as Psusennes I and Mutnedjemet one of the chief celebrants of Amun’s cult in Tanis was their son Ankhefenmut (C), who was well-established in the realm of the official cults as Steward of Amun and Chief Steward of the Cattle of Amun289. As already stated, the Queen was also the head of Mut and Khonsu’s hierarchies, and Istemkheb (C) (DB Own. 138) was entitled in Tanis as God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child. However, as for Henuttauy (A), Istemkheb (C)’s title of God’s Mother is attested exclusively by a bowl inscribed for her father and for her from NRT III (Figure 12). Having in mind that DB Own. 138 was also married to the HPA Menkheperra, he might have exercised her sacerdotal functions both in Tanis or in Thebes.

Figure 12: DB Doc. 192: left picture from Stierlin & Ziegler 1987: 68 (50) and right drawing from Montet 1951: 101 Fig. 42

In addition to Psusennes I’s wife, who represented the head of the sacerdotal and administrative hierarchies in the capital, the prosopographical information

related to Khonsu’s servants in Tanis can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Despite these circumstances, it can be assumed that other queens might have also played a similar role within the cultic sphere in the same way that, for instance, Amenemope adopted the title of HPA in Tanis as his father and predecessor\textsuperscript{290}.

The unique example of an elite woman serving Khonsu in Tanis that I have found is \textit{DB Rel. 63}; unlike what happened in Thebes, where most of the attested women were Nurses or Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child, Irymutpanefer was \textit{ḥryt šmʾyw t n Ḫns w m Wst Nfr-ḥtp}. She is the only known example of Songstress of Khonsu\textsuperscript{291} and provides us with evidence for the existence of an organisation of Songstresses of Khonsu, at least during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty at Tanis. Notwithstanding this woman, unfortunately, as far as lower levels of the female cult of Khonsu and Khonsu the Child are concerned, the lack of data is a severely limiting factor in reconstructing the functioning of the Tanite institutions.

\textit{DB Own. 42 – DB Rel. 63}’s father– was a high dignitary of Psusennes I. The document that attests Irymutpanefer’s titles is precisely his father’s statue of Osiris (\textit{DB Doc. 74})\textsuperscript{292}: besides \textit{šmʾyt} of Amun and Singer of the Choir of Mut, she was the only royal \textit{mnʾt} attested for this dynasty\textsuperscript{293}. In this concern, it is quite likely that the high rank of his father was transposed into her, who was closely connected to the palace\textsuperscript{294}. His father’s influence in the court must have been quite significant and it might have determined her daughter’s marriage to \textit{DB Rel. 62} too. Both

\textsuperscript{290} Kitchen 2004: 272.
\textsuperscript{291} \textit{DB Own. 37} and \textit{DB Own. 34} were both part of the group of \textit{ḥsywt} of Amun, Mut and Khonsu; neither of them was a \textit{šmʾyt}.
\textsuperscript{292} K. A. Kitchen notes that “As both father and daughter are mention in matching texts by her husband (\textit{DB Rel. 62}), one may suggest that they died about the same date, being jointly commemorated on the one monument” (2004: 265 n. 128).
\textsuperscript{293} See p. 141 n. 253.
\textsuperscript{294} von Kaenel 1984: 36.
**DB Own. 42** and **DB Rel. 62** are two of the four male servants of Khonsu attested in Tanis (Chart 5).

### Chart 5: Male servants of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and Khonsu the Child in Tanis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Own. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Khonsu titles</th>
<th>Other titles</th>
<th>Provenance (documents)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Wn-ðbðw-n-Ddt</td>
<td>•hm-ntr n Hns w</td>
<td>imy-r hmw-ntrw nbw; hm-ntr Wn-dðbðw-n-Ddt n pr Wsir nb Ddt; imy-r mš; wr imy-r mš h3wyty n3 pðtyw pr-rž hnh wðs snb; ury-pf, ḫṣty-c; it-ntr mry; sḏṣwyty bity; imy-r smrw wfw</td>
<td>NRT III, Tanis</td>
<td>Psusennes I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ʿnh.f-n-ʾlmn</td>
<td>(father of DB Rel. 63 and father-in-law of DB Own. 62)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NRT V and Tanis</td>
<td>Psusennes I/ Amenemope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>S(y)z</td>
<td>(husband of DB Rel. 63 and son-in-law of DB Own. 42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanis</td>
<td>Psusennes I/ Amenemope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Own. No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Khonsu titles</td>
<td>Other titles</td>
<td>Provenance (documents)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ssw-pr-ες-m-bsh-\textsuperscript{ε} Hmn</td>
<td>\textsuperscript{ε}imy-r hwt-nbw n lmn Mwt ḫnsw</td>
<td>it-ntr n (\textsuperscript{ε}lmn-Rc nsw ntrw; \textsuperscript{ε}imy-r pr; \textsuperscript{ε}imy-r pr-hd n nb tsyw</td>
<td>Tanis</td>
<td>Psusennes I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DB Own. 42**’s stela with a statue of Osiris (**DB Doc. 74**) and the blocks of his tomb reused in the construction of NRT V\textsuperscript{295} provide us with several pieces of genealogical and biographical information that attests the highest distinction attained by Ankhefenamun’s family, whose members were in the service of Psusennes I, and probably his two predecessors\textsuperscript{296}. Ankhefenamun was Superintendent of the Chamberlains of Pharaoh after his father, called Nesamun and probably native of Thebes\textsuperscript{297}; consequently, they were in charge of the guard and protection of the king\textsuperscript{298}. Additionally, **DB Own. 42** was a ḫm-ntr priest of Amun from an unknown location called Khapu, as well as w\textsuperscript{θ} b priest of Amun and God’s Father of Mut.

While Irymutpanefer did not perform any priestly duties on behalf of Khonsu the Child, his father was Scribe of the Temple of Khonsu the Child, the

\textsuperscript{295} For these blocks, see Montet 1960: 81-85.

\textsuperscript{296} Kitchen 2004: 265.

\textsuperscript{297} L. Habachi (1947: 276-277) stated that the Tanite kings might have encouraged some of the big families of Upper Egypt to settle in some towns of the Delta; on the basis of Ankhefenamun family’s titles, the author suggested that such possibly might have happened to this family. Based on the epithet “Justified before all the gods of Thebes”, he also suggested a special connection between Thebes and Ankhefenamun’s father, Nesamun, who might have been living in Thebes before emigrating to Tanis (1947: 276-277). In this concern, K. A. Kitchen (2004: 266 n. 129) notes that Nesamun was possibly a Theban by origin for the same reason.

\textsuperscript{298} von Kaenel 1984: 34 n. 10.
Very Great First Child of Amun. This function has no parallels in Thebes; although no more priestly or administrative titles are documented so far –besides, of course, the head of the female hierarchy, the God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child–, this demonstrates the existence of a Tanite temple dedicated to this child deity by this time. In this regard, P. Montet\textsuperscript{299} suggested that he was High $h\text{m-n} tr$ priest of Khonsu the Child, probably based on his reading of \textit{DB Doc. 73} (Figure 13 left side), which is the only block among the more than 200 blocks recovered from his tomb that attest \textit{DB Own. 42}’s title on behalf of this form of the god Khonsu. However, according to the text of his statue (Figure 13 right side), which evidences his scribal duty on behalf of Khonsu the Child, Ankhefenamun is nowadays generally referred to just as $s\check{s}$ ($n$) $h\text{wt-n} tr$ $n$ $\text{H}nsw$ $ps$-$\text{hrd}$ $\frac{53}{3}$ $w$ $t$ $p$ $y$ $n$ $\text{Imn-Rc}$ $nsw$ $ntrw$\textsuperscript{300}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image6.png}
\end{center}
\caption{on the left, \textit{DB Doc. 73}, fragment of Fig. 1 from von Känel 1987: 53; on the right, inscriptions on the statue’s right (\textit{DB Doc. 74}), from Jansen-Winkeln 2007\textsuperscript{1}: 69}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{299} Montet 1960: 87.

\textsuperscript{300} Habachi 1947; von Känel 1984: 34; and Kitchen 2004: 226.
Moreover, in line with *DB Doc. 74*’s inscriptions, L. Habachi proposed that Ankhefenamun might have also been God’s Father of Khonsu; according to this author, “The title ‘the divine father’ can be taking as referring to the god Khonsu mentioned afterwards in connection with the title ‘scribe of the temple of Khonsu’”301 (see the highlighted text of the right side of Figure 13). This proposal is quite reasonable when looking at the priestly titles borne by *DB Own. 42*; his service to Amun, Mut and Khonsu as God’s Father and ḫm-nṯr and ḫwḥ priest evidence his close connection with the cult of the Theban triad in the capital.

On the other hand, *DB Rel. 62* seems to have continued along the same career lines as Ankhefenamun. He was already an important man of state in his own right, as suggested by F. von Känel302; nevertheless, K. Kitchen also considers the possibility that he might have gained his high office of Superintendent of Granaries of the Pharaoh after his marriage to the daughter of Psusennes I’s Chief Chamberlain, who was also a royal mnḥt303. In any case, *DB Rel. 62*’s presumed rank seems quite likely, while it is true that his close bonds with the reigning house through, for instance, a service in charge of the funerary chapel of the king might have been reinforced –or even initially promoted– by the union with this influential family304.

Regarding the sacerdotal functions of Irymutpanefer’s husband, the gods Amun and Khonsu occur in his titles: he was God’s Father of Amun as well as of

---

301 Habachi 1947: 264 section “b”.
302 von Känel 1984: 36.
Khonsu. Therefore, and even though *DB Rel. 62* was not serving the goddess Mut, the members of Ankhefenamun’s family were closely linked to the cult of the Theban triad in Tanis by this time.

Along the same lines, another important member of Psusennes I’s government was involved in the Tanite cult of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep: the General Wendjebauendjedet (*DB Own. 41*). His case is particularly impressive because of his many funerary goods and the location of his burial (Chamber 4), right next to the king’s burial chamber (Figure 14).

![Figure 14: Plan of the Tanite royal necropolis with the burials of *DB Own. 41* (at the bottom) and of Psusennes I (at the top) marked in yellow (image from Goyon 2004:109)](image-url)
Furthermore, *DB Own. 41*’s high military and religious positions are numerous and of great importance (see Chart 5). In addition to being head administrator of the Domain of Khonsu –the same office performed by the prince Ankhefenmut (C) but on behalf of Amun–, he hold the positions of ḫm-nṯr priest of Khonsu and of Khonsu-Ra, Lord of Thebes\(^{305}\). These titles are attested within the decoration of his burial chamber (*DB Doc. 61*) and by 13 objects of his funerary ensemble\(^{306}\); they were not only found inside the burial chamber, but also from the antechamber of NRT III. This corpus consists of a wooden coffin, a silver coffin, canopic jars and ushabtis, as well as silver and golden bowls and pieces of jewellery: *DB Doc. 62-72, 193* and *194*.

Wendjebauendjedet’s appointments as General and Army Leader of the Pharaoh and Superintendent of the ḫm-nṯr priests of All the Gods are recurrent within these funerary goods. However, it is revealing that his functions on behalf of Khonsu occur together with or instead of the one of General on inscriptions on smalls documents, where the space is very limited; for instance, in his two sets of ushabtis (*DB Doc. 65* and *66*) and his golden ring (*DB Doc. 67*), he is identified as General, High Steward of Khonsu and/or simply Steward of Khonsu. Moreover, in some cases, his attachment to Khonsu’s personnel is the only biographical information mentioned in the texts, as in a necklace and pectoral containing a scarab (*DB Doc. 68*), a carnelian pendant (*DB Doc. 69*) and a golden tube (*DB Doc. 70*). These facts demonstrate the importance of these functions in *DB Own. 41*’s career and the high status that he might have reached, to a certain extent, thanks to these offices.

\(^{305}\) For the same title in Thebes, see *DB Own. 10* and *52* (Chart 1 and 3 respectively).

\(^{306}\) For a list of the documents found in *DB Own. 41*’s burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.
In this regard, P. Montet\textsuperscript{307} pointed out that the god Khonsu was already worshipped at the region from the end of the Old Kingdom. For this scholar, the relevance of this god may explain the prestige of a servant of Khonsu like \textit{DB Own. 41}. Moreover, Psusennes conceded him the office of Superintendent of the \textit{hm-ntr} priests of All the Gods, which probably entitled him to conduct the daily cult of Amun in the capital as the king’s deputy; a dignity that seems presumably more suitable for the Tanite HPA\textsuperscript{308}.

Even though Khonsu’s previous presence at Tanis must be taking into account, the increasing importance of the cult of the Theban triad and of Khonsu the Child at Thebes by the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty and the parallelism between Tanis and Thebes in this regard are key elements for understanding the position in society of \textit{DB Own. 41}. The available prosopographical data for this Dynasty indicates that serving as a \textit{hm-ntr} priest of Khonsu in Thebes might have been restricted to a certain rank of dignitaries. Both by their role performed in the Khonsu temple and run of titles as well as by their family links, the \textit{hm-ntr} priests of Khonsu seem to belong to a major category of servants of this god. In Tanis, we could be facing the same circumstances, where high elite individuals such as Wendjebauendjedet might have formed the highest echelons of Khonsu’s priestly personnel; besides, there is no evidence of a hierarchical organisation among them by this time, just as there was not such evidence for Thebes until a later time.

In this particular case, the connections between \textit{DB Own. 41} and the royal family are quite feasible when looking at his titles, funerary goods and the place of his burial. Except for a bracelet on which two women are mentioned (M 710), no

\textsuperscript{307} Montet 1951: 187.
\textsuperscript{308} Kitchen 2004: 265 n. 127.
genealogical information is known for Wendjebauendjede\textsuperscript{309}. However, a possible family bond between him and the royal family was proposed by G. P. F. Broekman\textsuperscript{310}; based on a combination of facts that includes the ones mentioned above, he suggests \textit{DB Own. 41}’s likely royal origin in relation to Smendes. In this regard, his own name and his sacerdotal office of \textit{hm-ntr} priest of Osiris at Mendes would denote a connection with the ancient Djedet, from where Smendes also originated. Even though there is no clear evidence to prove this theory, it is true that the high status and influence of \textit{DB Own. 41} would almost certainly go hand-in-hand with a prestigious background; all the privileges that he received might be explained by the royal parentage. Furthermore, it is also consistent that Wendjebauendjede\textsuperscript{3}et was in charge of the Tanite cult of Khonsu, in the same way that Psusennes, Mutnedjemet (\textit{DB Own. 44}) and Ankhefenmut (C) were celebrants of the cults of the Theban triad in Tanis. As in the southern milieu and the HPA’s entourage, the relatives of the king – both men and women – and his closest dignitaries seem to be connected to the highest echelons of the hierarchies of Amun, Mut and Khonsu.

Lastly, the fourth man connected to Khonsu’s personnel in Tanis is \textit{DB Own. 43}. Although his title of \textit{imy-r hwt-nbw n Imn Mwt Hnsw} is only documented by a block-statue (\textit{DB Doc. 75}), he was the owner of another private tomb, whose fragments were reused in the construction of later royal burials\textsuperscript{311}. However, as well as the individuals from Chart 2, he was not just in service of the god under study but of the whole triad; he was Overseer of the Golden Precincts of the Theban triad in Tanis, as well as \textit{DB Own. 19} and \textit{20} were Masters of Secrets  

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{309} For these women and their possible family connection with \textit{DB Own. 41}: Montet 1951: 87.  
\textsuperscript{310} Broekman 1998.  
\textsuperscript{311} See, von Käenel 1984: 42 and 1987: 45 n. 4.}
and *DB Own. 47* was Scribe of the Golden Precincts of Amun, Mut and Khonsu in Thebes. Therefore, this single piece of evidence may indicate the existence of certain administrative or cultic areas where the Tanite servants of Amun, Mut and Khonsu acted together; that is, another likely similarity with what was occurring in Thebes.

In spite of the reduced amount of data, this group of individuals seems to resemble some patterns of organisation and titles attested at Thebes, but on a smaller scale. Both male and female servants of the different forms of Khonsu were prominent individuals of Psusennes I’s court. The new attention being paid to the divine child was represented by the Queen (*DB Own. 44*) as God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child; and although no lower-ranked women are attested by the available sources, a Scribe of the temple of this child deity (*DB Own. 42*) may evidence the existence of a specific building devoted to his worship of this god and its corresponding apparatus. As far as Khonsu in Thebes is concerned, in addition to the above mentioned joint cult of the whole triad, the titles of Steward, God’s Father and *ḥm-ntr* priest (*DB Own. 41 and 42 and *DB Rel* 62) are also represented in Tanis. Further, the service of Khonsu was closely connected with the cult of Amun and Mut; the relationship between their personnel might have been sound and most likely served to reinforce the legitimacy of the northern kings. Obviously, this panorama may change as soon as, for instance, the necropolis of the Tanite nobles is found. The actual knowledge restricts us to a few high elite individuals closely linked to the king. However, it is true that, looking at the southern HPA and how the priesthood of Khonsu developed in accordance with the political milieu, the proposed reconstruction of the organisation of Khonsu’s personnel in Tanis during this period seems quite consistent.
Towards the end of the second millennium BCE, a clear shift had occurred in the way that Egypt was governed: the Upper and Lower Egypt were independently ruled. The country was divided between the line of Smendes I in the North and the HPA in the South, who combined religious functions with military power. The latter exploited the weakness of the royal authority to assume a leading political position in Upper Egypt, which in practice led to the rise of a theocratic dynasty that functioned parallel to the royal one. Although the nature of the relationships between these two lines may have altered significantly over time, it was broadly peaceful. In this regard, the cult of the Theban god Amun was one of the foundations for this mutual agreement.

Amun reigned supreme over all Egypt. Going hand in hand with his undoubted leading role, from the Ramesside Period onwards, the expansion of the worship of the divine triads and the development of the cult of child-gods have been considered evidence of the emergence of the *mammisiac* religion. Consequently, we must necessarily contextualise the increase in priests and officials serving Khonsu during the 21st Dynasty within this theological development. Besides, it needs to be highlighted that this increase has not been studied previously, nor has a comprehensive study of Khonsu’s personnel during the TIP has ever been made.
The theocratic government gave prominence to Mut and Khonsu as consort and heir of Amun respectively; further, this preeminence was reflected in the cultic sphere. J. Berlandini\textsuperscript{312} already called attention to the priestly institution of the God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child, headed by the women of the royal and HPA families. In addition, H. de Meulenaere\textsuperscript{313} referred to a few examples of Overseers of Wet-nurses and Nurses of Khonsu the Child as further evidence for the existence of a mammisiac cult of Mut emerging in Thebes in the TIP. Nevertheless, the thorough examination of the prosopographical record reveals a more complex scene consisting of high and lower-ranking female and male servants of the different forms of the god Khonsu by the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty; these individuals reflect the recently developed religious trends in accordance with the new political situation in Egypt. Moreover, the characteristics and transformations of a group of clergy reflect the changes that occurred in the political and ideological landscape where its servants functioned. Likewise, it is precisely the context and the different degrees of authority and influence exerted over Thebes by the northern and southern rulers which determined the development and role played by the personnel of the god Khonsu during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty.

In Thebes, the HPAs decided to promote the cult of the Theban triad as a means to legitimate their dynasty. By celebrating the birth of a child god— with whom any sovereign could be identified— and promoting his worship, the HPAs proclaimed their right to the rule of Thebes as the offspring of Amun. The worship of Khonsu, the divine heir, both as part of the triad and as an independent child-god,

\textsuperscript{312} Berlandini 1979: 102-109.
\textsuperscript{313} De Meulenaere 1982: 29 n. 29.
was probably used for legitimisation purposes as it emphasised the parallel natures of the divine family and the family of the Theban HPA\textsuperscript{314}.

In this respect, one must also not forget that Herihor and Pinudjem I were both involved in building and decorating works at the Khonsu temple at Karnak. Indeed, the proliferation throughout the remaining source material of Khonsu’s priests and functionaries may have arisen as a consequence of the practical needs of a renewed temple. Further, the building programme undertaken must be seen as a result of a great investment, as a deliberated redirection of human and economic resources to institutions, activities and individuals attached to Khonsu’s cult and religious promotion.

On the other hand, the connection by marriage between the two lines who ruled the country and the devotion to Amun-Ra shown also by the northern kings has led me to pay particular attention to the remaining materials from Tanis. The sovereigns of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty had their capital at Tanis, which was expanded by Smendes and his successors to such an extent that it was regarded as a second Thebes. There is explicit evidence for the existence of an established cult of the Theban Amun, Mut and Khonsu at Tanis, as well as of Khonsu the Child. At least king Psusennes I, who was also HPA in Tanis, seems to have emulated his southern counterparts in this regard; his tomb as well as some elite burials located within the Amun temple enclosure testify to the paramount importance of the devotion shown to Amun-Ra, Mut and Khonsu in the capital city. Although the amount of information from no other location is comparable to that from Thebes, the nature and organisation of these priesthoods in Thebes and Tanis appear similar.

\textsuperscript{314} For instance: Naguib 1990: 53-54 and 207-210; Forgeau 2002: 8.
In any case, at the outset of the TIP the cult of this child-god, either individually or integrated into the Theban triad, gained popularity and quickly amassed a priesthood comprising both men and women. Even though one must remember that the material record is always incomplete and that our hypothesis may therefore be subject to new findings or different interpretations of the existing material, the remaining evidence seems to provide consistent patterns of behaviour and functioning that may have characterised Khonsu’s servants by the 21st Dynasty.

Among these features, one of the most relevant is that the servants of the different manifestations of Khonsu were not exclusively functionaries or priests of a single god but of a wider group of deities. Their set of functions included offices on behalf of other gods, but the worship of the different members of the Theban triad is a common denominator between them: Amun has a constant presence within their titularies and Mut is also quite prominent. Consequently, one cannot comprehend the personnel of Khonsu without having in mind that their members were generally involved in the cult of Amun and Mut. In this context, the PDB becomes an essential working tool to record prosopographical data, providing information on individual monuments and on the frequency with which Khonsu’s related titles are attributed to a single person. Additionally, it also helps in appreciating the relationship between titles cited concurrently, title sequences and transmission of certain offices; moreover, the variation in titles and the contexts where these occurred offers a nuanced approach that helps to understand of the cult and the political and social background in which this was developed.

As expected when considering the development of the birth doctrine and the promotion of the cult of the divine triads, the titularies of the majority of DB Own. and DB Rel. cannot be solely ascribed to the service of Khonsu. Nearly all of them—including the God’s Fathers, ḫprech priests and different kind of scribes (Charts 1),
the servants of the Theban triad (Chart 2), the members of the ḫm-nṯr hierarchy (Chart 3), the female servants of Khonsu (Char 4) and the Tanite individuals (Chart 5)– performed similar-ranking offices connected with the cult and temple administration of other gods of the Theban triad besides Khonsu315. For instance, some God’s Fathers and ḫw b priests of Khonsu were also God’s Father and ḫw b priests of Amun and/or Mut, the ḫm-nṯr priests were also part of the hierarchy of ḫm-nṯr priests of the other gods of the Theban triad, the God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child were Chiefs of the Sacred Musical Troupe of Amun and sometimes ḫmt-nṯr priestesses of Amun, Mut and/or Khonsu, while the Nurses and Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child were Songstresses of Amun and some of them belonged to the Choir of Mut.

Besides the irrefutable theological connexion, the evidence suggests that there existed a further correspondence between some servants of Amun, Mut, Khonsu and Khonsu the Child. The bonds between these gods transcended the religious sphere and are manifested at a more practical level of the temple functioning and ritual. A priest could have several offices and incomes in different temples; beyond personal devotion or familial connections and traditions, other factors determined an individual’s career. In this case, the religious connexions between the gods of the triad –including the different forms of the god Khonsu– and the physical proximity of their temples and sanctuaries definitely determined their corresponding cultic institutions316. Once a priest or scribe reached certain degree of initiation after being trained, it would not be unexpected that he might served in different precincts and areas at Karnak, possibly on a rotational basis. He might be

315 DB Own. 22, 27, 112 and 45 were only servants of Khonsu.
316 Similarly, the inclusion or construction of a temple inside a sacred enclosure was not decided at random either.
appointed to or promoted to civil and sacerdotal duties depending on the necessary expertise and the temples’ requirements at certain periods.

Using the example of the office of *it-ntr n ḫnsw (m Wsdst Nfr-ḥtp)*, which is the most frequently occurring Khonsu title attested by the prosopographical record during the 21st Dynasty, one may notice that some titles often occur in combination. Individuals such as *DB Own. 7* or *DB Own. 31* held the positions of God’s Father of Amun and Mut too. However, this was not a fixed combination; among this corpus there are God’s Fathers of Khonsu and Amun (*DB Own. 28*), *wꜣb* priests of Khonsu who were God’s Fathers of Amun (*DB Own. 6*), and *wꜣb* priests of Amun who were neither *wꜣb* priests or God’s Fathers of Khonsu but Scribes of his temple (*DB Own. 9*), etc. Although these individuals usually might have performed duties on behalf of Khonsu, Amun and Mut during their lifetime—maybe at the same time or consecutively—, they can still be considered as an independent personnel or priesthood of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep or of Khonsu the Child; these institutions were characterised by the existence of specific ritual duties, with servants involved in the cult of their corresponding deities in their temples. Therefore, while the close liaison of the servants of Khonsu with Amun and Mut remained essential, Karnak may be seen as a hierarchical administrative and religious unit where various sacerdotal hierarchies and institutions must have existed, and whose members moved from one temple to another.

On the other hand, the existence of individuals who performed offices characterised by the simultaneous inclusion of the three gods of the triad points to an overlap in certain ritual and administrative roles at Karnak. There were specific areas of the cult, rituals or more mundane tasks connected to Amun, Mut and Khonsu that required a coordinated joint action; as a consequence, some individuals operated in the name of the Theban triad on specific occasions. This may have
applied to some building assignments, musical duties, the office of Master of Secrets and Chamberlain or the counting of the cattle and the offerings for the aforementioned three gods (see DB Own. 23 and 17 from Chart 1, Chart 2, DB Own. 37 and 34 from Chart 4 and DB Own. 43 from Chart 5). These sacerdotal and administrative titles reinforce the connection between these priesthoods: not only a lively traffic of servants among the different domains of the gods of the Theban triad can be suggested, but the cults of Amun, Mut and Khonsu shared competences concerning some sectors or spheres too, both at Thebes and at Tanis.

Moreover, in the context of a theocratic state of Amun, the existence of a hierarchical organisation that was concerned with the Theban triad’s personnel needs to be considered. The religious preeminence of Amun-Ra is consistent with a certain degree of subordination of Khonsu’s servants –and most likely Mut’s– to the clergy of Amun. This fact would explain why there appears to have been no head of the clergy of Khonsu and, why the high functionaries are poorly attested, and why the administration of Khonsu’s domain in Karnak was under the supervision of some of the women of the HPA. During the 21st Dynasty, the HPA’s control encompassed all the potential spheres of influence to maintain the balance of power within Karnak and in Thebes. His authority might definitely have conflicted with other positions of power; so, maybe, higher cultic roles were not even conceivable at Thebes\textsuperscript{317}. Besides, leading functions such as that of Third $hmn$-ntr priest of Khonsu only appear at the end of the dynasty, when some concessions were made to a few elite families and the northern monarchs were documented at Thebes; a developed hierarchy of $hmn$-ntr priests of Khonsu had no place before this date.

\textsuperscript{317} At least from Herihor up to Menkheperra.
In the same way, the existence of groups of clergy that, to a certain extent, depended on Karnak’s central administration –i.e. that were under the supervision and control of the HPA– may well explain why most of the funerary goods of the priests of Khonsu come from Bab el-Gasus: a cache traditionally linked to the priesthood of Amun\textsuperscript{318}. The Theban priests and priestesses buried in the cemeteries of Deir el-Bahri were all devoted to Amun; however, there were servants of Mut, Khonsu and Khonsu the Child among them. It is true that there might have existed more servants of Khonsu by the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty; nevertheless, while other burials of priests and officials have vanished or have not been found so far, in my opinion there might be no reason for a cache of priests of Khonsu or Mut. The growth in power of the Theban Amun priesthood and the transformation of the temple of Amun-Ra into the capital of a theocratic state determined the development of any other cults at Thebes; an example is Khonsu’s cult, whose main centre of worship was inside Amun’s precinct and which, as a result, was under the direct jurisdiction of the HPA.

In view of the foregoing, one cannot fully appreciate the role played by the servants of Khonsu in isolation from the servants of their close companions Amun and Mut. The theological link between the gods of the triad, the location of their temples and the titularies of their functionaries reinforce the connection between their personnels. Further, one must necessarily contextualise the increasing number of these individuals having in mind the beginning of the mammisiac religion and its implications, as well as the promotion of the cult of divine triads and Amun’s supreme government. Nevertheless, based on the corpus of genealogical and biographical data collected in this thesis, it is possible to offer an explanation of the modus operandi of the personnel of the different forms of Khonsu.

\textsuperscript{318} See Sousa 2014 for a recent review of this idea.
The following pages aim to summarise the characteristics of each of these priesthoods in Thebes and in Tanis. The internal structure of the institution and the set of functions performed on behalf of each one of the forms of Khonsu are outlined below:

I. Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep

The available prosopographical data for the 21st Dynasty indicate that serving as a $\text{hm-ntr}$ priest of Khonsu might have been restricted to a certain rank of dignitaries, who most likely formed a major category of servants of this god above the God’s Fathers and $\text{w$q^h$}$ priests. The run of titles of these few men and women, as well as their familial connections, position them as the uppermost levels of the religious authority at Khonsu’s temple, both in Thebes and Tanis.

Even though DB Own. 21 cannot be certainly identified with Herihor’s ninth son, he might have played an important role in the procession of the bark of Khonsu, so as to be recorded in the reliefs of the Khonsu temple at Karnak. Hori (DB Own. 8), along with the panoply of $\text{hm-ntr}$ priestly functions on behalf of several deities, was Gods’ Father of Khonsu and Mut as well as $\text{hm-ntr}$ priest of Khonsu; being a son of the HP Menkheperra was most likely a decisive factor when considering his titles. Finally, the Tanite General Wendjebauendjedet (DB Own. 41), who might have had some familial link with the royal line, was in charge of the Tanite cult of Khonsu being $\text{hm-ntr}$ priest and High Steward of Khonsu. The HPA’s family and entourage and the relatives of the northern rulers and their closest dignitaries constituted the highest echelons of the priesthood of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. On the contrary, Herihor (DB Own. 142) was the only ruler who seems
to have held a title within this institution, while he was connected to Khonsu’s service only by a function which refers to his building and restoring activities at the Khonsu temple.

Besides the occasional adoption of kingly status by the Theban HPAs, their most conspicuous mark of high office was their leadership of the priesthood of Amun, which gave them supreme authority over Thebes. It seems quite reasonable that part of their overall control of the South was, to a certain extent, based on a deliberate policy of installing trusted family members or functionaries to certain offices as well as limiting the existence of high-ranking posts that might rival their sovereignty. In this regard, the office of HPA became hereditary; however, there is no evidence for the hereditary succession of the title of *hm-ntr* priest of Khonsu, nor for the existence of a *hm-ntr* priest hierarchy of Khonsu until well into the 21st Dynasty.

Nevertheless, this picture changed after the reign of Menkheperra. Thereafter, the kings Amenemope, Siamun and Osorkon were all documented in Thebes; besides, the HPA Pinudjem II did not adopt any royal attributes, as Herihor, Pinudjem I and Menkheperra had done earlier. K. Jansen-Winkeln suggests that the reign of Amenemope might have signalled a change in the political structure. Further, from about the last decade of the pontificate of Menkheperra, we have more information on the leading priests of Amun in Thebes. The southern rulers did not claim the key-offices of Second, Third and Fourth *hm-ntr* priest of Amun which, from then on, were held by certain families linked by marriage with the

---


320 Before the last years of Menkheperra, some of the few attested leading priests of Amun were: the second son of Herihor –Third *hm-ntr* priest–, a brother of Pinudjem I –Second *hm-ntr* priest– and the relatives of *DB Doc. 4*’s owner –Fourth *hm-ntr* priests. See Broekman 2011: 95.
HPA. As proposed by K. Kitchen, Menkheperra might probably have made some administrative and priestly concessions to the local elite in return for the acceptance of the “acquisition of ‘livings’ by Menkheperra’s family in provinces beyond Thebes”\textsuperscript{321}. This strategy might have been developed by the HPAs to ensure the stability and strength of their rule, or it may be a testament to the increasing power of local elite families at the end of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty.

In my opinion, the greater importance attained by certain local families by the end of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty seems to have been connected to the development of a \textit{hm-ntr} priests’ hierarchy within Khonsu’s personnel. It is not by chance that Menkheperra (B) (\textit{DB Own. 5}), a member of the sacerdotal class that prospered at this time, bore the first attested high sacerdotal office on behalf of Khonsu; it is also probably significant that he was the son of the Fourth and Third \textit{hm-ntr} priests of Amun Tjanefer, linked by marriage with the family of the HP Menkheperra. Menkheperra (B), who might have previously been God’s Father of Khonsu, inherited the office of Third \textit{hm-ntr} priest of Amun from his father and held also the title of Third \textit{hm-ntr} priest of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep.

This office had been hereditary since the transfer of the post to the family of Nespakashuty by the 10\textsuperscript{th} year of Siamun. Already during the Libyan Period, Nespakashuty (ii)’s son and grandson (\textit{DB Own. 50} and 51), inherited it and acquired other high-ranking priestly titles, such as Fourth \textit{hm-ntr} priest of Mut and Third \textit{hm-ntr} priest of Amun. Concerning the latter, it seems that there might have been some link between the posts of the Third \textit{hm-ntr} priests of Amun and Khonsu. Additionally, Nespakashuty’s descendants were placed throughout the Amun

\textsuperscript{321} Kitchen 2004: 276-277.
domain in a wide variety of priestly and administrative offices, including scribal and priestly functions in Karnak such as the office of $\text{hm-ntr}$ priest of Khonsu $\text{wts-h5w}$.

It is an undeniable fact that, by the end of the 21st Dynasty and beginning of the 22nd Dynasty, the notable Theban elite, such as the families of Tjanefer and Nespakashuty, controlled the major positions of the priesthood of Amun, Mut and Khonsu; this is trend that will be seen to continue during the Libyan Period. When the prominent local families came onto the scene, they claimed already-established or new high-ranking offices from the hierarchies of the gods of the Theban triad, through which they extended their influence and grew in power. Indeed, the development of a ranking system among the $\text{hm-ntr}$ priests of Khonsu –and most likely Mut– must be bound together with the needs of a local booming elite. In this regard, Menkheperra (B) and Nespakashuty (ii) must be seen as originators of this situation; from now on, extensive families dominated these Theban priesthood by employing heredity to maintain their positions. Therefore, we gain a more informed understanding of the interplay between elite families and the ruling power, and the acquisition of prominent temple-related positions within the main Theban priesthoods.

In Tanis, we are forced to limit our analysis to the reign of Psusennes I. There is no evidence of a hierarchical organisation among the $\text{hm-ntr}$ priests of Khonsu, while the available evidence may show certain similarities with Thebes: the elite individuals close to the royal family, such as the High Steward of Khonsu Wendjebauendjedet ($\text{DB Own. 41}$), might have formed the highest echelons of Khonsu’s personnel. The king himself was HPA at Tanis, Queen Mutnedjemet ($\text{DB Own. 44}$) was the head of Amun’s $\text{hnrt}$, God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, Second $\text{hm-ntr}$ priest of Amun, $\text{hmt-ntr}$ priestess of Mut and Khonsu and High Steward of Mut, and the prince Ankhefenmut (C) held the office of High Steward of
Amun. Therefore, including *DB Own. 41*, the closest individuals to Psusennes I, who were also intended to be buried next to him in his burial chamber, were the superiors in charge of the Theban triad’s official cults at Tanis.

Moreover, there is evidence for other two *hmt-ntr* priestesses of Khonsu besides Mutnedjemet, both of whom were Steward of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep: *DB Own. 37* and *35*. Henuttauy (A) (*DB Own. 37*) was Pinudjem I’s wife and mother of Mutnedjemet, who inherited some offices such as the aforementioned ones from her, which were held later by Istemkheb (D) (*DB Own. 35*), Menkheperra’ daughter and the wife of the HP Pinudjem II. Although no HPA or Tanite kings held supreme priestly offices among the hierarchies of Mut or Khonsu, their spouses did, including high-posts on behalf of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and Khonsu the Child. In addition to their leading position in Amun’s *hnrt*, they played a leading role in the cult of the triad in Thebes or in Tanis.

The existence of a Theban *hnrt* of Khonsu might be proposed when looking at the title borne by *DB Own. 39*, the daughter of Herihor and Nedjemet (*DB Own. 142* and *38* respectively). Not a single *hryt wrt *hnrt* n *Hnsw* is attested, and neither is there a *smtyt n *Hnsw* at Thebes. However, it is reasonable that, as while a chief High *hm-ntr* priest of Khonsu might rival the supreme authority of the HPA, a *hryt wrt *hnrt* n *Hnsw* would hold a similar status to the feminine counterpart of the HPA, that is to say, the *hryt wrt *hnrt* n *Imn*; while it is true that most of these high elite women had already a significant influence on Khonsu’s domain. S. A. Naguib points out that a high elite woman’s acting as *wrt *hnrt* of a deity might have been determined by her husband’s position^{322}. Therefore, the

---

^{322} Naguib 1990: 201-205.
scarce documentation on ḫmwnṯr priests of Khonsu most likely argues against a larger number of wrt ḫnrṭ of Khonsu; in any case, it may be expected that DB Own. 39 was the wife of one of those ḫmwnṯr priests.

On the other hand, even though at Tanis we have no attestation of a ḫnrṭ of Khonsu, the royal mnṯt Irymutpanefer (DB Rel. 63) —daughter of a high dignitary of the court of Psusennes I (DB Own. 42) who was God’s Father of Khonsu, and spouse of a God’s Father of Khonsu too (DB Rel. 62)— was ḥṛyt šmṯywt n Ḥnsw. Besides šmṯy of Amun and Singer of the Choir of Mut, she fulfilled her service to the Theban triad in the northern capital bearing a title that indicates a ranking system among the Songstresses of Khonsu. Further evidence for an organisation of Songstresses of Khonsu is lacking for the whole TIP.

As can be seen, lower or middle-ranking female servants of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep are quite rare. Nevertheless, among the members of the Theban elite, there is evidence of more than thirty male occupants of minor priestly positions and scribal and administrative duties on behalf of Khonsu. Although it is true that they were not involved in high-ranking offices within Khonsu’s priestly organisation, their titles and funerary equipment suggest that most of them played an important role as regards the sacerdotal and administrative spheres at Karnak. Among the individuals from Chart 1, it should be noted that God’s Father, wrḥ priest and scribal titles such as Regulation Scribe of a Temple, Temple Scribe or Scribe of the Divine Offerings for Amun, Mut and Khonsu323 recurrently appear in conjunction.

---

323 Even though there are only a few individuals who held scribal titles on behalf of Khonsu attested by the inscriptive evidence —see DB Own. 9, 45 and 27—, the office of Scribe recurs frequently in the titularies from Charts 1 and 2.
It is true that this group seems heterogeneous; for instance, the Temple Scribes are considered to have been superior functionaries who kept all the temple accounts and made all the entries in the temple day book\textsuperscript{324}, while serving as a $wrb$ priest has been traditionally seen as a lower rank of priestly officiant below the $\text{hm-ntr}$ priests. Nevertheless, the commonalities between them on the basis of their titulatures suggest that they held a similar cohesive elite status: the similar-ranking duties on behalf of the gods of the Theban triad and of other deities attested at Karnak bound this set of servants together. These men constituted the basis of Khonsu’s temple functioning at Thebes, while they were also part of the staff of the nearby temples.

Therefore, there is here further evidence for the cultic connexion between the servants of the gods of the Theban triad, including lower level servants. It can be proposed that personnel circulated between different monuments, temples and shrines within the larger Karnak complex; the existence of a large community of temple personnel at Karnak who moved through and were not restricted to a single temple defined the nature of Khonsu’s cult. Moreover, this relationship between the gods of the Theban triad and some of their servants appears to be reinforced by the existence of certain administrative and religious functions which involve Amun, Mut and Khonsu, as suggested above. In this regard, Chart 2’ individuals are essential; although they performed some offices that gave them considerable status—mid to upper-level administrative positions such as Overseer of the Recruitment or Head Archivist of the Treasury of Amun’s domain—it is true that they were also $wrb$ priests, God’s Fathers and/or scribes of Amun and Mut.

\textsuperscript{324} See, Blackman 1918\textsuperscript{2}: 138-139 and Payraudeau 2014: 251.
It is also remarkable that one of these God’s Fathers of Khonsu, *DB Own. 29*, seems to have had a closer relationship with the cult of this god bearing the titles *kbhw n Hnsw* and *kbhw n nb Bnnt*. A small handful of men were Libationers of Khonsu during the whole TIP. It is during the 25th Dynasty when the title of Libationer of Khonsu occurs more frequently; indeed, the possible connection between its holders and the priesthood of the Theban god Montu during the Kushite rule cannot be excluded (see Chapter 4 below). However, this potential link between both priesthoods—or at least between some of their servants connected to specific ritual duties— is not documented either during this dynasty or the Libyan Period.

On the other hand, three other male individuals connected to the service of the Theban form of Khonsu at Tanis may support the idea of a correspondence between the personnel of the triad at that site as well, although with reservations because of the limits dictated by the scarce remaining evidence. *DB Own. 43* was Overseer of the Golden Precincts of the Theban triad, which indicates certain administrative or cultic areas where the servants of Amun, Mut and Khonsu acted together at Tanis. Additionally, in responding to the needs of the cult of a god that gained popularity, the aforementioned God’s Fathers of Khonsu *DB Own. 42* and *DB Rel. 62*, father and husband of Irymutpanefer (*DB Rel. 63*), need to be mentioned.

Ankhefenamun’s family had some degree of power and attained high distinction at the court of Psusennes I. Even though Ankhefenamun himself (*DB Own. 42*) was Superintendent of the Chamberlains of Pharaoh, his service to Amun, Mut and Khonsu as God’s Father and *ḥm-ntr* and *wꜣb* priest evidences his close connection with the cult of the Theban triad in the capital. This connection might have determined in some way his daughter’s and son-in-law’s status. Indeed,
one might presume that DB Rel. 62 might have gained his office of Superintendent of Granaries of the Pharaoh after his marriage to Irymutpanefer. Although he might have been already an important man in his own right, his social position was most likely reinforced by his union with this influential family. Furthermore, regarding his sacerdotal functions, he was God’s Father of Amun as well as of Khonsu. The latter title was shared by both father-in-law and son-in-law, so it would not be unreasonable to expect that the marriage with Ankhefenamun’s daughter enabled Sya to flourish in the Amun domain. There is no evidence to prove that he might have inherited this office due to his new family ties, nor that Irymutpanefer was servant of Khonsu because of his father or husband; however, there is no doubt that the positions held by this third generation of the family strengthened its influence.

As regards the hereditary patterns of transmission of the titles of Khonsu’s clergy, DB Own. 14 and DB Rel. 16 attest the unique case of transference on genealogical lines at Thebes: both father and son were God’s Fathers of Amun, of Mut and of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. Given the nature of the source material, the absence of genealogical details in the inscriptive evidence is a common feature for this period. However, as well as using heredity, marriage and nepotism played a role in controlling a range of positions, such as the wives of HPAs and monarchs and the aforementioned members of the Nespakashuty family. One can propose that it may also have played a considerable role in how these low-middle priests and scribes gained their positions in the Khonsu temple, although, as is being proposed, their service to other gods of the triad definitely was a decisive factor in this respect.
II. Khonsu the Child

By the beginning of the 21st Dynasty, the growing importance of the divine child had resulted in his integration into the official pantheon. In responding to the needs of the Theban priesthood, the youngest god of the Theban triad characterised as \( p\text{3-hrd} \) became the beneficiary of a new cult that developed its own personnel, which was led by the God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child who supervised a group of female subalterns; there were also a few male servants and functionaries who seem to have been part of the same institution. Furthermore, the remaining inscriptive evidence from Tanis suggests the existence of a similar organisation at least by the reign of Psusennes I.

As stated in the previous section, the superiors of Amun’s \( h\text{nrt} \) Henuttawy (A) (DB Own. 37), Mutnedjemet (DB Own. 44) and Istemkheb (D) (DB Own. 35) performed high-ranking sacerdotal duties on behalf of the three gods of the Theban triad at Thebes and at Tanis. Within the context of the theocratic government, these three women were also God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child, a priestly title throughout which they gained more benefits and prestige evoking a ritual cosmogonic maternity of the divine heir. They shared their devotion to the child form of Khonsu with three more women from the HPA’s family, who held also the position of (\( h\text{rtyt} \) wrt \( h\text{nrt} \) (tpyt) n ‘lmm) and some other functions on behalf of Amun and Mut such as \( h\text{rtyt} \ mn^w\text{wt} n \text{Mwt} \), \( h\text{sy}\text{t} \ czt n ‘lmm m \text{W}\text{st} \) or \( \text{sm}^yt n ‘lmm-R^c nsw \ ntrw \): Nedjemet (DB Own. 38), Istemkheb (C) (DB Own. 138) and Henuttawy (C) (DB Own. 36).

There is not enough evidence to affirm that all the Greatest Chiefs of the Sacred Musical Troupe of Amun and mothers of an heir or heiress were God’s
Mother of Khonsu the Child, nor of the joint holding of this priestly title by the two co-wives of the HPA. However, these women, who were the highest-ranking female members of the ruling households, played a central role in the cult of Khonsu the Child. The northern kings and the southern HPAs spread their power within the cults of Amun, Mut and the different manifestations of Khonsu. Their wives actively participated in the cults of the members of the Theban triad as they rose and embodied the new attention paid to the divine child, enhancing the legitimacy of their lineages. By acting as heads of this cult, these women identified themselves with Mut, the carnal mother of the heir, with whom the pharaoh or the southern HPA might be identified. As a consequence, the institution of this office was a prelude to the significant changes in the theological and political milieu brought about by the beginning of the 21st Dynasty. Further, as with Queen Mutnedjemet, it is possible that other consorts of Tanite sovereigns were (ḥryt) wrt ḫnrt (tpyt) n ḫmn and mwt-nṯr n ḫnsw p3-ḥrd.

The titularies of these six women reveal some variants of the title of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, including the designations “Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep”, “Khonsu-Ra” or just “Khonsu”. Several factors might have determined the selection of an individual’s titles which were to be recorded, leading to an apparently heterogeneous collection of titles and variants. For instance, the first position in Amun’s hereditary succession of Khonsu the Child is sometimes remarked by using the formula “z wr tpy n Imn” –as in DB Own. 37 and 44–, while the presence or omission of this epithet does not appear to be reflected in the cultic sphere. Similarly, although the corresponding epithet was omitted, it is very likely that an inscription refers to the principal manifestation of this Theban god when the name of Khonsu appears alone, when he is characterised as Theban or

when it is associated with other deities of the Theban Triad or with the Khonsu temple. However, based on the remaining evidence, I do not think that the above-mentioned alternative forms of the analysed title necessarily indicate the existence of a similar hierarchy for Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep or Khonsu-Ra.

Along with Nedjemet (**DB Own. 38**), Istemkheb (D) (**DB Own. 35**) and Henuttauy (C) (**DB Own. 36**) were *mwt-nṯr n ḫnsw*. In this regard, **DB Own. 35** was recorded as *mwt-nṯr n ḫnsw pꜣ-ḥrd* too, while **DB Own. 36** bore exclusively this variant of the title, that is to say, her funerary goods do not include a mention of the function of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child but only the version in which Khonsu has no epithet.

As for those two elite women, I have the impression that the omission of an epithet for Khonsu may not necessarily mean that they performed ritual duties as God’s Mothers on behalf of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. By the beginning of the TIP, particular functions, aspects or epithets of Khonsu were personified in several divine entities. These forms of the god obtained certain independence, and developed their own priesthhoods and autonomous sanctuaries; however, inherent ties between them persisted. The theological background characterised by the development of the birth doctrine and the increasing importance of the child gods must not be forgotten. In this context, as has been discussed, the connections between the gods of the triad extend beyond the religious sphere; indeed, the independent cults of different manifestations of the god must be seen, to a certain extent, as two faces of the same coin. Moreover, it is possible that, by the time of Henuttauy (C) and Istemkheb (D), this office was completely established and intimately linked to the god Khonsu the Child. Therefore, the lack of an epithet would not change the function and meaning of the office, and this nuance would not alter the title’s functionality in a funerary context.
Looking at *DB Own. 141*’s titulary we find a similar example: Gautsoshen (B) was recorded both as Nurse of Khonsu the Child and of Khonsu. As discussed below, this title seems to have been closely connected to the service of Khonsu the Child; besides, there is no further evidence for other Nurses of Khonsu or of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. As a consequence, one may suggest that she was exclusively ḫnmrt n Ḥnsw ptḥ-hrd. Nevertheless, the case of *DB Own. 38* may require a further consideration. Nedjemet has been seen as a key figure at the outset of the 21st Dynasty, who restored the title of Greatest Chief of the Sacred Musical Troupe of Amun and instituted the office of God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child. If she had exclusively held the variant title of God’s Mother of Khonsu, Nedjemet might have been considered as the individuals analysed before. However, she was also designated as mwtr-nṯr n Ḥnsw-Rˁ nb Wȝst and mwtr-nṯr n Ḥnsw m Wȝst Nfr-htp on her coffin ensemble and her funerary papyrus (*DB Doc. 57* and *58* respectively). There is no further evidence to understand the organisation of Khonsu the Child’s newly developed cult in its earliest stage; nor to know if she intentionally or fortuitously decided to present herself as the ritual mother of the divine heir Khonsu in his different manifestations. Perhaps the nature of this office was slightly different by then, or there was not yet a manifest cult differentiation between some of the major forms of Khonsu. In any case, it is not mere conjecture to state that Herihor’s wife ritually played an essential role in Khonsu’s cult in its broadest sense; the different epithets and functions could be ultimately attributed to the primary form of the god, Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep.

In this regard, it is also necessary to briefly mention the emergence of Khonsu-Ra Lord of Thebes as part of the priestly offices of three DB Owners during the 21st Dynasty. Besides Nedjemet, Khonsuemheb (*DB Own. 10*) and the General Wendjebauendjedet (*DB Own. 41*) were ḫm-nṯr n Ḥnsw-Rˁ (nb Wȝst).
Despite their difference in rank, both were servants of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and the other members of the Theban triad in Thebes and Tanis, respectively. These individuals give rise to some doubts about the existence of a specific cult and separate shrine for this aspect of Khonsu. The complex and partly uncertain nature of Khonsu and the plurality of his forms have been always an issue. Although finding the answers in the present state of our knowledge seems to be very difficult, it is true that the close connection between Khonsu-Ra and the Khonsu temple at Karnak must recall our attention.

At the Khonsu temple, this deity, who was also qualified as Theban, appears rather often. There, Khonsu-Ra is depicted as an adult and as a child, as well as with lunar and solar iconography\(^ {326} \). As pointed out by J.-C. Degardin\(^ {327} \), in a scene in the court of the temple, the HPA Pinudjem carries a censer before Khonsu-Ra Lord of Thebes, while the epithet of the god describes him as Khonsu Neferhotep\(^ {328} \). Similarly, in the parallel scene from the eastern jamb of the doorway\(^ {329} \), the god is named Khonsu Lord of Thebes but the dedication mentions Khonsu as Lord of Happiness, being “\( nb \) swt-\( ib \)” a secondary epithet usually borne by Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep\(^ {330} \). In some ritual contexts, it is likely that Khonsu fulfilled functions related to his solar nature as Khonsu-Ra, a fact that would also emphasise his relation with and strong dependency on Amun-Ra. Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep’s close association with the form Khonsu-Ra may be occasionally reflected in particular areas of the cult; maybe some theological nuances differentiate one from the other to the point that even some priests decided to be


\(^{327}\) Degardin 2000: 44-46 and 50.

\(^{328}\) Khonsu II: plate 119 A l. 1 and 3 (court, south wall, doorway, west jamb, second register).

\(^{329}\) Khonsu II: plate 124 A l. 1 (court, south wall, doorway, east jamb, lowermost register).

\(^{330}\) See Klotz 2008: 138-139.
remembered as Khonsu-Ra’s servants. Although this differentiation would have existed, one might think that Khonsu-Ra would have been closely connected to the chief god of the temple, Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. Therefore, it is not inconceivable that both gods were sometimes referred to as equivalents. Even though I suggest it with caution, I do not think that there was an organisation around a God’s Mother of Khonsu-Ra, nor a hierarchy of ḫm-nṯr priests for him.

Returning to the cult of Khonsu pꜣ-ḥrḏ, besides the highest level of this hierarchy, the prosopographical record attests a group of elite women who performed minor sacerdotal duties for the god Khonsu the Child. Although their real function in the temple is unknown, their characterisation as mnḫt, ḫmnṯt or ḫnmt suggests that they might have been closely related to the theology of conception, birth and nursing of the divine child, complementing the major ritual role played by the God’s Mothers.

As proposed by S.-A. Naguib33¹, the office of nurse for a child god was usually assigned to lower ranking priestesses. Among this set of eight nursing priestesses, Meretamun (F) (DB Own. 4) was a daughter of the HPA Menkheperra, DB Own. 30 was possibly a daughter of a Pinudjem II and Gautsoshen (B) (DB Own. 141) was the daughter of the Third ḫm-nṯr priest of Khonsu Menkheperra (B). Notwithstanding these familial relationships, which may have determined their rank, there is a large overlap between the titularies of these women and those of DB Own. 4, 141, 30, 46, 40, 111, 113 and 33: all of them performed musical duties as Songstresses of Amun, and some of them were also Singer of the Choir of Mut. Therefore, they also took part in the lively traffic that might have existed within the different precincts, cults and hierarchies at Karnak.

³³¹ Naguib 1990: 229.
On the other hand, looking again at the offices held by the superiors of this hierarchy, Nedjemet (DB Own. 38) and Henuttauy (A) (DB Own. 37) were both hryt mn\\textsuperscript{r}wt n Mwt. This title indicates the likely existence of another category of mn\\textsuperscript{r}wt of Mut who were under their authority. In the case of Khonsu the Child, a similar leading figure existed, even though its first and only attestation is a woman known as Tamit, who was imy-r mn\\textsuperscript{r}wt n Ḥnsw p3-ḥrd during the mid-late 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{332}. The lack of female leading figures above these mn\\textsuperscript{r}wt during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty may be the result of the fragmented material record; however, some additional titles borne by the wrb priest and God’s Father of Amun, Mut and Khonsu Bennebensekhauenef (DB Own. 134) must be taken into account in this regard.

While the aforementioned female servants of Khonsu the Child seem to have been operating within the traditional boundaries of feminine roles, the cult of this deity included some male priests whose duties are consistent with the same principle. DB Own. 134 was the first Overseer of Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child attested; moreover, he is also a unique example of a Nursing Priest/Feeder of Khonsu the Child during this period. Even though these Overseers were presumably be in charge of a group of male Wet-nurses, there is no evidence of any male Wet-nurse of Khonsu, nor of a woman imy-r mn\\textsuperscript{r}wt n Ḥnsw p3-ḥrd by the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty. Therefore, the possibility of certain links between male and female servants should not be excluded, as proved later by the family of Ankhpakhered; in some ritual contexts, this man might have supervised a group of mn\\textsuperscript{r}wt n Ḥnsw p3-ḥrd himself.

In accordance with H. de Meulenaere’s convincing proposal\textsuperscript{333}, the emergence of the mammisiac Theban cult in association with Mut by the beginning

\textsuperscript{332} Tamit was part of Ankhpakhered’s family, with whose male members the position of Overseer of mn\\textsuperscript{r}yw of Khonsu the Child became more extended during the Libyan Period.

\textsuperscript{333} de Meulenaere 1982.
of the TIP seems to be supported by the additional inscriptional evidence considered here. The noteworthy cultic role of these elite women as servants of Khonsu the Child—together with \textit{DB Own. 134} as its unique male Nursing Priest attested—must necessarily be seen in context with the development of the birth doctrine and Temple A’s probable function as an early birth house. They embodied the new attention paid to the divine child in the official theology. This group, headed by the wives of the HPAs, was engaged in the re-evaluation and promotion of the cult of Khonsu \textit{p3-hrd} to proclaim the right of the Theban rulers as the offspring of Amun and Mut, and to reinforce the southern government.

With regard to Tanis, the existence of a temple dedicated to this child deity seems proved by the aforementioned high dignitary of the court of Psusennes I Ankhefenamun (\textit{DB Own. 42}), who was a Scribe of the Temple of Khonsu the Child, the Very Great First Child of Amun. This function has nevertheless no parallels in Thebes. Apart from the head of the hierarchy, the God’s Mother of Khonsu the Child, no more priestly titles connected to Khonsu \textit{p3-hrd} are documented so far. Ankhefenamun’s daughter (\textit{DB Rel. 63}), the only non-royal woman servant of Khonsu attested in the northern capital, did not perform any priestly duties on behalf of Khonsu the Child; although she was royal \textit{mnrt}, she was not a nursing priestess of this child god. The sparse prosopographical information does not enable us to draw a meaningful comparison between the Tanite development of this cult and that for Thebes. While it is true that, as in Thebes, its expectable expansion must necessarily be seen in a context of political and theological changes, this cult, as well as the worship of the Theban triad, provided an alternative venue for the continuation of the cult of Amun independently of Thebes.
III. Other Secondary Manifestations of Khonsu

There is little evidence of servants of the minor manifestations of Khonsu during the whole TIP. In this regard, even though the evolution of Khonsu p3-ir-s3rw and Khonsu (p3)wn-n5w seems to have run parallel to one another at the Khonsu temple, only the first one is documented by the prosopographical record. Nesamun (DB Own. 112) was sš hwt-nTr n Ḥnsw p3-ir-s3rw, a fact that may prove the existence of a Theban sanctuary and an established cult of this oracular deity by the end of the 21st Dynasty or the beginning of the 22nd Dynasty. Unfortunately, the little information that his papyrus gives us (DB Doc. 14) limits a further understanding of his role as a servant of Khonsu p3-ir-s3rw at Thebes.

As suggested by G. Posener334, a feasible way to differentiate between the independent form of this god or the one part of the triad of Khonsus, where Khonsu p3-ir-s3rw was worshiped along with Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep and Khonsu (p3)wn-n5w, depends on the form in which his epithet is written. Thus, for an independent deity “m Wst” is usually added to his name and Khonsu (p3)-wn-n5w is absent. In this case, Nesamun’s only designation as mry-nTr does not help us to clarify whether the temple alluded to was dedicated to an independent Khonsu p3-ir-s3rw –most likely Temple C, to the south-east of Karnak– or whether this hwt-nTr n Ḥnsw p3-ir-s3rw might have been a sanctuary within the main temple of Khonsu at Karnak.

Additionally, the same scholar pointed out the presence of this deity at Tanis during the reign of Psusennes I: a statue of a baboon provides the first monumental

attestation of this deity in a religious context\textsuperscript{335}. Nevertheless, the existence of an established cult in the northern capital cannot be verified by the inscriptions in evidence so far.

Finally, the presence of some members of a collateral line of Nespakashuty’s family entitled as $\text{hm-ntr}$ priests of $\text{Hnsw \ wts-h\w}$ requires a particular attention. The nature of Khonsu $\text{wts-h\w}$ is scarcely known, although, according to G. Posener, he was closely linked to Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep\textsuperscript{336}. There is no attestation of any servant of this secondary form of Khonsu until the end of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty. Indeed, the monument that provides the genealogy of this branch and its members’ affiliation to this priesthood is a block statue dating to the reign of Osorkon I ($\text{DB Own. 82}$).

The family of Nespakashuty managed to acquire and control for generations of a series of important titles in the late 21\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty, and the acquisition of the offices of Third $\text{hm-ntr}$ priests of Amun and Khonsu are a reflection of this fact. Although this secondary branch of the family belonged to a less exalted sphere, a younger brother of Nespakashuty ($\text{DB Rel. 72}$), his son ($\text{DB Rel. 71}$) and the grandson of the latter ($\text{DB Rel. 73}$) inherited the aforementioned title as well as, for instance, the dignity of Openers of the Doors of the Sky in Karnak and some military scribal duties. The office of $\text{hm-ntr}$ priest of $\text{Hnsw \ wts-h\w}$ seems to have been hereditary and dominated by this branch of the family; however, it was transferred to Nakhtefmut (A) later on, which would suggest that the title was thought to be as significant at this point.

\textsuperscript{335} Posener 1968: 403-404.

\textsuperscript{336} He based this assumption on the fact that these two gods were mentioned together in the biographical inscription of Montemhat: Posener 1969: 377 and n. 37 above.
It is precisely their association with this important Theban lineage which seems to have contributed to the connexion of these functionaries with the service of Khonsu. Moreover, another nephew of Nespakashuty needs to be considered when discussing the cult of secondary manifestations of Khonsu: Hor (E) (*DB Own. 52*), a ḫmn-nṯr Ḥnsw-Rˁ nb Wḥst already during the Libyan Period. It is therefore remarkable that the direct descendants of Bakenkhonsu (i) were part of the Khonsu personnel. Even though the main line of the family caught our attention, the priestly offices borne by Nespakashuty’s brother and his descendants definitely link them to the Khonsu temple, even though connected to secondary manifestations of the god closely related to Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. The manipulation of the key offices at the Karnak temple was an important part of the Theban elite’s control. In this context, being part of the personnel of the Khonsu temple, including the worship of his minor manifestations, constituted one of the spheres of influence of the local elite, which flourished at the end of this dynasty and during the rule of the Libyan monarchs.
4. The Libyan and Kushite Periods: Some Remarks

As already stated, this doctoral thesis is a sample of a further study: a glimpse of a methodological choice and the results of part of a research that covers the whole TIP and the first years of the 26th Dynasty. This work goes beyond the 200 entries of the PDB and surpasses the number of servants of Khonsu and titles documented so far. In this concern, I want to broadly outline some of the most outstanding lines of research that the surviving evidence suggests; while an in-depth study of Khonsu’s personnel from the 22nd Dynasty to the transition to the Saite rulers will be carried out and published in the future.

Thanks to the changes in the Theban prosopographical record it is possible to identify a set of new titles and individuals linked to the cult of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep during the Libyan period. Khonsu’s hierarchy became more complex and his servants grew in number; these features were not fully unexpected when looking at the Third \( \text{hm-ntr} \) priests of Khonsu in the above sections. The surviving evidence, the new political situation and the influence of the Libyan lineage system

---

337 Some of them were already proposed in the Fourth International Congress for Young Egyptologists: Cult and Belief in Ancient Egypt (Sofia) in 2012 and in the corresponding proceedings: see Villar 2014.1

338 For a summary of the chronology of this period, see, for instance Jansen-Winkeln 2006.3.
on political and administrative structures might have been some of the factors contributing to this evolved layout. Moreover, this growth is in line with the increasing numbers of $hm\text{-}ntr$ priests during the Libyan period$^{339}$.

Apart from a w$^b$ priest of Khonsu buried in Herakleopolis Magna, the already-mentioned servants of Khonsu from the Serapeum$^{340}$, a $hm\text{-}ntr$ priest of Khonsu amid Bubastis and another one from Busiris, Thebes continues to provide most of the evidence, and is not comparable with any other location. Nevertheless, while a significant proportion of the 21$^{\text{st}}$ Dynasty’s documents consists of coffins and other funerary objects from the cemeteries from Deir el-Bahri, the non-royal temple statues discovered in the Karnak Cachette –located in the court between the 7$^{\text{th}}$ and 8$^{\text{th}}$ pylons at the Amun temple– become a paramount source of prosopographical information for the subsequent dynasties. The importance of such statuary lies in the proclamation of lengthy genealogies and titularies to claim an illustrious background for an individual; there was a determined effort to legitimise the holding of sacerdotal, military and/or administrative functions within a family to preserve its memory.

These genealogies record at least the parentage of the owner, while sometimes the line of ancestors can be traced back as far as the New Kingdom; an exceptional example is the inscription of the Karnak temple known as “Horkhebi’s decree”, which mentions eighteen generations of relatives and attests the significant position held by some of them within the Khonsu temple’s hierarchy for decades$^{341}$. As a result, the hereditary transmission of priestly and administrative offices recorded by those documents provides us with more individuals in the service of the

$^{339}$ Broekman 2011: 93. See also Chart 3.
$^{340}$ See n. 119 and 272.
$^{341}$ Vittmann 2002 and Frood 2010.
god, predominantly Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep, and whole families holding the same titles, generation after generation. It is true, however, that the reliability of this kind of individual inscriptions is questionable when no further evidence can be provided.

The inheritance of important positions and privileges from one relative to the next and the alliances with the royal families are essential factors to understand the elite of the Libyan Period. At least initially, the appointment to, removal from or confirmation of certain individuals in high-ranking offices may have been the result of the sovereigns’ takeover of the Thebaid and their new attitude towards the integrity of the country. However, this turned out to be a two-edged sword; the favouring of certain lineages or individuals with the tenure of particular offices, the hereditary transmission of titles and certain marriage alliances increased the assets of some family groups, which became more powerful and independent.

In this context, not only the HPAs but mainly the Second, Third and Fourth $hmntr$ priests of Amun brought together the most powerful and influential Theban posts in their hands, including leading functions on behalf of Khonsu. Even though there is no evidence for a single $hmntr\ tpy\ n\ Hnsw$, the offices of Second, Third and Fourth $hmntr$ priests of Khonsu are attested and can be counted among the most influential offices of the Libyan period. As we have seen, it is true that the genealogical information confirms the existence of some of these titles at an earlier time, although they were not attested by contemporary evidence during the 21st Dynasty.

Individuals belonging to the Nakhtefmut family were $hmntr\ 2-nw\ n\ Hnsw$, Nespakashuty’s family managed to inherit the title of $hmntr\ 3-nw\ n\ Hnsw$ (see

342 See Broekman 2011 for this idea.
Chart 3 above) and some members of the family of Nebnecheru were ħm-nṯr 4-nw n ḫnsw. Again, looking at their grouping of titles one may note that, apart from being part of a more elaborate hierarchy of Khonsu, these individuals usually belonged to the personnel of Mut and Amun. Therefore, holding offices in relation to the three gods of the Theban divine triad in combination was a common feature for the individuals connected to the highest offices of Khonsu at that time too.

Moreover, as in Nespakashuty’s family, further positions within Khonsu’s personnel were held by other members of Nakhtefmut’s lineage. The Fourth ħm-nṯr priest of Amun and Second ħm-nṯr priest of Mut Nakhtefmut (A) was also ħm-nṯr n ḫnsw ṭs-hȝw and ss ssmt r Ḗnnt. His family, which was linked with the royal house by marriage alliances, had already served within the Khonsu temple for generations as ħm-nṯr priests of Khonsu of Ḗnnt and as Scribes connected to the temple and the festivals performed there; some of Nakhtefmut’s descendants would also be in the service of this god.

The tendency towards the accumulation of offices within the Theban hierarchies of Khonsu and Mut by the Third and Fourth ħm-nṯr priests of Amun may shed light on processes and trends that exceeded Khonsu’s personnel sphere of influence. The de facto control of the most relevant Theban priesthoods by a number of elite families evidences more profound changes regarding the northern sovereigns’ initiatives to consolidate their authority; it may also provide information about their methods of securing the cooperation of existing officials or of ensuring the loyalty of the new ones. These powerful Theban families, who have already risen to prominence at the end of the 21st Dynasty or during the first years of the Libyan kings, seem to have been favoured possibly in exchange for loyalty. The appearance of new offices and the inherited tenure of them by some of their members indicate that both the positions and their holders were invested with
considerable importance. Collectively, their group of titles position them at the uppermost levels of the Karnak temple economy and religious authority, as well as politically quite significant; although the rise and decline of certain lineages and individuals requires a further analysis.

On the other hand, special attention must be paid to the more than a hundred graffiti incised by priests of Khonsu and Amun on the roof of the Khonsu temple in Karnak dated to the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties. Even though there is no conclusive evidence concerning the motivation or religious significance of these inscriptions, their authors must have been involved in ritual tasks or events in the Khonsu temple; they were part of the temple staff and they might have worked or rested in that area, or at least had access to the roof where they displayed their identity through these graffiti.

Most of these graffiti provide hieratic or hieroglyphic names accompanied by titles with or without institutional affiliation –mostly God’s Father or wḥ priests– and, at most, the name of the author’s father. The reconstruction of sequences of office holders becomes an impossible task. However, it is possible to distinguish some sacerdotal families whose members were lower-ranking servants of Khonsu for generations; that is the case of ‘nhḥ.f-n-Mwt’s descendants, who held wḥ priest and it-nṯr offices on behalf of Khonsu during three generations.

In contrast to the substantial evidence for a lower-clergy personnel composed of wḥ priests and God’s Fathers of Khonsu –attested mostly by the roof graffiti– and for a higher status group of priests and an increasing number of associated offices –Second, Third and Fourth ḫm-nṯr priests of Khonsu, as well as

343 For studies about this corpus see, for instance: Jacquet-Gordon 1979 and 2003; Degardin 2009 and 2010; and Villar 2014².

344 See Jacquet-Gordon 2003: 40-42 graffiti no. 99, 100, 102, 103 and 104.
other minor sacerdotal functions attested by the statues and funerary materials of the
Theban upper class–, the servants of Khonsu the Child are limited to the members
of the Ankhpakhered family, which seems to have been related in some way to
Nakhtefmut’s lineage\textsuperscript{345}. Ankhpakhered (i), his father and grandfather, as well as his
grandson were $stw-n\textsuperscript{tr} n \HNsw\ p\textsuperscript{2}-\textsuperscript{hrd}$ and $imy-r\ mn\textsuperscript{cyw} n \HNsw\ p\textsuperscript{2}-\textsuperscript{hrd}$; furthermore, while no God’s Mothers or Nurses of Khonsu are attested, the
aforementioned Tamit, who belonged to the royal line of the 22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty, was
$imy-r\ mn\textsuperscript{cyt} n \HNsw\ p\textsuperscript{2}-\textsuperscript{hrd}$ during the mid-late 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE. These facts might
be related to a shift in the political priorities or within the institution itself, or maybe
to the significant drop in the number of women evidenced by the prosopographical
record.

Concerning the servants of Khonsu during the 25\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty and the
transition to the Saite period, the remaining sources nearly coincide in nature with
the materials for the Libyan period, although they are significantly reduced in
number. The functions of $w\textsuperscript{cb}$ priest and God’s Father of Khonsu still occur most
frequently, even though the number of graffiti on the roof of the Khonsu temple
decreased and reconstructing families of priests is in consequence an even more
arduous task. Simultaneously, the panoply of Libyan titles seems to be greatly
reduced and no leading functionaries of the Theban hierarchy of Khonsu are
attested; moreover, as regard the coffins, statues, and other funerary documents,
finding long genealogies of people attached to the service of this god becomes less
common.

A number of Khonsu’s servants were characterised as $kbh\textsuperscript{w} n \HNsw n Bnnt$, a title that occasionally appears before the 25th Dynasty\textsuperscript{346}. As usual, these

\textsuperscript{345} Bierbrier 1979: 83 and Payraudeau 2005.

\textsuperscript{346} See \textit{DB Own. 29}.  
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individuals also held certain positions in relation to other gods; however, and even though Amun and Mut are still present, another deity emerges notably through their titularies: Montu, the original main Theban god whose servants became a really prominent group of clergy by the later TIP.

In this respect, it should be highlighted that all these Libationers of Khonsu were $hm-ntr$ priests of Montu, although just a few of these $hm-ntr$ priests of Montu were Libationers of Khonsu; otherwise they do not have a relation to Khonsu’s cults. As already mentioned, personal names compounded with Khonsu, such as Ankhefenkhonsu, Neskhonsu or Djedkhonsiuefankh, are quite popular in the TIP. Although many priests of Montu and their spouses adopted names of these types, only $\text{‘nh.f-n-Hnsw (i) –a notable member of the Besenmut family–was also Libationer of Khonsu.}$

It would be premature to propose any hypothesis to explain this, however, it is possible to suggest the existence of a connection between the office of Libationer of Khonsu and the priesthood of Montu. Furthermore, given the transference of Montu’s association with kingship to Khonsu at Karnak during the New Kingdom\textsuperscript{347}, the relationship between both groups of servants during this period may have had a similar nature. In any case, it seems certain that the Kushites brought about certain changes in the administrative and governmental structures of Thebes that affected the cultic domains of Khonsu too.

Introducing ethnic Kushites into prominent Theban offices was one of the new rulers’ efforts to consolidate their authority and to curb the influence of the powerful local families\textsuperscript{348}. The owner of TT 391, Karabasken, was most likely part

\textsuperscript{347} Sheikholeslami 2009: 362.

\textsuperscript{348} For this topic, see Naunton 2011.
of this strategy. Among other important posts, he was Theban Governor and Fourth ḥm-ntr priest of Amun, as well as ḥm-ntr priest of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep. Similarly, Montemhat (A), who was also sš hwt-ntr n Ḥnsw m Wȝst Nfḏ-htp, might have succeed him as ḥm-ntr n Ḥnsw, ḫnty- r n niwt and ḥm-ntr 4-nw n ḫmn. What initially could be seen as a Kushite intervention in the establishment of certain individuals in Theban offices, may subsequently reflect a loss of control over them in favour of the same local elite. Although the transfer of the posts of Governor of Thebes and Fourth ḥm-ntr priest of Amun from one individual to another attracts our attention, it seems that exerting some influence over Khonsu’s temple hierarchy was part of these strategies somehow.

Along the same lines, it is also remarkable that two different HPAs were also ḥm-ntr priests of Khonsu the Child: Haremakhet and Harkhebi (vii), respectively son and grandson of the King Shabaka. Khonsu the Child’s cult seems to go hand in hand with the ruling family at Thebes again, and the works undertaken in his temple/mammisi seem to prove it. Nevertheless, the Nubian princesses headed the institution of the God’s Wife, which in theory was the foremost religious authority in Thebes; their close connection with the god Amun provided the needed legitimacy for the new Dynasty. The ascendancy of feminine power in the form of the God’s Wives of Amun could be one of the reasons why we have no attestations of God’s Mothers of Khonsu the Child after the 21st Dynasty, nor an established female personnel of Khonsu the Child during the 25th Dynasty.

On balance, the prosopographical record clearly reflects the effects of the shifting political situation in Egypt on the personnel of Khonsu. The servants of the
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349 See p. 146-150 above.

350 An exception would be the ḫmnnt n Ḥnsw ḫs-hrd ḫst-wrt; although K. Jansen-Winkeln (2009: 532 Doc. 330) already expresses his doubts about her assignment to the 25th Dynasty.
different manifestation of this god played a significant role in a historical milieu characterised by the rise and decline of powerful family groups, marriage alliances and hereditary transmission of titles. In my opinion, an in-depth analysis of these materials is a useful instrument to better comprehend the Theban temple administration and political system during the Libyan and Kushite periods.
CONCLUSIONES

A finales del II milenio a.C., Egipto se encontraba dividido entre una línea dinástica de faraones asentados en Tanis y unos Primeros Sacerdotes de Amón de Karnak\textsuperscript{351} que gobernaban el territorio tebano. Estos últimos supieron aprovechar la debilidad de la autoridad real para asumir, de manera indiscutible, un posición predominante en el Alto Egipto, combinando el liderazgo político y religioso con un fuerte poder militar; en la práctica, ésto supuso la instauración de un estado teocrático que funcionaba de manera paralela a los soberanos tanitas.

Aunque durante los casi 140 años entre la era de la \textit{w\textdag m mswt} y la ascensión de la Dinastía XXII las relaciones entre el poder real tanita y el sacerdotal tebano sufrieron cambios, el reconocimiento mutuo y los lazos familiares entre ambos fueron elementos fundamentales para comprender la naturaleza pacífica de las mismas. Sin lugar a dudas, el culto al dios Amón-Ra como rey indiscutible de todo Egipto es un factor clave para entender esta convivencia, hecho que también explicaría las altas cotas de poder adquiridas por los PSA en tanto que interlocutores directos del dios.

De forma paralela a la soberanía indiscutible de Amón sobre todo el país, desde Época Ramésida y en consonancia con el desarrollo de la denominada

\textsuperscript{351} Si bien en la tesis he utilizado el término “\textit{High} hm-\textit{ntr priest}” para hacer referencia al más alto cargo ostentado dentro de la jerarquía de sacerdotes \textit{hm-\textit{ntr}} de una divinidad, en estas conclusiones en español el término empleado será el de “Primer sacerdote \textit{hm-\textit{ntr}}".
religión mammísíaca, se produce una expansión del culto a las tríadas divinas y se desarrolla un culto a los dioses niño. El gobierno teocrático dio relevancia a Mut y Khonsu en tanto que consorte y heredero de Amón respectivamente, al igual que estableció un culto oficial a la forma independiente de Khonsu el Niño; relevancia que se vio reflejada en el registro prosopográfico y en la esfera cultural. Como consecuencia, el aumento significativo de sacerdotes y funcionarios al servicio de las distintas formas del dios Khonsu a partir de la Dinastía XXI encuentra una indudable correspondencia con este desarrollo teológico.

A finales de los años setenta del siglo XX, J. Berlandini analizó la institución de la Madres Divinas de Khonsu el Niño, lideradas por las mujeres de la familia real y de los PSA tebanos352. De igual modo, H. de Meulenaere propuso poco después la existencia de un culto mammísíaco a la diosa Mut en Tebas durante el TPI basándose, entre otras evidencias, en la documentación de algunos individuos ostentando cargos como el de Nodriza de Khonsu el Niño o Supervisor de dichas Nodrizas353. Sin embargo, una análisis meticuloso del material prosopográfico conservado de la Dinastía XXI revela una realidad más compleja, que difiere notablemente de lo documentado en el momentos anteriores: un panorama compuesto por diversas instituciones al servicio de las diferentes formas del dios Khonsu, cuyos miembros, tanto hombres como mujeres, desempeñaron cargos sacerdotales y administrativos a distintos niveles dentro de las mismas. El grado de autoridad ejercido sobre Tebas por el poder político, bien sea por el propio sacerdocio tebano de Amón o por los faraones tanitas, es un elemento determinante para comprender el desarrollo del personal al servicio de las distintas formas de Khonsu. En este sentido, las características y el funcionamiento de estas jerarquías

353 De Meulenaere 1982: 29 n. 29.
van a reflejar las transformaciones que ocurrieron en el contexto político e ideológico en el que sus miembros desempeñaron sus funciones.

En Tebas, la promoción del culto a los dioses de la tríada tebana llevada a cabo por los PSA puede entenderse como una vía más para legitimar su liderazgo. El culto al heredero divino de Amón, bien sea como parte de la tríada o como un dios niño independiente, fue probablemente empleado para enfatizar las similitudes entre la naturaleza de la familia divina y su propio linaje. Los PSA, mediante la conmemoración del nacimiento de un dios niño –con el cuál cualquier soberano puede identificarse– y la promoción de su culto, reforzaban su control e influencia sobre la Tebaida. Asimismo, hay que atribuir a Herihor y a Pinedjem I los trabajos constructivos y decorativos llevados a cabo en el templo de Khonsu de Karnak. Es razonable pensar que la proliferación de sacerdotes y funcionarios al servicio de dicho dios estuvo relacionada con las necesidades prácticas surgidas a partir de la renovación de dicho templo; al igual que dichos esfuerzos constructivos fueron, posiblemente, el resultado de una gran inversión de recursos económicos y humanos en la promoción religiosa y cultural del dios Khonsu.

Por otro lado, a la hora de emprender un estudio prosopográfico completo del personal del dios Khonsu, las alianzas matrimoniales entre ambas partes del país y la gran devoción mostrada por los monarcas tanitas a Amón-Ra me llevaron a prestar especial atención al material procedente de Delta. Tanis, la capital de los faraones de la Dinastía XXI, fue ampliada por Smendes y sus sucesores hasta ser considerada la “Tebas septentrional”. Existen evidencias de la existencia de un culto oficial a los dioses tebanos Amón, Mut y Khonsu, al igual que a Khonsu el Niño; por ejemplo, Psusennes I ostentó el cargo de PSA en la capital, al igual que
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miembros de su familia y sus más cercanos cortesanos desempeñaron cargos al servicio de las divinidades de la tríada tebana. Aunque hay que expresar cierta cautela a la hora de formular hipótesis al respecto, ya que la cantidad de información disponible en Tebas no es comparable a lo conservado para cualquier otro lugar, a día de hoy y en base a las evidencias disponibles, la naturaleza y organización de estos sacerdocios en Tebas y Tanis parecen similares.

Desde principios del TPI, el culto de este dios niño, tanto de manera individual como integrado dentro de la tríada tebana, ganó popularidad y rápidamente desarrolló un sacerdocio que incluida hombres y mujeres. Aunque la fragmentación del registro material es siempre un problema, lo que supone que las propuestas presentadas están sujetas a nuevos descubrimientos o incluso a diversas interpretaciones de unos mismos datos, el estudio del material presentado en esta tesis demuestra la existencia de ciertos rasgos comunes y patrones de comportamiento que marcaron el funcionamiento y organización de las instituciones al servicio de Khonsu durante la época estudiada. En este sentido, la base de datos prosopográfica ha sido una herramienta clave; ésta permite recopilar y ordenar gran cantidad de datos genealógicos y biográficos complejos e identificar semejanzas y diferencias entre los diferentes sacerdotes de Khonsu, haciendo posible asimismo la realización de búsquedas cruzadas.

Una de las características más relevantes de este grupo de individuos es la aparición recurrente de los tres dioses de la tríada tebana en sus titulaturas; aunque se documentan otras divinidades, Amón y Mut van a tener una presencia casi constante. En el contexto que da origen a la denominada doctrina del nacimiento y en el que el culto de las tríadas divinas es promovido, la mayoría de DB Owners y
DB Relatives estudiados no fueron únicamente servidores del dios Khonsu\textsuperscript{355}. Tanto en Karnak como en Tanis, es imposible entender el comportamiento de los sacerdotes y funcionarios al servicio de Khonsu si no se tiene en cuenta su participación en los cultos de los otros miembros de la tríada divina tebana. Los Padres Divinos, sacerdotes \textit{w$b} y escribas de Khonsu (Chart 1), los individuos que ostentaban títulos que incluían a Amón, Mut y Khonsu simultáneamente (Chart 2), los miembros de la jerarquía de sacerdotes \textit{hm-ntr} (Chart 3), las mujeres (Chart 4) y los sujetos que ejercieron oficios en Tanis (Chart 5), además de sus funciones vinculadas a Khonsu, generalmente desempeñaron cargos de rango y características similares vinculados al culto y a la administración de los otros dioses de la tríada. Por ejemplo, varios Padres Divinos y sacerdotes \textit{w$b} de Khonsu desempeñaron estas mismas funciones al servicio de Amón y/o Mut; los sacerdotes \textit{hm-ntr} de Khonsu formaron parte de la misma jerarquía de las otras divinidades de la tríada; las Madres Divinas de Khonsu el Niño encabezaron el Cuerpo Musical Sagrado de Amón-Ra y, en ocasiones, fueron Sacerdotisas \textit{hmt-ntr} de Amón, Mut y/o Khonsu; mientras que las Nodrizas de Khonsu el Niño fueron, generalmente, cantoras devotas a Amón e integrantes del coro de la diosa Mut.

En este sentido, la combinación reiterada de ciertos cargos al analizar las titulaturas de los individuos que forman el corpus objeto de estudio es destacable. Por ejemplo, en lo que respecta a los Padres Divinos de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep –\textit{it-ntr n Hnsw (m Wst Nfr-htp)} es el título vinculado al culto de Khonsu más documentado durante la Dinastía XXI–, tanto el \textit{DB Own. 7} como el \textit{DB Own. 31} fueron a su vez Padres Divinos de Amón y de Mut. Sin embargo, esta combinación de funciones no es fija, encontramos Padres Divinos de Khonsu y

\textsuperscript{355} \textit{DB Own. 22, 27, 112 y 45} son los únicos individuos para los cuales sólo se documentan cargos vinculados al culto de Khonsu o a la administración de su dominio.
Amón exclusivamente (DB Own. 28), sacerdotes wꜣb de Khonsu que fueron Padres Divinos de Amón (DB Own. 6), o sacerdotes wꜣb de Amón que no fueron ni sacerdotes wꜣb ni Padres Divinos de Khonsu, si no Escribas de su templo (DB Own. 9).

La carrera de un individuo, que solía prestar servicio a varias divinidades, posiblemente estuvo determinada por numerosos factores, incluyendo, por ejemplo, la devoción personal hacia alguna divinidad o la existencia de una conexión especial entre su familia y algún dios en concreto. Sin embargo, la adquisición de ciertos puestos sacerdotales o administrativos posiblemente estuviera sujeta a la experiencia y el grado de iniciación adquirido por una persona, al igual que a las necesidades específicas de los propios templos. Una vez que un sacerdote o escriba adquiriera ciertos conocimientos, sus servicios pudieron haber sido requeridos por los distintas áreas y santuarios circundantes, quizás de manera rotativa. Más allá del indiscutible vínculo religioso entre Amón, Mut y las diferentes manifestaciones del dios Khonsu, la evidencia material permite sugerir cierta correspondencia entre sus servidores. Del mismo modo que la construcción de un templo dentro de un recinto sagrado mayor no responde a decisiones casuales, la estrecha relación entre estos dioses sobrepasó la esfera meramente teológica, manifestándose a un nivel más práctico, vinculado al funcionamiento y la organización de sus santuarios.

De igual modo, merece especial atención un número reducido individuos cuyos títulos incluían a los tres dioses de la tríada tebana simultáneamente; estos personajes se encargaron de la supervisión de algunas tareas constructivas o de labores musicales, estuvieron involucrados en el recuento de ganado y las ofrendas divinas, u ostentaron el oficio de Jefe de los Secretos. La documentación de
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356 Véanse DB Own. 23 y 17 (Chart 1), Chart 2, DB Own. 37 y 34 (Chart 4) y DB Own. 43 (Chart 5).
ciertas áreas administrativas y rituales que requerían una acción coordinada de los servidores de Amón, Mut y Khonsu sugiere que, al menos ocasionalmente, debieron existir competencias compartidas o sectores y esferas comunes a los dioses de la tríada tebana, tanto en Karnak como en Tanis.

Sin embargo, y a pesar de esta correspondencia y de los vínculos existentes entre los diversos personales al servicio de los dioses de la tríada, es razonable plantear la existencia de sacerdocios independientes y de prácticas rituales propias vinculadas a las distintas formas del dios Khonsu –esencialmente Khonsu en Tebas y Khonsu el Niño– y a sus correspondientes lugares de culto. Karnak pudo haber funcionado como una unidad administrativa y religiosa amplia donde coexistían varias instituciones o cleros y un vivo tráfico de sus individuos de un templo a otro. Es más, en el contexto del estado teocrático de Amón, sería razonable pensar en una estructura jerárquica entre dichos personales, regida por la supremacía indiscutible del rey de los dioses. Un cierto grado de subordinación del clero de Khonsu, y posiblemente del de Mut, a los PSA tebanos explicaría, por ejemplo, por qué no se documenta ningún Primer sacerdote ḫm-nṯr de Khonsu durante el TPI, el motivo de la ausencia de altos cargos vinculados a la jerarquía de sacerdotes ḫm-nṯr hasta finales de la Dinastía XXI, o la presencia de algunas mujeres de la familia de los PSA ejerciendo un liderazgo sobre la administración del templo de Khonsu.

Al menos hasta el pontificado de Menkheperra, la existencia de altos cargos sacerdotales vinculados a otros cleros tebanos hubiera entrado en conflicto con la supremacía del PSA; otras posiciones de poder que pudieran contestar su autoridad posiblemente no fueron siquiera concebibles. Solamente se documentan altos funcionarios dentro de la jerarquía de sacerdotes ḫm-nṯr de Khonsu a partir del momento en el que el poder del clero de Amón se ve, en cierto modo, mermado; cuando las familias de la élite tebana vuelven a entrar en escena, ostentando altos
cargos monopolizados desde inicios de la dinastía por la familia de los PSA, aparecen los primeros Terceros Sacerdotes *hm-ntr* de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep.

Del mismo modo, el control y supervisión de los distintos sacerdocios de Karnak por parte de su administración central, es decir, del PSA, explicaría por qué los ajuares funerarios de los servidores de Khonsu proceden en su mayoría de Bab el-Gasus, una *cachette* tradicionalmente vinculada al sacerdocio de Amón. Las enormes cotas de poder adquiridas por en sacerdocio tebano de Amón y la transformación de su templo de Karnak en la capital del estado teocrático sin duda determinó del desarrollo de cualquier otro culto en Tebas; el culto a Khonsu, cuyo templo se encontraba dentro del recinto sagrado de Amón, sería un claro ejemplo de esta situación. Casi con toda seguridad, el registro material fragmentario condiciona el número de sacerdotes de Khonsu conservado para todo el TPI. Aunque dicho número fuera posiblemente superior, y aún teniendo en cuenta que los enterramientos de sus miembros puedan haber desaparecido o estén aún sin descubrir, en este contexto, no creo que hubiera sido viable la utilización de otros enterramientos colectivos destinados exclusivamente a los sacerdotes de Khonsu o Mut.

En base a todo lo anterior, es razonable sugerir que no se puede comprender el papel jugado por los sacerdotes y funcionarios al servicio de Khonsu si los separamos de los servidores de Amun and Mut. Las conexiones teológicas entre los dioses de la tríada, la proximidad de sus lugares de culto y las titulaturas de los miembros de su clero y administración corroboran la existencia de unos vínculos estrechos entre sus personales. Asimismo, los inicios de la religión *mammisiaca*, la promoción del culto de las triadas divinas y el gobierno indiscutible y soberano de
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357 Para una revisión reciente sobre este tema, ver Sousa 2014.
Amón sobre todo Egipto son factores que van a determinar el llamativo aumento de sacerdotes al servicio del dios Khonsu a principios del TPI.

Por otro lado, los datos biográficos y genealógicos recopilados y analizados durante esta investigación permiten a su vez aportar detalles más concretos concernientes a la organización y funcionamiento interno de los diferentes sacerdocios asociados a varias manifestaciones del dios Khonsu durante la Dinastía XXI. Las páginas sucesivas contienen una breve síntesis de dichas características y de los títulos y funciones asociados a las instituciones estudiadas, tanto en Tebas como en Tanis.

I. Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep

El oficio de sacerdote ḫm-nṯr de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep, cargo tradicionalmente vinculado a un escalafón superior al de los Padres Divinos y sacerdotes wḥb, parece haber sido desempeñado por un número limitado de individuos de cierto rango. Por sus titulaturas y por sus conexiones familiares, los hombres y mujeres que ostentaron dicho cargo al servicio de Khonsu parecen haber constituido los niveles más altos de la jerarquía sacerdotal de sus templos, tanto en Karnak como en Tanis.

Aunque no es posible identificar con certeza a DB Own. 21 con el noveno hijo de Herihor, debió desempeñar un papel destacado en la procesión de la barca de Khonsu, como muestran los relieves del templo de Khonsu de Karnak. Hori (DB Own. 8), además de haber sido Padre Divino de Khonsu y Mut y sacerdote ḫm-nṯr de Khonsu, ostentó varios oficios vinculados a numerosas divinidades;
posiblemente, su filiación con el PSA Menkheperra fue un factor determinante en la adquisición de dichos títulos. Finalmente, el General tanita Wendjebauendjedet *(DB Own. 41)*, que sin duda fue uno de los cortesanos más importantes de la reinado de Psusennes I –e incluso pudo haber tenido algún lazo familiar con la dinastía real tanita–, lideró el culto oficial del Khonsu tebano en la capital en tanto que Gran Mayordomo y Sacerdote *ḥm-nṯr* de dicha divinidad. Por el contrario, Herihor *(DB Own. 142)* fue el único PSA que desempeñó algún cargo directamente relacionado con el culto a Khonsu, si bien éste hace referencia a las actividades constructivas y de restauración llevadas a cabo en su templo en Karnak, que precisamente estuvieron bajo su supervisión.

Junto con la adopción de prerrogativas reales, el nombramiento y establecimiento de miembros de la familia de los PSA en los principales puestos de influencia tebanos fue una de las estrategias empleadas por estos últimos para garantizar su control indiscutible del Alto Egipto. Posiblemente, la limitación o inexistencia de oficios de alto rango que pudieran rivalizar con su autoridad formó parte de esta misma estrategia. Aunque el puesto de PSA se convirtió en hereditario, no hay pruebas de una transmisión hereditaria del título sacerdote *ḥm-nṯr* de Khonsu, tampoco de la existencia de una jerarquía de esta grupo sacerdotal hasta bien avanzada la Dinastía XXI, en las últimas décadas del extenso pontificado de Menkheperra.

El panorama político cambió a partir de ese momento. Los reyes Amenemope, Siamón y Osorkón están bien documentados en Tebas, y Pinedjem II no adoptará prerrogativas reales. Además, los puestos de Segundo, Tercero y Cuarto Sacerdote *ḥm-nṯr* de Amón no serán reclamados por la familia de los PSA, si no que, de ahora en adelante, dichas funciones pasarán a manos de poderosos linajes tebanos conectados por alianzas matrimoniales con dichos PSA. Con anterioridad,
se documentan contados individuos desempeñando altas funciones dentro del sacerdocio tebano de Amón; entre ellos, el segundo hijo de Herihor de la famosa escena de la procesión fue Tercer Sacerdote $hmntr$ de Amón, el hermano de Pinedjem I fue Segundo Sacerdote $hmntr$ de Amón y los parientes de $DB$ $Own.$ $4$ fueron Cuartos Sacerdotes $hmntr$ de Amón.\textsuperscript{358} Sin embargo, como propuso K. Kitchen, Menkheperra pudo hacer ciertas concesiones en este sentido en favor de las antiguas familias tebanas a cambio de la aceptación de la gran influencia de los miembros de la familia de Menkheperra en el Alto Egipto\textsuperscript{359}; estrategia que tendrá como consecuencia directa el aumento significativo de poder de una élite local tebana a finales de la Dinastía XXI.

En mi opinión, el aumento de poder y la influencia de estas familias estuvo directamente relacionado con el desarrollo de la jerarquía de sacerdotes $hmntr$ de Khonsu. Menkheperra (B) ($DB$ $Own.$ $4$), miembro de esta pujante y renovada clase sacerdotal e hijo de Tjanefer (A) –Tercer y Cuarto Sacerdote $hmntr$ de Amón– y de una hija del Menkheperra, fue el primer individuo en desempeñar un alto cargo sacerdotal al servicio del dios Khonsu; posiblemente, habiendo sido previamente Padre Divino de Khonsu, heredó de su padre el cargo de Tercer Sacerdote $hmntr$ de Amón, y obtuvo igualmente el mismo cargo dentro al servicio del dios Khonsu. A partir del año 10 del reinado de Siamón, dicha función paso a manos de la familia de Nespakashuty, cuyos miembros ostentaron un amplio numero de puestos sacerdotales y administrativos en Karnak durante Época Libia, incluyendo el oficio de sacerdote $hmntr$ de Khonsu $wts$-$hfrw$. El propio Nespakashuty (ii), su hijo y su nieto ($DB$ $Own.$ $50$ y $51$ respectivamente), además de Terceros Sacerdotes $hmntr$ de Amón o Cuartos Sacerdotes $hmntr$ de Mut, fueron Terceros Sacerdotes $hmntr$.

\textsuperscript{358} Broekman 2011: 95.

\textsuperscript{359} Kitchen 2004: 276-277.
de Khonsu. En este sentido, además de la transferencia hereditaria de este título entre varios miembros de dicho linaje, sería posible sugerir una cierta correspondencia, al menos en determinados momentos, de los puestos de Tercer Sacerdote ḥm-nṯr de Amón y de Khonsu.

A finales de la Dinastía XXI, varias familias de notables tebanos, como la de Tjanefer o Nespakashuty, retomaron el control las principales dignidades vinculadas al culto de Amun, Mut y Khonsu. Mediante la adquisición de altos cargos dentro de las jerarquías sacerdotales de los diferentes dioses de la triada –tanto ya existentes como algunos que no están documentados con anterioridad–, estas familias vieron como su influencia en Tebas aumentó, volvieron a desempeñar un papel relevante tras unos años en los que la familia de los PSA tebanos controlaban todas las posibles esferas de influencia. En este sentido, la aparición de altos cargos dentro de la jerarquía de Khonsu, y posiblemente de Mut, daría respuesta a las necesidades de una pujante nobleza tebana. Es más, durante la Dinastía XXI, Menkheperra (B) y Nespakashuty (ii) iniciarían una tendencia que va a caracterizar el gobierno de los inmediatamente posterior dinastas libios, donde las familias tebanas más influyentes van a dominar los principales sacerdocios y posiciones de poder en Tebas, transmitiéndolos de manera hereditaria dentro de sus propios linajes. Por lo tanto, el sacerdocio de Khonsu jugó un papel relevante, nunca antes señalado, en un contexto en el que la adquisición de oficios vinculados al culto de las principales divinidades tebanas parece un elemento clave para comprender la idiosincrasia y la naturaleza de las relaciones entre la elite local y el poder.

Respecto a lo ocurrido en Tanis, el registro material limita nuestro estudio al reinado de Psusennes I. Aunque no disponemos de evidencias sobre la existencia de una jerarquía de sacerdotes ḥm-nṯr de Khonsu, los individuos más cercanos a la familia real –y cuyo enterramiento estaba previsto junto al del propio monarca–,
monopolizaron los escalafones superiores de los cultos a los dioses de la tríada tebana en la capital, incluyendo el culto de Khonsu y de Khonsu el Niño. El propio rey fue PSA en Tanis; la reina Mutnedjemet (*DB Own. 44*), que lideraba el Cuerpo Musical Sagrado de Amón, fue Madre Divina de Khonsu el Niño, Segundo Sacerdote ḫṁ-mṭṛ de Amón, al igual que sacerdotisa ḫmt-mṭṛ de Mut y Khonsu e Intendente del dominio de Mut; y si bien el príncipe Ankhefenmut (C) ejerció de Gran Mayordomo en el dominio de Amón, el General Wendjebauendjedet (*DB Own. 41*) ostentará la misma dignidad al servicio de Khonsu.

Además de la reina Mutnedjemet, están documentadas otras dos sacerdotisas ḫmt-mṭṛ de Khonsu, habiendo ambas ejercido igualmente la más alta autoridad administrativa en templo de Khonsu de Karnak en tanto que Intendentes de su dominio: *DB Own. 37* y *35*. La propia Mutnedjemet heredó dichas prerrogativas de Henuttauy (A) (*DB Own. 37*), su madre y mujer Pinedjem I; en un momento posterior, Istemkheb (D) (*DB Own. 35*), hija de Menkheperra y mujer del PSA Pinedjem II, ostentó también sendos oficios. Si bien ningún PSA desempeñó altas funciones sacerdotales en las jerarquías de Mut o Khonsu, sus esposas –ḥṝṭ ḡ getResource.wt ḡ getResource.nṭṛ ḡ getResource.tpyt n ḡ getResource.īmn– sí lo hicieron, tanto para la forma principal de Khonsu, como para la divinidad independiente Khonsu el Niño, tanto en Tebas como en Tanis.

subalternas de las primeras. S. A. Naguib propone que el hecho de que una mujer de la élite estuviera al servicio de una divinidad como su \textit{wrt \textit{hnrt}} estuvo determinado por el cargo desempeñado por su marido\textsuperscript{360}. Teniendo en cuenta esta afirmación, el reducido número de sacerdotes \textit{hm-ntr} de Khonsu atestiguados determinaría necesariamente el número de \textit{wrt \textit{hnrt}} de Khonsu; de cualquier modo, \textbf{DB Own. 39} pudo haber sido la esposa de uno de estos sacerdotes \textit{hm-ntr}.

Aunque no existe ninguna evidencia sobre la presencia de un Cuerpo Musical Sagrado dedicado a Khonsu tampoco en Tanis, la nodriza real Irymutpanefer (\textbf{DB Rel. 63}) –hija y esposa de dos altos dignatarios de la corte de Psusennes I, ambos Padres Divinos de Khonsu (\textbf{DB Own. 42} y \textbf{DB Rel. 62} respectivamente)– fue \textit{h\textsubscript{2}r\textsubscript{2}t \textit{šm\textsuperscript{6}ywt n \textit{Hnsw}} en la capital. Junto a sus funciones de \textit{šm\textsuperscript{6}ywt n \textit{Hmn-R\textsuperscript{c} nsw n\textsubscript{r}rw y h\textsubscript{2}sy\textsubscript{2}t n p\textsubscript{3} c\textsubscript{3} n Mwt w\textit{rt nbt I\textsubscript{š}rw}}, su título al servicio del dios Khonsu indicaría la existencia de cierta estructura jerárquica dentro de dicho grupo; sin embargo, no vamos a encontrar más información sobre cantoras al servicio de este dios ni en Tebas ni en Tanis durante el resto del TPI.

Como se puede observar, hay documentado un número muy limitado de mujeres desempeñando funciones sacerdotales de rango medio o bajo al servicio de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep. Sin embargo, en lo que respecta al personal masculino de dicha divinidad, más de una treintena de individuos ostentaron cargos menores vinculados a su culto y administración. Los miembros de este grupo, compuesto principalmente por Padres Divinos, sacerdotes \textit{w\textsuperscript{7}b} y distintos tipos

\textsuperscript{360} Naguib 1990: 201-205.
escribas al servicio de Khonsu\textsuperscript{361}, generalmente ejercieron este mismo tipo de funciones al servicio de los otros miembros de la tríada tebana. Por lo tanto, además de constituir la base de funcionamiento del templo de Khonsu, formaron parte del personal de Amón y Mut como Padres Divinos, sacerdotes \textit{w\textsc{bh}}, Escribas del Templo, Escribas de las Ofrendas Divinas, etc. Las titulaturas de estos individuos son una evidencia más de los vínculos que existieron entre los sacerdotes y funcionarios de los dioses de tríada tebana, comprendiendo también los niveles situados por debajo de los sacerdotes \textit{hm-ntr}. La circulación de servidores entre los distintos monumentos, templos y santuarios del complejo Karnak va a marcar la naturaleza del culto a Khonsu durante la Dinastía XXI. Además, como se ha comentado con anterioridad, la existencia de ciertos títulos administrativos y religiosos que incorporan a Amón, Mut y Khonsu como conjunto refuerza la existencia de cierta correspondencia entre sus respectivos dominios y el funcionamiento de éstos en Tebas.

Asimismo, las titulaturas de otros tres servidores del dios Khonsu tebano en Tanis sugieren que la correspondencia entre los cultos de los distintos miembros de la tríada pudo haberse repetido en la capital; sin embargo, estos datos deben interpretarse con cautela debido a la escasa información prosopográfica disponible sobre la élite tanita. El título de \textit{imy-r hwt-nbw n ‘Imn Mwt Hnsw} documentado para el \textit{DB Own. 43} podría interpretarse en este sentido, sugiriendo que ciertas esferas rituales o administrativas en la capital requerían la actuación conjunta de los

\textsuperscript{361} Aunque sólo \textit{DB Own. 9, 45 y 27} fueron escribas de Khonsu, la función de escriba se repite de manera muy recurrente en las titulaturas de los individuos recopilados en los Chart 1 y 2. Por otro lado, uno de los mencionados Padres Divinos de Khonsu, \textit{DB Own. 29}, fue además \textit{kbh\textsc{w} n Hnsw y kbh\textsc{w} n nb Bmnt}. La posible conexión entre los poseedores de este título y el sacerdocio del dios Montu tebano durante la Dinastía XXV es un tema citado brevemente en el siguiente capítulo; si bien es verdad que dicho vínculo no parece sostenerse para este único Libador de Khonsu de la Dinastía XXI.
sirvientes de Amón, Mut y Khonsu. Además, los Padres Divinos de Khonsu anteriormente mencionados, *DB Own. 42 y DB Rel. 62*, padre y marido de Irymutpanefer (*DB Rel. 63*), merecen una atención especial.

La familia de Ankhefenamun jugó un papel fundamental durante el reinado del faraón Psusennes I. El propio Ankhefenamun (*DB Own. 42*), que desempeñó altos cargos en la corte e incluso estuvo vinculado al culto funerario del monarca, participó del culto de la triada tebana en Tanis como Padre Divino, sacerdote *wrb* y sacerdote *hm-ntr*. Su elevada posición seguramente condicionó las carreras tanto de su hija como de su yerno. Sya (*DB Rel. 62*) parece haber sido un personaje influyente por derecho propio; no obstante, su matrimonio posiblemente le facilitaría el acceso a algunas de las dignidades que ostentó, como por ejemplo la de Inspector del Doble Granero del Faraón, alguna de sus funciones rituales al servicio de Amón y Khonsu o sus tareas funerarias relacionadas con el enterramiento del rey. No hay evidencias para demostrar que la conexión cultural de Irymutpanefer con Khonsu hubiera estado determinada por los lazos de su padre o su marido con dicha divinidad; sin embargo, parece indiscutible pensar que las posiciones desempeñadas por esta tercera generación de la familia reforzó con creces su influencia.

En lo que respecta la transmisión hereditaria de títulos dentro de este bajo sacerdocio de Khonsu, *DB Own. 14 y DB Rel. 16* proporcionan el único ejemplo al respecto: ambos fueron Padres Divinos de Amón, de Mut y de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep. La escasa documentación de detalles genealógicos durante la Dinastía XXI está condicionada por propia naturaleza de las fuentes conservadas. Sin embargo, del mismo modo que los lazos matrimoniales o familiares jugaron un papel clave en el control de ciertas prerrogativas por parte de, por ejemplo, los monarcas tanitas, los PSA tebanos o los miembros de la familia de Nespakashuty, estos factores podrían haber condicionado de igual modo la adquisición de cargos.
como los de Escriba, Padre Divino o sacerdote wrb de Khonsu. Además, como ya he sugerido, el formar parte del personal de los otros dioses de la tríada tebana, tanto en Karnak como en Tanis, pudo ser un factor igualmente determinante en este sentido.

II. Khonsu el Niño

A principios de la Dinastía XXI, la creciente importancia adquirida por los dioses niños se vio reflejada en su integración en el panteón oficial de Khonsu p3-hrd, que se convirtió en beneficiario de un culto independiente que desarrolló su propio personal en Tebas. Éste estaba liderado por las Madres Divinas de Khonsu el Niño, que supervisaban a un grupo de mujeres de rango inferior; un número restringido de hombres formó parte de esta jerarquía. Asimismo, las fuentes disponibles apuntan a la existencia de una institución similar en Tanis al menos durante el reinado de Psusennes I.

Como ya se ha mencionado, las Grandes del Cuerpo Musical Sagrado de Amón Henuttauy (A) (DB Own. 37), Mutnedjemet (DB Own. 44) e Istemkheb (D) (DB Own. 35) desempeñaron altos cargos vinculados al culto y administración de todas las divinidades de la tríada tebana, tanto en Tebas como en Tanis. En un contexto marcado por el gobierno teocrático, estas mujeres fueron también Madres Divinas de Khonsu el Niño, un título sacerdotal que evocaba la maternidad del heredero divino. La devoción por esta forma independiente de Khonsu fue compartida con otras tres mujeres más de la familia de los PSA tebanos: Nedjemet (DB Own. 38), Istemkheb (C) (DB Own. 138) and Henuttauy (C) (DB Own. 36). Éstas, además de ser (ḥrty) wrt ḫnrt (ḥpyt) n ḫmn, estuvieron vinculadas a los cultos
de Amón y Mut, siendo, entre otros cargos, ḫryt mn wrt n Mwt, ḫsyt ṣzt n ḫmn m Wȝst o šmḏyt n ḫmn-R nsw nṯrw.

En base a la documentación disponible, no se pueda afirmar con certeza que todas las ḫryt wrt ḫnrt (tpyt) n ḫmn y las madres de un heredero o heredera fueran Madres Divinas de Khonsu el Niño, ni tampoco que este título haya sido ostentado por las dos esposas principales de los PSA. Lo que parece incuestionable es que las mujeres de las casas gobernantes, tanto en Tebas como en Tanis, jugaron un papel esencial en el culto a Khonsu pḥ-ḥrd. El poder e influencia de los monarcas septentrionales y de los PSA tebanos se extendió por los sacerdocios de Amón, Mut y Khonsu, incluyendo las diferentes manifestaciones de éste último. Sus consortes participaron activamente en dichos cultos, reforzando la legitimidad de sus correspondientes linajes. El liderazgo de estas mujeres sobre el sacerdocio dedicado a Khonsu el Niño favorecía su asimilación con la diosa Mut, madre carnal del heredero divino, con el que cualquier faraón o PSA podía identificarse. Como consecuencia, la aparición del título de Madre Divina de Khonsu el Niño preludia y atestigua los cambios políticos y religiosos introducidos con el inicio de la Dinastía XXI.

La elección de los títulos por los que un individuo era recordado en los componentes de su ajuar funerario estuvo determinada por numerosos y diversos factores. Las titulaturas de estas seis mujeres documentan algunas variantes de dicho título en las que, por ejemplo, se omite el epíteto de Khonsu, o donde se sustituye a Khonsu pḥ-ḥrd por Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep o Khonsu-Ra. En los casos de DB Own. 37 y 44, tanto la presencia como la omisión de la fórmula “ḥṣw wr

363 Al igual que sucede con la reina Mutnedjemet, sería razonable suponer que otras reinas tanitas ostentaron los títulos de (ḥryt) wrt ḫnrt (tpyt) n ḫmn y mwt-nṯr n ḫns w pḥ-ḥrd.
“trat el cargo de Madre Divina de Khonsu Ḥnsw p3-hrd no parece haber tenido consecuencias prácticas en lo que al culto se refiere. Por otro lado, cuando el nombre de Khonsu va solo, está caracterizado como tebano, o aparece asociado a las otras divinidades de la tríada o al templo de Khonsu de Karnak, es muy probable que hiciera referencia a la principal forma del dios Khonsu, Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep. Sin embargo, en lo que respecta al título mwt-nṯr n Ḥnsw, ostentado por Nedjemet (DB Own. 38), Istemkheb (D) (DB Own. 35) y Henuttauy (C) (DB Own. 36), no creo que la omisión del epíteto de Khonsu signifique necesariamente que éstas ostentaran dicha función al servicio de la forma Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep. Aunque el título de mwt-nṯr n Ḥnsw p3-hrd está documentado en el ajuar funerario de DB Own. 35, DB Own. 36 fue recordada exclusivamente por la variante en la que Khonsu no va acompañado de ningún epíteto. A pesar de la documentación de las funciones de Madre Divina de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep o de Khonsu-Ra, las evidencias disponibles no apuntan a la existencia de instituciones similares al servicio de ninguna de las dos manifestaciones mencionadas.

A principios del TPI, diferentes aspectos o epítetos del dios Khonsu adquirieron cierta independencia, encarnando distintos dioses que desarrollaron sus propios cleros y santuarios autónomos; sin embargo, los vínculos inherentes entre estas formas persistieron. En un contexto en el que se desarrolla la doctrina del nacimiento, donde los dioses niño y el culto a las tríadas adquieren gran relevancia, y en el que los vínculos entre Amón, Mut y Khonsu –los componentes de la tríada tebana– se ven reflejados en la organización y estructura de sus templos, los cultos independientes de las diversas manifestaciones del dios Khonsu deben entenderse, hasta cierto punto, como dos caras de la misma moneda. Es posible que, en tiempos de Henuttauy (C) e Istemkheb (D), el cargo de Madre Divina estuviera completamente establecido y vinculado a de Khonsu el Niño; por lo tanto, la falta
de epíteto del dios posiblemente no cambiara la función asociada al título, y tampoco alterara la función que éste desempeñaba en un contexto funerario.

Encontramos un ejemplo similar en el ataúd de Gautsoshen (B) (*DB Own. 141*), dónde ésta es recordada como Nodriza de Khonsu el Niño y Nodriza de Khonsu. Como se ha comentado anteriormente, éste título estuvo estrechamente vinculado al culto de Khonsu el Niño; además, no se documentan otras Nodrizas de Khonsu o de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep durante todo el TPI. Por lo tanto, es razonable sugerir que *DB Own. 141* fuera exclusivamente servidora de Khonsu *p3-hrd*, y no de la forma principal del dios Khonsu.

Por el contrario, el caso de Nedjemet (*DB Own. 38*), considerada la restauradora de la función de Primera Gran Superiora del Cuerpo Musical Sagrado de Amón e instauradora del oficio de Madre Divina de Khonsu el Niño, parece diferente. Si la única variante documentada de este último título hubiera omitido el epíteto de Khonsu, posiblemente podríamos equiparar a Nedjemet con el grupo anteriormente mencionado; sin embargo, ésta fue también, según sus ataúdes y su papiro funerario (*DB Doc. 57* y *58* respectivamente), *mwt-ntr n Ḥnsw-Rc nb Wst* y *mwt-ntr n Ḥnsw m Wst Nfr-ḥtp*. No disponemos de otras evidencias sobre la naturaleza y estructura del sacerdocio de Khonsu el Niño durante su formación, en los momentos iniciales de la Dinastía XXI; tampoco se puede determinar si Nedjemet deliberadamente pretendió presentarse como la madre ritual del heredero divino, Khonsu, en sus diversas manifestaciones, o si ya existía una diferenciación entre las mismas en la esfera cultural. De cualquier modo, la labor desempeñada por la esposa de Herihor en el culto a dicha divinidad, en un sentido amplio, fue fundamental.
Además de Nedjemet, la mención de Khonsu-Ra, Señor de Tebas, en las titulaturas de otros dos individuos podría llevarnos a planter la existencia de un culto y un personal independientes para esta manifestación del dios. A pesar de las diferencias de rango que muestran sus correspondientes titulaturas, Khonsuemheb (DB Own. 10) y el General Wendjebauendjedet (DB Own. 41) fueron ḫm-nṯr n ḫnsw-Rˁ (nb Wˁst) en Tebas y en Tanis respectivamente, y formaron parte del personal de los otros miembros de la tríada tebana en ambas ciudades. Aunque dado nuestro conocimiento actual y el número limitado de evidencias disponibles es complicado encontrar respuestas a esta cuestión, la correspondencia entre Khonsu-Ra, calificado generalmente como tebano, y la forma principal del dios Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep y su templo de Karnak resulta interesante.

Khonsu-Ra aparece representado en el templo de Khonsu de Karnak en numerosas ocasiones, tanto como un dios niño como una divinidad con cabeza de halcón, con iconografía solar y lunar\(^{364}\). Como señaló J.-C. Degardin, en una escena en la que el PSA Pinedjem porta un incensario frente su padre, Khonsu-Ra, señor de Tebas, dicha divinidad aparece igualmente caracterizada como Khonsu Neferhotep\(^{365}\). De manera similar, al dios Khonsu-Ra, señor de Tebas, se le atribuye un epíteto secundario de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep en una escena adyacente\(^{366}\), el de “Señor de la Felicidad” – nb ȝwt-ib\(^{367}\). La asimilación entre Khonsu y Ra en algunos contextos rituales, pudo verse reflejada en la práctica en ciertas áreas del culto, quizás determinando que unos pocos individuos decidieran presentarse como servidores de Khonsu-Ra en sus ajuares funerarios. Sin embargo, y aunque esta


\(^{365}\) Degardin 2000: 44-46 y 50. Véase: Khonsu II: plate 119 A l. 1 y 3 (court, south wall, doorway, west jamb, second register).

\(^{366}\) Khonsu II: plate 124 A l. 1 (court, south wall, doorway, east jamb, lowermost register).

\(^{367}\) See Klotz 2008: 138-139.
diferenciación haya existido, la forma de Khonsu-Ra estuvo estrechamente vinculada a Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep y a su templo. Por lo tanto, no sería descabellado pensar que ambos dioses fuesen, ocasionalmente, equiparados. Aunque esta afirmación debe hacerse con cautela, la existencia de un culto encabezado por las Madres Divinas de Khonsu-Ra o de una jerarquía de sacerdotes ḥm-nṯr al servicio de ésta divinidad me parece poco probable.

Retomando la devoción profesada hacia Khonsu ps-ḥrd, el registro prosopográfico revela la presencia de un grupo de ocho mujeres de la élite que desempeñaron cargos sacerdotales de menor rango relacionados con Khonsu el Niño, posiblemente subordinadas a las Madres Divinas368. Su caracterización como mnṯʾ, ḥnmtt o ḥnmt sugiere su vinculación ritual con las doctrinas de la concepción, del nacimiento y de la lactancia. Entre ellas, Meretamun (F) (DB Own. 4) fue hija del PSA Menkheperra, DB Own. 30 posiblemente fuera hija de Pinedjem II y Gautsoshen (B) (DB Own. 141) de Menkeperra (B), Tercer Sacerdote ḥm-nṯr de Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep. Aunque los lazos familiares de estas tres mujeres seguramente determinaron su estatus social y su posición dentro de la jerarquía del templo, las titulaturas de DB Own. 4, 141, 30, 46, 40, 111, 113 y 33 muestran numerosas similitudes con las de las primeras: más allá de su vínculo con el dios Khonsu el Niño, todas ellas fueron Cantoras de Amon-Ra, y la mayoría participó en el coro de la diosa Mut, habiendo por tanto formado parte de la sugerida circulación de personal entre los diferentes recintos sagrados e instituciones de Karnak.

Por otro lado, al examinar los títulos de Nedjemet (DB Own. 38) y Henuttauy (A) (DB Own. 37), observamos que ambas supervisaron a un grupo de nodrizas al servicio de la diosa Mut en tanto que ḥryt mnṯʾwt n Mwt. Existe un único

368 Naguib 1990: 229.
ejemplo de un cargo similar relacionado con Khonsu el Niño y ostentado por una mujer en todo el TPI: Tamit, parte de la familia de Ankhpakhered –cuyos miembros masculinos se caracterizaron por ostentar la posición de Inspectores de mnfrw de Khonsu el Niño durante el Período Libio–, fue imy-r mnfrwt n Ḥnsw ḫsr durante la segunda mitad del siglo VIII a.C. La falta de evidencias sobre una organización jerárquica dentro del grupo de Nodrizas de Khonsu el Niño durante la Dinastía XXI puede ser un reflejo de la fragmentación del registro material. Sin embargo, los títulos atribuidos al sacerdote wḥ y Padre Divino de Amón, Mut y Khonsu Bennebensekhauenef (DB Own. 134) deben ser considerados a este respecto.

Aunque las servidoras de Khonsu el Niño desempeñaron funciones en consonancia con los roles femeninos tradicionales, durante la dinastía objeto de estudio, algunos hombres participaron de dicho culto, y sus cargos parecen responder a esta misma tendencia. DB Own. 134 es considerado el primer imy-r mnfrw n Ḥnsw ḫsr y él único ejemplo de un ḫmnty n Ḥnsw ḫsr. Aunque presumiblemente estos inspectores estarían al cargo de un grupo de mnfrw, no existen testimonios de tal oficio, al igual que no hay evidencias de ninguna mujer supervisando a un grupo de Nodrizas de Khonsu el Niño para estos momentos. Por tanto, no se debería desestimar la idea de la existencia de ciertos vínculos entre el personal femenino y masculino; en algún contexto ritual, personajes como DB Own. 134 podrían haber estado al mando un grupo de mnfrwt n Ḥnsw ḫsr, de la misma forma que tanto los hombres como mujeres de la familia de Ankhpakhered van a estar vinculados a dicha función en el período inmediatamente posterior.

La idea del surgimiento de un culto mammisíaco asociado a la diosa Mut a principios del TPI, propuesta por el tristemente fallecido H. de Meulenaere, se ve reforzada por el grupo de servidores del dios Khonsu el Niño presentados
anteriormente, número que sobrepasa las evidencias aportadas por él mismo\(^{369}\). En este sentido, el destacado papel cultual del individuo *DB Own. 134*. del grupo de las Madres Divinas y de los diferentes tipos de Nodrizas al servicio del dios Khonsu el Niño deben contextualizarse en al desarrollo de la doctrina del nacimiento y posiblemente vincularse al funcionamiento del Templo A como un mammisi temprano. Estos individuos personifican la creciente atención prestada a los dioses niños en la teología oficial, una promoción del culto a Khonsu *p3-hrd* liderada por las esposas de los PSA tebanos, que reforzaba la legitimidad de éstos y su gobierno asociándoles directamente con el hijo y heredero de Amón y Mut.

El material disponible para Tanis parece indicar la existencia de un templo dedicado a esta divinidad en la capital, al menos durante el reinado de Psusennes I. Ankhefenamun (*DB Own. 42*) fue escriba de dicho templo, un título que no se ha documentado en Tebas hasta el momento; éste, junto con el cargo de Madre Divina de Khonsu el Niño, son los únicos títulos relacionados con Khonsu *p3-hrd* en la capital. La única mujer de la élite documentada en Tanis, precisamente hija de Ankhefenamun, (*DB Rel. 63*) no ejerció ningún cargo en este sacerdocio; aunque fue Nodriza real, no desempeñó dicha función en el terreno ritual. La escasa información prosopográfica sobre este personal tanita no permite establecer comparaciones entre su funcionamiento y el de Tebas, sin embargo, el desarrollo de dicho culto, al igual que el de la tríada tebana, deben analizarse dentro de un contexto marcado por importantes cambios políticos y religiosos, y ser asimismo entendido como una vía alternativa de devoción a Amón-Ra independiente de Tebas.

\(^{369}\) de Meulenaere 1982.
III. Otras manifestaciones secundarias de Khonsu

Se conservan escasas evidencias sobre el culto a otras manifestaciones secundarias de Khonsu durante todo el TPI. En este sentido, y a pesar de que los desarrollos de Khonsu pA-ir-sxrw y de Khonsu (pA)wn-nhw parecen haber transcurrido de forma paralela y vinculados al templo de Khonsu de Karnak, sólo el primero de ellos está documentado por el registro prosopográfico. Nesamun (DB Own. 112) fue sS Hwt-nTr n Hnsw pA-ir-sxrw, hecho que apuntaría a la existencia de un santuario tebano dedicado esta divinidad oracular entre finales de la Dinastía XXI y principios de la XXII. Sin embargo, la escasa información proporcionada por su papiro funerario (DB Doc. 14) limita nuestra interpretación.

Como sugirió G. Posener, el epíteto vinculado a Khonsu pA-ir-sxrw va a permitir diferenciar entre la forma independiente de este dios y el miembro de la denominada “tríada de Khonsus”, formada por Khonsu Khonsu pA-ir-sxrw, Khonsu m W3st Nfr-htp y Khonsu (pA)wn-nhw370. En el primero de los caso, “m W3st” generalmente acompaña al nombre del dios y Khonsu (pA)-wn-nhw estaría ausente. En el caso de Nesamun, en el que dicha divinidad no recibe ningún epíteto, y dónde la información biográfica adicional se limita a la designación de mry-nTr, no es posible valorar si el templo mencionado en su titulatura hace referencia al dedicado a dicha divinidad independiente –posiblemente el Templo C, localizado al sureste de Karnak–, o si por el contrario sería un santuario dentro del templo principal de Khonsu.

Asimismo, este mismo estudioso apuntó a la presencia de esta divinidad en Tanis durante el reinado de Psusennes I: la estatua de un babuino sería el primer

testimonio de dicha divinidad en un contexto religioso\textsuperscript{371}. Sin embargo, no hay evidencias que apunten a la existencia de un culto establecido dedicado a Khonsu p3-ir-sh\textsuperscript{w} en la capital.

Por último, desde finales de la Dinastía XXI, varios miembros de una rama secundaria de la familia de Nespakashuty heredaron el cargo de sacerdotes $hm$-$n$\textsuperscript{tr} de $Hn$sw w\textsuperscript{3}s-h\textsuperscript{w}; sin embargo, la estatua cubo en la que registra la genealogía de este linaje y su vínculo con dicho sacerdocio data del reinado de Osorkón I (DB Own. 82). La naturaleza de Khonsu w\textsuperscript{3}s-h\textsuperscript{w} es muy poco conocida; según G. Posener, éste se encontraba estrechamente vinculado a Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep en base a que ambos fueron mencionados conjuntamente en la inscripción biográfica de Montemhat\textsuperscript{372}.

Durante generaciones, la familia de Nespakashuty consiguió controlar puestos militares y altos cargos sacerdotales y de la administración en los dominios de los distintos dioses de la tríada, incluyendo los títulos de Tercer Sacerdote $hm$-$n$\textsuperscript{tr} de Amón y de Khonsu. Aunque esta rama detentó un poder menor en Tebas, el hermano pequeño de Nespakashuty (DB Rel. 72), su hijo (DB Rel. 71) y el nieto de este último (DB Rel. 73) fueron escribas vinculados con la armada o Abridores de las Puertas del Cielo de Karnak, y heredaron además dicho cargo vinculado a Khonsu w\textsuperscript{3}s-h\textsuperscript{w}; éste fue posteriormente ostentado por Nakhtefmut (A), un dignatario tebano de gran relevancia en Época Libia, lo que sugeriría una cierta importancia de dicho cargo.

Es bastante probable que los lazos familiares de estos individuos con Nespakashuty propiciaran su conexión con el sacerdocio de Khonsu. Es más, otro

\textsuperscript{371} Posener 1968: 403-404.
\textsuperscript{372} Posener 1969: 377 y n. 37.
sobrino de Nespakashuty, Hor (E) (*DB Own. 52*), será ḥm-nṯr Ḥnsw-Rc nb Wȝst ya durante Época Libia. Es muy significativo que todos los descendientes directos de Bakenkhonsu (i) formaran parte del personal al servicio del dios Khonsu. Aunque el hermano de Nespakashuty y sus descendientes fueran servidores de esta manifestación secundaria, la vinculación de ésta con Khonsu en Tebas Neferhotep y su principal centro de culto no debe olvidarse. La monopolización de los principales puestos sacerdotes de Karnak fue un mecanismo de control de la élite. En este contexto, ser parte del personal del templo de Khonsu, que posiblemente incluyera el culto a manifestaciones menores de este dios, constituyó una de las principales esferas de influencia de una élite local tebana que ve incrementado su poder a finales de la Dinastía XXI; poder que mediante alianzas matrimoniales con los nuevos dinastas libios mantendrán e incluso aumentarán.
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**From:** Bab el-Gasus

**Chronology:**

- Dynasty: 21st
- Reign: Menkheperra

**Notes about the document:**

A.115.


Middle 21st D. Mummy braces of HP Menkheperra.


**Pakharu’s Family**

**Other documents and titles:**

- Hr-sStA m pt tA dwAt n pr Imn Mwt 2nsw 2
- Inspector of Khonsu in Thebes

**Images:**


**References:**

- Doc. 13, p. 64.
- Doc 47 (men).
- Nagubi (1990): w nb ln m pr Imn m Ipt-swt (or Hrrt n Imn); it-nTr mry n Imn; Xry-Hbt Hry-tp n Imn; sm m pr Ra; Hsy aA m rx Imn; Hm-nTr n Imn; wnw pt m Ipt-swt.
- *Pr-bm* means “the foreign”.
- See Jansen-Winkeln (2008) for the genealogy.

**Images:**

- Papyrus JE 95705 (Niwinski CAIRO 129, p. 299)
- Ashmole (Aubert 13, p. 65 + XVI planches)
- Rourav (1990): w nb ln m pr Imn m Ipt-swt (or Hrrt n Imn); it-nTr mry n Imn; Xry-Hbt Hry-tp n Imn; sm m pr Ra; Hsy aA m rx Imn; Hm-nTr n Imn; wnw pt m Ipt-swt.
- *Pr-bm* means "the foreign".
- See Jansen-Winkeln (2008) for the genealogy.
### THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

#### Notes about the document:

A.115.

ASAÉ 8, p. 31-2.

#### Other documents and titles:

- Mummy belt (ASAÉ 8, p. 52)
- Papyrus JE 95878 (Navara CAIRO 42, p. 267; Pankoff 1964, p. 66-71, 133 (127)
- Papyrus JE 95705 (Navara CAIRO 129, p. 299)
- Ashmolean (Aubet 13, p. 63 + XVI planches)

Naguib (1990): w′b-lt-br (-(-(?) n Imn m Imn (or Hrrt n Imn); it-nTr mry n Imn; Xry-Hbt Hry-spt n Imn; sm m pr Ra; Hsy aAr m rx Imn; Hm-nTr n Imn; wnw pt m Ipt-swt.

**Pkh-xwr** means "the foreign".

See Jansen-Winkeln (2008) for the genealogy.

#### References:


---

#### Genealogy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Relative</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Owner Title's owner</th>
<th>Tranliteration title's owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Master of Secrets of Amun, Mut and Khonsu</td>
<td>Hry-sStA sm pt tA dwAt n pr Imn Mwt 2nsw</td>
<td>Hry-sStA sm pt tA dwAt n pr Imn Mwt 2nsw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Type of document:

Shroud

Material: Linen
**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

Alba María Villar Gómez

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

### Owner Information

- **ID**: JE 29666
- **Owner**: Pakharu

### References


### Other Documents and Titles


### Images

- [Image of Coffin Ensemble](image1.png)
- [Image of Mummy Belt](image2.png)

### Notes About the Document

- Niwinski (1988): CG 6241/6242/6234/6233/6235; outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy-cover. Mummy braces of HP Pinudjem II.

### Genealogy

**Pakharu’s Family**

- **Father**: Ahaneferamun
- **Inspector of Khonsu in Thebes**: 4th generation of Masters of the Secrets from the Pakharu’s family (source of the genealogical tree, p. 51 Fig. 1).
### The Priests of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:** Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:** Coffin ensemble

**Material:** Wood

**From:** Bab el-Gasus

**Chronology:**

**Dynasty:** 21st

**Reign:** Pinudjem II

**Specific date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Specific date</th>
<th>Notes about the document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other documents and titles:**

- Mummy-linen (AAG 8, p. 28)
- Shroud (AAG 8, p. 28)
- Papyrus CG 58825 (Niemink CAIRO H, p. 302)
- Papyrus S.II.10224 (Niemink CAIRO B1, p. 274-275)
- Ushabti Box JE 29278 (OMR0 74, p. 28)
- Reliefs (Aubert 4, p. 53, Janes 2002, 59)

Naguib (1990): wkh n Imn; dph wkh; wkh n pr Imn wph; lbkh b n Imn; lbkh-nb n Imn wph; lbkh-nb n pr Imn wph; lbkh-nb n Imn wph.

**Images:**

**References:**

**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>JE 29704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Coffin ensemble</td>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign:</td>
<td>Menkheperra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other documents and titles: | - Shroud (ASAE 8, 26)  
- Ushabtis (Aubert 16, p. 68)  
- 4 Canopic jars ex MacGregor and Keiller collections |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Title Owner</th>
<th>Title’s owner</th>
<th>Transliteration title's owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wet nurse of Khonsu the Child</td>
<td>In’t Rhos pr-djnd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Relative</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Relative’s name</th>
<th>Hierog-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>Sisamkhed (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Halfsister</td>
<td>Henuttauy (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Sisamkhed (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Hr</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Relative</th>
<th>Relative’s title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mother of the God Khonsu the Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mother of the God Khonsu the Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Priestess of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The Great of the Domain of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>God’s Father of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Isis priest of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Isis priest of Anubis Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:**

### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

**Owner:** Nentiamun (F)  
**Name transcr.:** Mnt-hm (F)  
**Other name:**

#### Notes about the document:

- **Dynasty:** 21st  
- **Specific date:**  

- **Agora (2004):** Buried under Psusennes III.
- **Ashton (2009):** Book of Amduat, as daughter of Menkheperra, she is presumably to be dated one generation later than her father and would have died in c. 990-970 BCE.

**Other documents and titles:**

- **S. J. (2004):** 67-68: Buried under Psusennes III.
- **Ashton (2009):** Book of Amduat, as daughter of Menkheperra, she is presumably to be dated one generation later than her father and would have died in c. 990-970 BCE.

### Relative Kinship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Relative Kinship</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Hiero-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td>Henuttauy (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td>Henuttauy (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td>Henuttauy (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Hor</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relative's title

- **8** Mother of the God Khonsu
- **31** Mother of Khonsu
- **32** Mother of the God Khonsu
- **288** God's Father of Khonsu
- **288** God's Father of Khonsu

### Images and References:

- **Niwinski, A. (1979):** Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy of the XXIst Dynasty: New Proposals for their Interpretation, JARCE 16: 49-68.
- **Niwinski, A. (1979):** Problems in the Chronology and Genealogy of the XXIst Dynasty: New Proposals for their Interpretation, JARCE 16: 49-68.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

*Alba María Villar Gómez*

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:**

- Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:**

- Coffin ensemble
- Material: Wood

**From:**

- Sub el-Gauss

**Chronology:**

- Dynasty: 21st

**Notes about the document:**

1. Al. 147.
3. Neiniski (1979): his coffin has the features of style of Pinudjem II's or Psusennes' pontificate.
4. Aston (2009, p. 195): he seems to die by Year 10 of Siamun (c. 976 BC), and his father was buried very early in the pontificate of Pinudjem II.

**Images:**

- [Image](image1)

**Relative Kinship:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Hierog-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Mother of the God Khonsu the Child</td>
<td>Hm-nTr 3-nw n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; wr mAAw Ra Itm m WAst; stm m Axt nHH; imy-r iHwt n pr Ra tp Hwt pr Imn.</td>
<td>13B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Nurse of Khonsu the Child</td>
<td>Hm-nTr 3-nw n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; wr mAAw Ra Itm m WAst; imy-r iHwt n pr Ra tp Hwt pr Imn; stm m Axt nHH.</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other documents and titles:**

- Papyrus JE 96538 (Neiniski CAIRO 5, p. 255)/ 96538 (Jansen-Winkeln 18, p. 192) (Ghobbi (Aubert, 16, p. 70)
- Naguib (1990): hm-nTr 3-nw n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; wr mAAw Ra Itm m WAst; rm-nTr 2nw n Imn; Hm-nTr n MnTw; Hm-nTr n 3nm nb KbHw; Hry-sStA m pt tA dwAt; wr mAAw m Ra Itm m WAst; imy-r iHwt n pr Ra tp Hwt pr Imn; stm m Axt nHH.

**References:**


**Images:**

- [Image](image2)

- [Image](image3)

- [Image](image4)

- [Image](image5)
**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

---

**GLOBAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Location/Museum:** Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:** Papyrus

**Material:** Papyrus

**From:** Bab el-Gasus

---

**ID-Owner:**

- **Id:** 5
- **Owner:** Menkheperra (B)
- **Name transliteration:** Mn-kpr-br (B)

---

**Chronology:**

- **Dynasty:** 21st

---

**Notes about the document:**

Aston (2009, p. 195): he seems to die by Year 10 of Siamun (c. 976 BC), and his father was buried very early in the pontificate of Pinudjem II. p. 192: Book of the Dead.

---

**Other documents and titles:**

- **Papyrus JE 96368** (Hinweis CAIRO 5, p. 251)/ 96538 (Jansen-Winkeln 19, p. 192)
- **Aubert (1998, p. 70)**

---

**Images:**

---

**References:**

- **Doc. 18, p. 190**

- **Doc. CAIRO 41, p. 267.**

- **Doc. 64 (men).**

- **Kees, H. (1958).** Das Priestertum im Ägyptischen Staat vom Neuen Reich bis zur Spätzeit. Leiden/Rotterdam.
- **p. 169.**

---

**PDB8**
The Priesthood of Khonsu

Alba María Villar Gómez

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

ID-Owner: 6
Owner: Neqephefaran
Name transcription: Ns-pA-nfr-Hr-an


Naguib (1990):

Blackman (1918):

Images:

References:


Doc. 78 (men).

PDB9
**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

*Alba María Villar Gómez*

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>1G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue</td>
<td>AE_INV_6268-6270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum</td>
<td>Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Coffin ensemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chronics**

- Dynasty: 21st
- Specific date: 970-931 BC according to the museum web page.

**Notes about the document:**

A.1.42.

Niwinski (1988): outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy-cover. JE 26366. Middle/Late 21st Dynasty.


Aston (2009, p. 191): the ushabti box can be dated to the period c. 1030-980 BC.

**Other documents and titles:**

- Outer coffin: JE 28983 (OMRO 74, p. 28)
- Ushabti (Aubert, 24, p. 75)

Naguib (1990): it-n-Tr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-n-Tr n Mwt; Hm-n-Tr n 9Hwty Hry st wr; sSu S Hwt-n-Tr n pr Mwt wrt ISrw; sSu n tA Hryt wrt xnrt tpyt n Imn; rwD aA mH-ib n nb.f; imy-r Hmw-n-Tr n nTrw nbw MHw 5maw.

**References:**

## The Priesthood of Khonsu

### Alba María Villar Gómez

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc:</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue:</th>
<th>JE 95814</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Sub el-Gasus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:


### Other documents and titles:

- NAG1 (1990): *it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr n Mwt; Hm-nTr n 9Hwty*  
  *Hry st wr; sS Hwt-nTr n pr Mwt wrt ISrw; sS n tA Hryt wrt xnrt tpyt n Imn; rwD aA mH-ib n nb.f; imy-r Hmw-nTr n nTrw nbw MHw 5maw.*

### References:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc: 12</td>
<td>ID-Catalogue: S.R.VII.11487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td>Type of document: Papyrus</td>
<td>Material: Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<table>
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<th>Drawer</th>
<th>Owner</th>
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<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ID: 12
ID-Catalogue: E. 29619
Location/Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo
Type of document: Coffin ensemble
Material: Wood
From: Bab el-Gasus

Chronology: 21st Dynasty
Reign: Pinudjem II

Notes about the document:

A.143.
Late 21st D, son of HP Menkheperra.
Mummy-linen of HP Pinudjem II.

Aston (2009, 152): the bandages were made the year 3 of an unnamed king (Amenemope, Osorchor or Siamun) during the pontificate of Pinudjem II.
The coffins have been dated to c. 990-950 BC.

ID-Owner: Hori
Name transliteration: Hori

ID-Tit Owner
Title’s owner
Transliteration title’s owner

1. God’s Father of Khonsu
it-nTr n 2nsw
2. Priest of Anubis Khonsu
Hm-nTr
3. Priest of Khonsu
Hm-nTr n Inpw 2nsw
4. Half-sister
Hmt-nTr
5. Wet-nurse of Khonsu
Hm-nTr n 2nsw

Other documents and titles:

- Osiris shroud (AAE 8, p. 36-37)
- Mummy-linen of HP Menkheperra II (AAE 8, p. 37)
- Ushabti (Aubert 29, p. 81)

Naguib (1990) and Niwinski (1979): it-nTr n Mwt; Hm-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw
nTrw; Hm-nTr n Imn (nb) nswt tAwy; Hm-nTr n 4tX n spAt(?) imy-r xAst; Hm-nTr n 4tH; nb Hwt wrt m WAst.

References:

- Daressy, Lieblein and Gauthier.
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ID-Doc. 1

ID-Catalogue: JE 29613

Location/Museum:

Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

Type of document:

Coffin ensemble

Material: Wood

From:

Bab el-Gasus

Chronology:

Dynasty: 21st

Reign: Pinudjem II

Notes about the document:

A.120.


Middle 21st D.

Leaky (1990: 166-167): in the time of Pinudjem II he held offices in the temple of Onuris at This and Osiris at Abydos.

Aston (2009, p. 198): the pendeological dates this burial to the pontificate of Pinudjem II, c. 1001-976 BC.

Other documents and titles:

Mummy belt and pendant / mummy-braces (ASAE 8, p. 32) / Image d’OQRS SR 14356 (JEA 74, p. 159, 162)

Papyrus Chicago 31759 (Niwinski OASCO 123, p. 297) Book of Amduat

Papyri Cairo S.R.VII.11501 (Niwinski CAIRO 123, p. 297) Book of Amduat

Ushabti Box JE 29295 (OMRO 74, p. 30)

Ushabtis

Naguib (1990): wab n Imn; sS sHnw n pr In-Hrt-5w sA Ra; sS sHnw n pr 3nm (w) nb KbHw; sS sHnw (n) pr Wsir nb Abdw; sS (s)rnp rwD aA n pr sA nsw n K

Other documents and titles:

References:


In Thebes, he was wab priest of Amun and Scribe of the Domain of Khonsu; outside Thebes, he bears more other titles.

Documents:


Doc. 81, p. 118.

Doc. 93 (men).

Doc. 33, p. 85.
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### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc:</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>JE 2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Stela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Sab el-Gasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dynasty: | 21st |
| Specific date: | A.120, Middle 21st D. |

**Notes about the document:**


Leahy (1990: 166-167): in the time of Pinudjem II he held offices in the temple of Osiris at This and Osiris at Abydos.

**Other documents and titles:**

- **Mummy tail and pendant / mummy-bracae (ASA 8, p. 32) / lingis d’Oweis (Sta 14396 (Abdalla 1989, p. 11))**
- **Shroud (JE 14396 (SEA 74, p. 159, 162))**
- **Papyrus Chicago 31795 (Iwanowski CHICAGO 2, p. 304)**
- **Papyrus Cairo S.R.VII.11501 (Niwinski CAIRO 123, p. 297) Book of Amduat**
- **Usaba Box JE 29295 (OMRO 74, p. 30)**
- **Usahbti (Aubert 33, p. 85)**

Naguib (1990): w’b n Imn; sS sHnw n pr In-Hrt-5w sA Ra; sS sHnw n pr 3nm (w) nb KbHw; sS sHnw (n) pr Wsir nb Abdw; sS (s)rnp rwD aA n pr sA nsw n K.

**Images:**

[Image 70x31 to 439x646] [Image 360x596 to 390x604] [Image 75x311 to 82x317] [Image 92x272 to 119x313] [Image 320x599 to 327x606] [Image 366x393 to 373x400]

**References:**


**Document:**

- PDB15
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue</th>
<th>Location/ Museum</th>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Chronicology</th>
<th>Owner Title's owner Tranliteration title's owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S.R.VII.10228</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td>Papirus</td>
<td>Sab el-Gasus</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>God’s Father of Khonsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High priest of Khonsu-Ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes about the document:

- Aston (2009, p. 182): BD; the coffins can be dated to the period c. 1010-950 BC.
- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr n Imn; sS Hsbt n pr Imn; sS n pr Imn.

#### Other documents and titles:

- Coffin ensemble CG 6002-6003-6004 (Niewski doc. 150, p. 132, inner coffin and mummy-case usurped to wab n HAt n Mwt sS Ns-pA-nfr-Hr; Niwinski puts the titles related with Khonsu also in this document, however, Jansen-Winkeln does not consider this option. Looking at Chassinat’s publication of the coffins (1909, p. 3-11), it seems that the titles related to Khonsu are not present in the coffins. Anonymous Papirus JE 96444 (Niewski, CAIRO 7, p. 256).
- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr n Imn; sS Hsbt n pr Imn; sS n pr Imn.

#### Images:

- References:
THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU
Alba María Villar Gómez
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

GLOBAL

ID-Document: 17
ID-Catalogue: shroud_A.106

Location/Museum:

Type of document: Shroud
Material: Leather

From: Bab el-Gasus

Chronology:

Dynasty: 21st
Reign:

Specific date:

Notes about the document:


Other documents and titles:

- Coffin ensemble CG 6002-6003-6004 (Niewinski doc. 150, p. 152, inner coffin and mummy-case) usurped to w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra (Kauf al-Abyad 18: 10-11). Niewinski puts the titles related with Khonsu also in this document, however, Jansen-Winkeln does not consider this option. Looking at Chassinat’s publication of the coffins (1901, p. 13-11), it seems that the titles related to Khonsu are not present in the coffins.
- Anonymous Papyrus: 21st Dynasty, No. 106 (Niewinski, CAIRO 7, p. 256)
- Ushabtis (Aubert 34, p. 86)

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra; w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra; w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra; w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra; w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra; w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra; w-n Tr n 2nsw-Ra.

Other Relative Kinship
Relative’s name
Hierog-Relative
ID-Owner

Images:

References:

Doc. 106, p. 236.
### Global

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue</td>
<td>AE_INV_6299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location/Museum

- **Location:** Kunsthistorigisches Museum, Wien
- **Museum:** Museum of Art

### Type of document

- **Ushabti box**
- **Material:** Wood

### From

- **Sub el Gassus**

### Chronology

- **Dynasty:** 21st
- **Specific date:** c. 1000-950 BCE

### Notes about the document

Jansen-Winkeln (2007) says that it is unpublished, however, the web page of the Museum has several pictures of this item.

### Other documents and titles

- **Coffin ensemble CG 5002-6001-6004** (Niwinski doc. 150, p. 132, inner coffin and mummy-case) usurped to vš n HAt n Mwt sS Ns-pA-nfr-Hr; Niwinski puts the titles related with Khonsu also in this document, however, Jansen-Winkeln does not consider this option. Looking at Chassinat’s publication of the coffins (1909, p. 3-11), it seems that the titles related to Khonsu are not present in the coffins.
- **Anonymous Papyrus JE 95644** (Niwinski, CAIRO 7, p. 256)
- **Ushabtis** (Aubert 34, p. 86)
- **Jansen-Winkeln (2007):** it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr n Imn; sS Hsbt n pr Imn; sS n pr Imn.

### Images

- ![Image 1](http://bilddatenbank.khm.at/viewArtefact?id=324718&view=AE_INV_6299_VSR.jpg)
- ![Image 2](http://bilddatenbank.khm.at/viewArtefact?id=324718&view=AE_INV_6299_VSR.jpg)
- ![Image 3](http://bilddatenbank.khm.at/viewArtefact?id=324718&view=AE_INV_6299_VSR.jpg)

### References

- Doc. 100, p. 236: unpublished.
## The Priesthood of Khonsu

### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>N.E 29664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Coffin ensemble</td>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes about the document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Dynasty:** 21st
- **Specific date:**

There is a graffiti of a wab of Khonsu called Nes-pa-nefer-her in the Temple of Mut (Traunecker F2.1).

**Other documents and titles:**

- **Naguib (1990):** it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr n 1r; sS nTr n pr Imn; imy-r nfrw n pr Imn.

**References:**

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

**Location/Museum:** Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:** Coffin ensemble

**Material:** Wood

**From:** Bab el-Gasus

**Dynasty:** 21st

**Reign:** Pinudjem II

**Specific date:** A.49.

**Foreign (Owner):**

**Name transliteration:** wab-priest of the fore of Khonsu

**Title's owner:** 21st Priest of Khonsu

**Hierog-Relative:**

**Relative's name:**

**Relative's title:**

**Tree genealogy:**

**Other documents and titles:**

- Papyrus S.R.VII.10236 (Niwinski doc. 73, p. 279)
- Ghoulad (ASAE 8, p. 26)
- Mummy-braces (ASAE 7, p. 26)
- Ishkade (Aubert doc. 49, p. 101)
- Stela JE 29313

- Naguib (1990): It-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS m pr Imn; sS nsw.

**Images:**

**References:**

### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/</td>
<td>Museums:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhône du Louvre, Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of</td>
<td>document:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology:</td>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes about the document:</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>Neiwinski (1989): late 21st D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other documents and titles:

- Piankoff (1957): wab n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS Htp-nTr n pr Imn.
  - father (1r-(sA)-Ist): it-nTr n Imn.

#### References:

## The Priesthood of Khonsu

### Alba María Villar Gómez

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc: 2</td>
<td>ID-Catalogue: Florence 2154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum: Museo Archeologico, Firenze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document: Inner case</td>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

Niwinski (1988): provenance from the Gall collection (nº 1376), purchased before 1856.

### Other documents and titles:

Niwinski (1988): it-nTr n Imn; it-nTr n Mwt.

The father bears the same titles.

### References:


Doc. 186, p.139.
# THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

## The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

### Alba María Villar Gómez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum:</td>
<td>Musée du Louvre, Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Coffin ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

**Niewinski (1988):** outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy-cover. Probably presented by F. Cailliaud to the Bibliothèque Nationale about 1820.

**Jansen-Winkeln (2007):** middle-late 21st D.

### Other documents and titles:

**Niewinski (1988):**

- it-nTr n 2nsw
- it-nTr n 2nsw m WAst Nfr-Htp

**Jansen-Winkeln, K. (2007).**


- Doc. 144, p. 256.


- Doc. 329, p. 164.


- p. 132.
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

## The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

### Document Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc:</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue:</th>
<th>Berlin 3005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Location / Museum

- Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin

### Type of document

- Papyrus

### Material

- Papyrus

### From

- Unknown

### Dynasty

- 21st

### Specific date

Unknown

### Notes about the document:


### Other documents and titles:

Niwinski (1988): Wb Hry wbA m Ipt-swt; it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr n Mwt wrt nb ISrw; it-nTr mry Inpw m pt tA dwAt; Xry-Hbt Hry-tp imn rn.f; Hry sSw Hwt-nTr n pr Imn-Ra nbw nTrw MHw 5maw; wr mAAw n Ra-Itm n WAst; stm n Axt nHH; wnw p t m Ipt-swt; Hry-sStA m pt tA dwAt.

### References:

  - Doc. 144, p. 256.
  - Doc. BERLIN 3, p. 244.
### THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

| ID-Doc: | 24 |
| Location/ Museum: | MAN, Madrid |
| Type of document: | Coffin ensemble |
| Material: | Wood |
| From: | Bab el-Gasus |

**Dynasty:** 21st

**Notes about the document:**

A13. JE 29693.


Middle 21st D.: Mummy-braces of HP Menkhepere.

Aston (2009, p. 166): the pendants date this burial to the pontificate of Menkheperra A, c. 1051-1001 BC. The coffin dates from c. 1010-1000 BC onwards thus this tomb group may be dated c. 1010-1000 BC.

**Other documents and titles:**

- Shroud (ASAE 8, p. 22)
- Pendants/mummy-braces (ASAE 8, p. 22)

Naguib (1990): š-mḫ-pr x Mwt st nṯr bỉn nwt Hn. š-pr x Dsc pḥ-nw Hn. MP x ḫr 17.

**Images:**

![Image](http://ceres.mcu.es/pages/MAN)

**References:**

- Doc. 34, p. 89.
- Doc. 280, p. 155.
- Doc. 37 (men).
### Document Information

**ID:** Doc. 33

**Location/Museum:** Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:** Coffin ensemble

**Material:** Wood

**From:** Bab el-Gasus

### Chronology

**Dynasty:** 21st

**Reign:** Menkheperra

### Notes about the document:

A11.

Niewinski (1988): CG 6243/6244/6227/6226/6228; outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy cover. Middle 21st D.

Mummy-braces of HP Menkheperra.

Aton (2009, p. 166): the bracae date the burial to the pontificate of Menkheperra A. The outer coffin c. 1020 BC, then the burial can be dated c. 1020-1000 BC.

### Other documents and titles:

- Mummy belt (ASAE 8, p. 22)

- Pendants / mummy-braces (ASAE 8, p. 22)

Naguib (1990): De ap n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS n pr Imn; sS wAH Htp-nTr n nTrw nbw Wst.

### The Priesthood of Khonsu

Alba María Villar Gómez

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue</td>
<td>shroud_A.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum</td>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Shroud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology</td>
<td>21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty</td>
<td>Menkheperra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes about the document</td>
<td>ASAE 8, p. 20. A.11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID-Owner:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Pi-$\text{a}$nu-$\text{a}$tu $\text{a}$.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierog-Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID-Tit:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title's owner</th>
<th>God’s Father of Khonsu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tranliteration title's owner</td>
<td>it-nTr n Imn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific date</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scribe of the Divine Offerings of Amun, Mut and Khonsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS n pr Imn; sS wAH Htp-nTr n nTrw nbw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other documents and titles:**

- Mummy belt (ASAE 8, p. 22)
- Pendant / mummy-braces (ASAE 8, p. 22)
- Naguib (1990):

**References:**


Doc. 33, p. 89.
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

---

### GLOBAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Document</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location/Museum

- **Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo**

### Type of document

- **Papyrus**

### From

- **Bab el-Gasus**

### Chronology

- **21st Dynasty**

### Notes about the document:


### Other documents and titles:

- **Mummy-belt (ASAE 8, p. 22)**
- **Pendants / mummy-braces (ASAE 8, p. 22)**
- **Naguib (1990):** "It was a time when the gods were in the middle of the world."

---

### Images

- **Doc. 33, p. 89.**
- **Doc. CAIRO 46, p. 269.**

### References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID: Doc</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>CG 6011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum:</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Outer case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes about the document:

SAME DOC. THAN DB DOC. 200 (DB OWN. 18=ORIGINAL OWNER).

Chassinat (1909): outer coffin, inner lid and mummy-cover (CG 6010-6011-6012-6013) reused by Gautsoshen (B) (DB Own. 141).

Niwinski (1988): Daressy’s list unknown. Middle 21st D.

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): A.139, as DB Doc. 29. 21st D.

The usurper of the coffins (CG 6010-6011-6012-6013) was DB Own. 141, possibly the great-granddaughter of HPA Menkheperra (mummy-braces inscribed during the pontificate of HP Pinedjem II). However, the owner of the coffins was DB Own. 18, or at least the owner of this outer case.

Chassinat (1909) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): wab n HAt Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS sHnw n pA Hm-nTr tpy n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS sHnw n pr Imn. it-nTr n Imn only mentioned by Niwinski.

#### Other documents and titles:

It is not clear if DB Doc. 28 and 29 are part of the same coffin ensemble. Chassinat (1909) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): v b n b sImn-W-R a sm nTrw. It is only mentioned by Niwinski.

#### References:

- Doc. 19, p. 150: He said that the distribution of coffins between Cairo and Leiden is uncertain. He does not mention any coffin ensemble from Leiden (DB Doc. 29).
- Doc. 71 (men).
- Doc. 38, p. 90: Gautsoshen (B) usurped part of his coffin ensemble, as well as elements from an anonymous person’s set. These coffins are in Cairo and Leiden.
- Doc. 38, p. 90: Gautsoshen (B) usurped part of his coffin ensemble, as well as elements from an anonymous person’s set. These coffins are in Cairo and Leiden.
- Doc. 71 (man).
- Doc. 38 (men): the author said that CG 6010, 6011, 6012, and likely 6013, composed the burial assemblage of Gautsoshen; while CG 6011 previously contained the mummy of DB Own. 18.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Museum</th>
<th>Coffin ensemble</th>
<th>Material:</th>
<th>Wood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bab el-Gasus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID-Owner**: Niasurnumnebmaatayu

**Name transliteration**: "N-y-nb-m-ntr-mdnt-nry". **Other name**: 

- **Hierog-Owner**: 
- **Other name**: 

**ID-Owner**: 

- **Title’s owner**: God’s Father of Khonsu
- **Transliteration title’s owner**: "it-n-Tr nw nsw"  

**Notes about the document:***

- **Dynasty**: 21st
- **Specific date**: 
- **Chronology**: 

The usurper of the coffins was Gautsoshen (B) (DB Own. 114), possibly the great-granddaughter of HP Menkheperra (mummy-braces inscribed during the pontificate of HP Pinudjem II).

**Chassinat (1909) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007):**

\[wab n HAt Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS sHnw n pA Hm-nTr tpy n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS sHnw n pr Imn.\]

\[it-n-Tr n Imn\]

only mentioned by Niwinski.

**Other documents and titles:**

- A.139. JE 29617.

Niwinski (1988): outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy-cover. Name and titles on the case belonged to DB Own. 18 (as in DB Doc. 28).

**Doc. 228, p. 146.**


- Doc. 38, p. 90.

Gautsoshen (B) usurped part of the coffin ensemble of DB Own. 18, as well as elements from an anonymous person’s set. These coffins are in Cairo and Leiden.

References:

- Doc. 228, p. 146.
- Doc. 38, p. 90.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Owner: Padiamun</td>
<td>Name transliteration: Pd-al-Imn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Inner lid</td>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Bub el-Gasus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty: 21st</td>
<td>Specific date: c. 987–981 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign: Pinudjem II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes about the document:

**A 33. INNER LID OF THE COFFIN ENSEMBLE DB DOC. 31.**

- According to Niwinski (1999 p. 104), the whole coffin was usurped and his first owner, DB Own. 19, owned the whole ensemble: JE 29706 (DB Doc. 31)

- Naguib (1995) and Niwinski (1999 p. 94-95, lower part of the lid, middle text): "wab SAy HAt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; wab aA Aq n Imn m Ipt-4wt; it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw.

- Other documents and titles:
  - The usurper, DB Own. 20, possibly bore the same titles than the first owner as he did not destroy nothing but the name of DB Own 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Additional Information:


- Doc. 120, p. 128. Usurped by BD Own. 20, who was "it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw."


- p. 93-104: In-depth analysis and updated information given in Niwinski 1988 about date and titles. The usurper, BD Own. 20, possibly bore the same titles than the first owner as he did not destroy nothing but the name of BD Own 19.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue</td>
<td>JE 29706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:**
- Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:**
- Coffin ensemble
- Material: Wood

**From:**
- Sub el-Gassus

**Chronology:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Specific date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**

A 93.

**Coffin Ensemble Which Includes DB Doc. 36.**

Niwinski (1988): CG 6152/6153/6160: inner coffin and mummy-cover. Middle 21st D.

Niwinski (1999): production of the coffin in the early years of HP Pinudjem II and King Amenemope (c. 987-981 BCE).

**Other documents and titles:**

Niwinski (1999): wab SAy n HAt Imn; wab; it-ntr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr mry m Ipt-4wt; Hsy aA; wnw pt m Ipt-swt; Hry-sStA n nAw Hwt-nbw n pr Imn.

**Other documents and titles:**


Doc. 12b, p. 128. DB Oen: 20 was it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw-nTrw.


Doc. 5 (men).


References:


Doc. 5 (men).


The Temple of Khonsu I: This priest is involved in the procession of the barks of the Theban triad and Amunet; he is at side of the Bark of Khonsu (plate 44 column 8).

Perhaps there is another relief representing this person: The Temple of Khonsu I, plate 26:20-21, which would identify him as the 9th son of Herihor from the procession of his family. The title Hm-nTr priest of Khonsu is not mentioned there, but it might be possible to equate DB Own. 21 with this individual, although there is no conclusive evidence in this regard. In affirmative case, he would be entitled also as sA-nsw n Xt.f.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>12086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td>Museo Civico di Storia ed Arte, Trieste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Inner coffin</td>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Owner:</th>
<th>Name transliteration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Padiamun</td>
<td>Pr-di-iəw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicknames:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Tit Owner</th>
<th>Owner Title's owner</th>
<th>Transliteration title's owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>wab-priest of Khonsu</td>
<td>w³ w₂nsw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Hiero-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images:</th>
<th>References:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Possible doc. 33.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:**
City Museum, Leeds

**Type of document:**
Coffin ensemble

**Material:**
Wood

**From:**
Unknown

**Chronology:**
**Dynasty:** 21st Dynasty
**Reign:** Ramesses XI

**Notes about the document:**

**Other documents and titles:**
Niwinski (1988): wab; it-nTr mry; sS Hwt-nTr n MnTw-Ra nb WAst; sS Hwt-nTr n MnTw-Ra nsw nTrw; sS wAH Htp-nTr n nTrw nbw MHw 5maw.
David and Tapp (1993) entitled him also as an Incense-bearer.

**Images:**
- [Image](http://www.mylearning.org/ancient-egypt-death-and-the-afterlife/images/1-2890/)
- [Image](http://www.mylearning.org/ancient-egypt-death-and-the-afterlife/p-2814/)

**References:**

**Other documents and titles:**


---

**Doc. 220, p. 145.**

**PDB35**
**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3D-Catalogue</td>
<td>A.776-781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:**
Musées des Beaux-Arts et Archéologie, Besançon

**Type of document:**
Coffin ensemble

**Material:**
Wood

**From:**
Thebes

**Chronology:**
21st Dynasty

**Specific date:**

**Notes about the document:**


Early 21st D. Provenance unknown.

Gasse (1982-1983) states the Theban provenance of this document and DB Doc. 36.

**Images:**

- Outer lid.
- Outer case.
- Inner lid.
- Inner case.
- Mummy-cover.

**References:**

- Early 21st D. Provenance unknown.
- Gasse (1982-1983) states the Theban provenance of this document and DB Doc. 36.

**Other documents and titles:**

- Papyrus Paris EN 626
- Papyrus Louvre E17400 (Newinski PARIS 49, p. 363)
- Udaaba Bogdika 2243
- Wood stele Louvre N.2973

**Naguib (1988) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007):**

- wab n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; wab n HAt n Imn; wab n HAt n Mwt; wab aA aq m Ipt-Swt; sS nsw mAat mr.f; imy-r nfrw n pr Imn; imy-r iHw n pA mdw Sps aA n Imn; imy-r mSa; Hsy aA m rx Imn; Hm-nTr n Imn-Ra (2pr).


- mr KAt nbt wrt n Imn Mwt wrt nbt ISrw; mr-kAwt nb n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; mr kAwt n mnw nbw wrw n Imn Mwt 2nsw; mr-kAt nbt wrt n Imn Mwt 2nsw.

**Gasset’s study:**


**Study of all the monuments of this owner including his titles and variations.**

**Identiﬁcatory information:**

- Owner: Seramus
- Nickname: 3r-3rm
- Other name: 
- Hierog-Owner: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Tit</th>
<th>Owner Title’s owner Tranliteration title’s owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Overseer of the Works of all the Great Monuments of Amun, Mut and Khonsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Great Favoured of the Lords of Thebes, of Amun, Mut and Khonsu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hierog-Relative:**

- Relative’s name

**Tree genealogy:**

**ID-Relative:**

- Relative’s title

**Images:**

- Outer lid.
- Outer case.
- Inner lid.
- Inner case.
- Mummy-cover.

**References:**

  - Doc. 126, p. 250.

  - Doc. 41, p. 111.

  - Doc. 102 (men).

**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**

*Alba María Villar Gómez*

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc: 24</td>
<td>Owner: Seramun</td>
<td>Name transcription: Sr-Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nickname:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document: Papyrus</td>
<td>Material: Papyrus</td>
<td>Hierog-Owner:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Thebes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chronology**

- Dynasty: 21st
- Specific date: 

**Notes about the document:**

p de Luynes, Cabinet des Médailles. Two fragments of a mythological papyrus, but the second one does not register any Khonsu title (Paris BN 825).

Gasse (1982-1983) states the Theban provenance of this document and DB Doc. 35.

**Other documents and titles:**

- Papyrus Paris BN 824
- Papyrus Louvre E17400 (Niwinski PARIS 49, p. 363)
- Ushabti Bologna 2143
- Wood stela Louvre M.2973

Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): wab n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; wab n HAt n Imn; wab n HAt n Mwt; wab aA aq m Ipt-Swt; sS nsw mAat mr.f; imy-r nfrw n pr Imn; imy-r iHw n pA mdw Sps aA n Imn; imy-r mSa; Hsy aA m rx Imn; Hm-nTr n Imn-Ra (2pr).

Gasse (1982-1983: 53) records variants of ID-tit-O 22 (vide supra): mr-KAt nbt wrt n Imn Mwt wrt nbt ISrw; mr-kAwt nb n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; mr-kAwt n mnw nbw wrw n Imn Mwt 2nsw; mr-kAt nbt wrt n Imn Mwt 2nsw.

**References:**


**Study of all the monuments of this owner including his titles and variations.**
**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc: 25</td>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Name transliteration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickname:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierog-Owner:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Tit Owner</td>
<td>Title's owner</td>
<td>Transliteration title's owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**

Niwinski (1988): outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy-cover. Early 21st D.

Niwinski (1989): the owner was mentioned in a graffiti of the period of Smendes and a son of the owner was mention in a inscription of the year 16 of Smendes.

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): the owner’s son may be mentioned in a note on the re-burial coffin of Amenhotep I in the year 16 Pinedjem I.

**Other documents and titles:**

- Papyrus Paris BN 38-45 (Niwinski PARIS 4, p. 350).
- Ushabti box E. 13322 (Lior des Pharaons p. 278).
- Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): wab Hry wbA m Ipt-swt; wab Hry wbA; sS Hwt-nTr m Ipt-swt; Hry sSw Hwt-nTr n Imn-Ra; Hry sSw Hwt-nTr n pr Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hry sSw Hwt-nTr n pr-HD n pr Imn-Ra nsw nTrw.
- wife (1nwt-nTrw): nbt pr; Smayt n Imn.

**Images:**

- [Link to image](http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=sal_frame&idSalle=137&langue=fr).
- [Link to image](http://www.marcpottier.com/3-1-3_egito.html).

**References:**

- Doc. 100 (men).
- She doesn’t mention the coffin, just the papyrus.
- Doc. PARIS 4, p. 350.
- Doc. 125, p. 249.
- He says that a son of the owner was mention in a note of the re-burial coffin of Amenhotep 1 in the year 16 Pinedjem 1.
- Doc. 341, p. 166.
- Doc. 125, p. 249.
- He says that a son of the owner was mention in a note of the re-burial coffin of Amenhotep 1, during the 16 year of Pinedjem (different than Niwinski 1989)
- Doc. 341, p. 166.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 21st Dynasty

**Title's owner:** Overseer of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep

**Translation:** Nfr-Htp

**Chronology:**
- A.52.
- Niwinski (1988): late 21st D. Inv. No. 163 (bis) (7363)
- Aston (2009 p. 173): according to John Taylor's Thesis, the coffin date to c. 1050-970 BC.
- Aston also said that the coffin's owner is a woman called Shedkhonsu.

**Notes about the document:**

- A.S2.
- Niwinski (1988): late 21st D. Inv. No. 163 (bis) (7363)
- Aston (2009 p. 173): according to John Taylor's Thesis, the coffin date to c. 1050-970 BC.
- Aston also said that the coffin's owner is a woman called Shedkhonsu.

- **Other documents and titles:**
  - Coffin ensemble (inner lid, inner case and mummy-cover) usurped by the songstress of Amun Geneva 007363, 012454 + Vienna AE_INV_6271 (from Museum's webpage)
  - (Geneva Inv. Nos. 163, 163 ter. (12454) + Vienna Inv. No. 6271: Niwinski doc. 197, p. 140-141)

- **Images:**

- **References:**
  - Doc. 196, p. 140.
  - Doc. 104 (men).
  - A lacuna covers the title related to Khonsu; it is reconstructed as mr(?).
### THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:**
Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden

**Type of document:**
Mummy-cover

**Material:**
Wood

**From:**
Unknown

**Chronology:**

- **Dynasty:** 21st
- **Reign:**
- **Specific date:**

**Notes about the document:**

- Niewiński (1988): purchased in 1828 from the collection of J. d’Atanasy. Middle 21st D.

**Images:**


**Consulted Sources:**


**Additional Information:**

- He called this owner Nesi-pa-neb-au.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### Alba María Villar Gómez

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Owner:</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Arnesneb</td>
<td>Name transliteration:</td>
<td>3m-Enwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicknames:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hier-Owner:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name transliteration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Assasi</td>
<td>From:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology:</td>
<td>21st - early 22nd</td>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reign:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**

- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): middle-late 21st D.

**Other documents and titles:**


**Images:**


**References:**

- Sadek, A. A. F. (1985). Contribution à l’étude de l’Amduat: les variantes tardives du Livre de l’Amduat dans les papyrus du Musée du Caire. Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen. p. 95 (about their ancestors): these Fourth Priests of Amun are not attested in any other known source and their chronological position is uncertain; however, it is not impossible that they were in office in the first half of the 21st D (no Fourth Priests of Amun are known for this period).
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**  
**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:**  
British Museum, London

**Type of document:** Papyrus  
**Material:** Papyrus

**From:** Unknown

**Chronology:**  
**Dynasty:** 21st  
**Raign:**

**Notes about the document:**  
Late 21st D.

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): middle-late 21st D.

- **Father:** it-nTr n 2nsw m WAst Nfr-Htp
- **Mother:** Ns-tA-wDAt-Axt

**Other documents and titles:**  

Niwinski (1989): it-nTr mry-nTr.*

On the British Museum Collection Database, the owner’s titles are: God’s Servant; Priest of Amun; God’s Father of Mut; Scribe of the Divine Offerings of the Amun Domain and God’s Father of Khonsu-Mswaset-Neferhotep. Maybe these titles were recorded on the body of the papyrus.

- **Father:** Ne-nFr-Fr.
- **Mother:** Ne-nRtFr.

**Images:**  
© Trustees of the British Museum  
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/Search_object_image.aspx?objectId=116654&partId=1&org=%2fresearch%2fsearch_the_collection_database%2fMuseum_number_search.aspx&objectPage=1&objectId=10312&documentPage=1&assetId=1013614

**References:**

Doc. 150, p. 258.

Doc. LONDON 54, p. 335.
**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

*The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue</th>
<th>JE 19622</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum:</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Outer lid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign:</td>
<td>Psusennes II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**

Niwinski (1979 and 1988): gilded coffin from late 21st D., pontificate of Psusennes. It seems likely that DB Own. 30 was the daughter of the High Priest Pinudjem II.


**Other documents and titles:**

Naguib (1990): Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; nbt pr; sAt n Hm-nTr tpy.

**References:**


The style of the coffin (only the outer lid remains) corresponds with the period of the pontificate of Psusennes, so it seems likely that she was the daughter of the High Priest Pinudjem II. Gilded coffin.

---

**Images:**

### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc: 41</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue: Cat. 1780 RCGE 46569</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum: Museo Egizio, Torino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document: Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material: Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Thebes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other documents and titles: Niwinski (1989): it-nTr n Imn-Ra; it-nTr n Mwt. Father (PA-nfr-Hr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images: <a href="http://collezioni.museoegizio.it/eMuseumPlus?service=ExternalInterface&amp;module=collection&amp;objectId=101688&amp;viewType=detailView">Image</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

**Owner:** Unknown

**Location/Museum:** Archæological Museum, Zagreb

**Type of document:** Papyrus

**Material:** Papyrus

**Material:**

**From:** Unknown

**Chronology:** 21st - early 22nd

**Notes about the document:**


Even though Niwinski says that this owner was wab priest of Khonsu, he possibly was confused by the name of the owner. According to Uranic the correct lecture of his name was: Idjedtu-Khonsu-kheper; the theophoric name of the owner contained the name of the god Khonsu, which is written on the vignette at the beginning of the name. He also says that the correct way of reading the name is made clear in the text itself. He was wab-priest of Amun and he might be a resident of Thebes.

**Other documents and titles:**

He was wab n Imn instead of wab n 2nsr.

**Images:**

- [Image 1](#)
- [Image 2](#)
- [Image 3](#)

**References:**


**Additional information:**

- He gives the real lecture of the name and the title, not related to the god Khonsu.
- He gives also the real lecture of the name and the title, not related to the god Khonsu.
THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

Niwinski (1989): presented by a Mr. Pieper in 1820.
Outer and inner coffins.
The mummy belonged to Bakenkhonsu, her son (owner of Pap. Belin 10500).
Late 21st D. - early 22nd D.
Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 21st D.

Other documents and titles:
Niwinski (1988): Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hsyt Hr Imnt WAst; nbt pr.

References:

Images:
References:
**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

---

**ID-Document:** 66  
**ID-Catalogue:** MMA 30.3.31

**Location/Museum:** Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

**Type of document:** Papyrus  
**Material:** Papyrus

**From:** MMA 65 (TT358), Deir el-Bahri

**Chronology:** Dynasty: 21st  
Reign: Pinudjem I

**Notes about the document:**
- The papyrus was found in the tomb of the Queen Ahmose Merytamun, in the entry corridor, inside an Osiris figure (MMA 1928-1929). Book of the Dead, JE 55146. TG 837.
- Niwinski (1988 and 1989): she was possibly a daughter of the HP Herihor, and she was buried under the pontificate of Masaharta and reign of Smendes I.
- Aston (2009, p. 202): DB Own. 34's mother died before c. 1050 BC and she died one generation later, before c. 1020 BC.

**Other documents and titles:**
- Coffin ensemble MMA 30.3.23-25 (Niwinski 1989, doc. 316, p. 161, outer and inner cofins, and mummy board): the coffins were originally inscribed for Tjenet-bekhenu, Nauny's mother, whose name was replaced in the most important sections of the text, but not everywhere.
- Papyrus MMA 30.3.32 (Niwinski 1989, doc. NEW YORK 14, p. 346): attests to the Amduat. Niwinski puts all DB Own. 34's titles in this papyrus; however, DB title 30 does not seem to appear here.
- Ushabtis OMRO 74, p. 39, MMA 30.6.26-30

**References:**

---

**Notes about the document:**
- The papyrus was found in the tomb of the Queen Ahmose Merytamun, in the entry corridor, inside an Osiris figure (MMA 1928-1929). Book of the Dead, JE 55146. TG 837.
- Niwinski (1988 and 1989): she was possibly a daughter of the HP Herihor, and she was buried under the pontificate of Masaharta and reign of Smendes I.
- Aston (2009, p. 202): DB Own. 34's mother died before c. 1050 BC and she died one generation later, before c. 1020 BC.

**Other documents and titles:**
- Coffin ensemble MMA 30.3.23-25 (Niwinski 1989, doc. 316, p. 161, outer and inner cofins, and mummy board): the coffins were originally inscribed for Tjenet-bekhenu, Nauny's mother, whose name was replaced in the most important sections of the text, but not everywhere.
- Papyrus MMA 30.3.32 (Niwinski 1989, doc. NEW YORK 14, p. 346): attests to the Amduat. Niwinski puts all DB Own. 34's titles in this papyrus; however, DB title 30 does not seem to appear here.
- Ushabtis OMRO 74, p. 39, MMA 30.6.26-30

**References:**

---

**Notes about the document:**
- The papyrus was found in the tomb of the Queen Ahmose Merytamun, in the entry corridor, inside an Osiris figure (MMA 1928-1929). Book of the Dead, JE 55146. TG 837.
- Niwinski (1988 and 1989): she was possibly a daughter of the HP Herihor, and she was buried under the pontificate of Masaharta and reign of Smendes I.
- Aston (2009, p. 202): DB Own. 34's mother died before c. 1050 BC and she died one generation later, before c. 1020 BC.

**Other documents and titles:**
- Coffin ensemble MMA 30.3.23-25 (Niwinski 1989, doc. 316, p. 161, outer and inner cofins, and mummy board): the coffins were originally inscribed for Tjenet-bekhenu, Nauny's mother, whose name was replaced in the most important sections of the text, but not everywhere.
- Papyrus MMA 30.3.32 (Niwinski 1989, doc. NEW YORK 14, p. 346): attests to the Amduat. Niwinski puts all DB Own. 34's titles in this papyrus; however, DB title 30 does not seem to appear here.
- Ushabtis OMRO 74, p. 39, MMA 30.6.26-30

**References:**

---

**Notes about the document:**
- The papyrus was found in the tomb of the Queen Ahmose Merytamun, in the entry corridor, inside an Osiris figure (MMA 1928-1929). Book of the Dead, JE 55146. TG 837.
- Niwinski (1988 and 1989): she was possibly a daughter of the HP Herihor, and she was buried under the pontificate of Masaharta and reign of Smendes I.
- Aston (2009, p. 202): DB Own. 34's mother died before c. 1050 BC and she died one generation later, before c. 1020 BC.

**Other documents and titles:**
- Coffin ensemble MMA 30.3.23-25 (Niwinski 1989, doc. 316, p. 161, outer and inner cofins, and mummy board): the coffins were originally inscribed for Tjenet-bekhenu, Nauny's mother, whose name was replaced in the most important sections of the text, but not everywhere.
- Papyrus MMA 30.3.32 (Niwinski 1989, doc. NEW YORK 14, p. 346): attests to the Amduat. Niwinski puts all DB Own. 34's titles in this papyrus; however, DB title 30 does not seem to appear here.
- Ushabtis OMRO 74, p. 39, MMA 30.6.26-30

**References:**
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

*Alba María Villar Gómez*

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>CG 61031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location/Museum:</strong></td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of document:</strong></td>
<td>Coffin ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material:</strong></td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From:</strong></td>
<td>TT120 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronology:</strong></td>
<td>21st Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynasty:</strong></td>
<td>Pinudjem II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes about the document:

Niwinski (1988): outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy-cover; JE 26198. Late 21st D. TG 918.

Niwinski (1979, p. 55): this second set of coffins is related in style to the coffins of the period of Pinudjem II.

#### Other documents and titles:


#### References:


**Images:**

- Images of coffins from the TT120 cache.

**Tree genealogy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu the Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mistress of the Domain of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>God’s Father of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hm-nTr priest of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Step-mother Istemkheb (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sister Meretamun (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Half-sister Henuttauy (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Brother Hori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Wet-nurse of Khonsu the Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other relative titles:**

- God’s Father of Khonsu
- Priest of Khonsu
- Priest of Anubis Khonsu

**Images:**

- Images of the coffins and related artifacts from TT120 cache.
### THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

**ID-Doc:** 46  
**ID-Catalogue:** CG 61030  
**Location/Museum:** Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo  
**Type of document:** Coffin ensemble  
**Material:** Wood  
**From:** TT120 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name transliteration</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Specific date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Meretamun (F)</td>
<td>Spswt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Henuttauy (C)</td>
<td>Hmt-nTr n Mwt wrt nbt ISrw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hori</td>
<td>Hm-nTr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td>mwt-nTr n 2nsw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>God´s Father of Khonsu</td>
<td>Hm-nTr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Priest of Anubis Khonsu</td>
<td>Hm-nTr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu</td>
<td>mwt-nTr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>God´s Father of Khonsu</td>
<td>Hm-nTr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**
- Middle/late 21st D.  
- TG 918.  
- Uprised by Nesikhons (A), co-wife of Pinudjem II; however, she died before 21st Dm.  
- Nesikhons' burial took place in the Year 5 of Siamun.  
- Neinski (1979, p.55): this coffin, which was usurped by Nesikhons, is of the style characteristic for the period of Menkheperra.

**Images:**  

**References:**  
- Doc. 67, p. 115.  
- Doc. 11, p. 183-184.  
- Doc. 8 (women).  
The Priesthood of Khonsu

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

Location/Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

Type of document: Papyrus

From: TT 120 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri

Chronology: 21st Dynasty

Specific date: TG 918, S.R.IV.525.

Notes about the document:

Niwiński (1989): she died after the Year 10 of Siamun, probably in the reign of Psusennes II.

Other documents and titles:

- Canopic jars: JE 26254 A-D
- Canopic jar: JE 26265
- Reliquary: JE 26270
- Reliquary: JE 26276
- Reliquary: JE 26280
- Reliquary: JE 26282

References:


THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

Alba María Villar Gómez

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

ID-Owner: Istimkheb (D)  
Name transliteration: Istimkheb (D)

ID-Owner: Istimkheb (D)  
Name transliteration: Istimkheb (D)

Owner: Unknown

Location/ 
Museum: Unknown

Type of 
document: Scarab  
Material: Unknown

From: Unknown

Chronology:

Dynasty: 21st

Specific date: TG 918.

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): from Borgia Collection. Possibly in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, but it is not certain because the catalogs from that Museum did not mention this document (for instance: La collezione egiziana del Museo Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, Soprintendenza Archeologica per le Province di Napoli e Caserta, 1989).

Notes about the document:

TG 918.

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): from Borgia Collection. Possibly in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, but it is not certain because the catalogs from that Museum did not mention this document (for instance: La collezione egiziana del Museo Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, Soprintendenza Archeologica per le Province di Napoli e Caserta, 1989).

Other documents and titles:

-Caithaba

Campbell, J. Cairo JE 26254 A-D

/for bottle JE 26265

-Balaqierinfunerary sent JE 26276 (see esp in 'text (text, title)?'). See Aston 2009, 227: explanation of date

-see DB Doc. 195

-Naguib (1990): [text not yet typed in 'text (text, title)?']. See Aston 2009, 227: explanation of date

Other documents and titles:

-Caithaba

Campbell, J. Cairo JE 26254 A-D

/for bottle JE 26265

-Balaqierinfunerary sent JE 26276 (see esp in 'text (text, title)?'). See Aston 2009, 227: explanation of date

-see DB Doc. 195

-Naguib (1990): [text not yet typed in 'text (text, title)?']. See Aston 2009, 227: explanation of date

Images:

References:


The author said that he did not find this object on the catalog of the Musei Vaticani; however, it is possible that it passed (as some objects from the Borgia collection) to the Naples Museum.


p. 55 and Table 1: III/II children and wives of Menkhеперра.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

**ID-Owner:** 36  
**Name transformation:** Henuttauy (C)  
**Nicknames:**  
**Other names:**

**Hierog-Owner:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Name transformation</th>
<th>Other names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Henuttauy (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of document:** Coffin ensemble  
**Location/Museum:** Museum of Fine Arts, Boston / Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>MMA 60, Deir el-Bahri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Chronology:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Specific date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>c. 1000-945 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**

Niewinski (1988): outer coffin, inner coffin and mummy-cover (the mummy cover is the one from NY).

Middle 21st D.  
TG 831, burial nº4.

Aston (2009, p. 199-200): MMA tomb 60 was reused to house of number of burials which date from the pontificate of Menkheperra or slightly later. Cache burial. TG 831 (Chamber Burial nº4).

Considering that Henuttauy (C) is usually seen as the daughter of Istemkheb (C) and Menkheperra, and the wife of Smendes II, the burial can thus be dated to the period 990-970 BC.

**Images:**

- [Mummy-board.](http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&pos=1)
- [Mummy-board.](http://www.metmuseum.org/collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&img=1)

**References:**


---

**Other documents and titles:**

- Papyrus MMA 25.3.28 (Niewinski NEW YORK 5, p. 345). Amduat Papyrus MMA 25.3.29 (Niewinski NEW YORK 6, p. 345.) Book of the Dead Property Decree, wall inscription on the north side of 10th Pylon at Karnak (Jansen-Winkeln, doc. 9, p. 177-182)

Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): *not here in Deir B*; *is her a “Deir-B” and not a “Deir-A”?* 

---

**Images:**

- [Mummy-board.](http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&pos=1)
- [Mummy-board.](http://www.metmuseum.org/collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&img=1)

**References:**

2. The title "Mother of Khonsu" does not appear here.
4. Doc. 44, p. 111. The title "Mother of Khonsu" is recorded here.
5. Doc. 58 (women). Genealogical tree from p. 155. The author says that the papyrus CAIRO 2 and 3 (Niewinski 1989) belonged to this woman; however, these documents possibly belonged to Henuttauy (B).
7. P. 55 and Table IIA: children and wives of Menkheperra.

---

**Images:**

- [Mummy-board.](http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&pos=1)
- [Mummy-board.](http://www.metmuseum.org/collections/search-the-collections/551138?rpp=20&pg=1&ft=25.3.6&img=1)

**References:**

2. The title "Mother of Khonsu" does not appear here.
## The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

### Batch 282

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ID-Owner:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Owner:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Name transliteration:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Henuttawy (A)</td>
<td>Henwi (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hierarchy:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ID-Relative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Relative's title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Relative's name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Hierachy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Mutnedjemet</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

- **Niwinski (1988):** outer case and inner coffin; JE 26204. Daughter of Ramesses XI, early/middle 21st D. TG 916
- **Aston (2009, p. 224-225):** the braces of Menkheperra indicate that she was originally buried during his pontificate, c. 1051-1001 BC. It is however certain that she was not originally buried in this tomb, since, in all accounts relating to the order of coffins at the time of the discovery, her coffins are always placed third which must indicate a position in corridor B. This position indicate that she must have been one of the last coffins brought into the cache. Her original tomb remains undiscovered.

### Other documents and titles:

- Mummy belt (Maspero, Momies royaux, p. 576-7)
- Gold plaque covering the flank incision (Smith, The Royal Mummies CG, 1912, p. 102)
- Ushabti box (the second one)
- Ushabtis (Collection Hoffman, nos 208-221)
- Figure of دائ (Cairo JE 46948)
- Note in a Sakhmet statue of Amenhotep III from the forecourt of the Mut temple (Jansen-Winkeln, doc. 56, p. 30)

### References:


### Images:

  - Outer coffin lid.
  - Detail Outer coffin lid.

---

**GLOBAL 21st Dynasty**

- TT320 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri
- Wood Coffin ensemble
- Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo
- ID-Doc: CG 61026
- ID-Catalogue: Location/Museum:
- Type of document: Material:
- From:
- Chronology:
  - Dynasty: 21st
  - Specific date: Menkheperra
- Notes about the document:
  - Henuttawy (A):
  - TT320 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri
  - Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo
  - Menkheperra
  - 1st pr n Imn-Ra; Hryt wrt xnrt tpyt n Imn-Ra; Hmt-nTr n Mwt wrt nbt ISrw; Hmt-nTr n In-Hrt-5w sA Ra; aAt n pr n Mwt nbt ISrw Hsyt aAt n Imn m WAst; Hryt mnawt n Mwt nbt ISrw; nbt tAwy; Hmt-nsw wrt; Hmt-nsw wrt tpyt n Hm.f nb tAwy;mwt-nsw; mwt-nsw wrt n nb tAwy; mwt n nb tAwy; mwt n Hmt-nsw wrt nbt tAwy; mwt n pA Hm-nTr tpy n Imn; mwt n pA imy-r mSa wr n MHw 5maw; mwt n dwAt-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sAt-nsw n Xt.f mr.f; sAt Hmt-nsw wrt

---

### Images:

  - Outer coffin lid.
  - Detail Outer coffin lid.
# THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU
## The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

### Alba María Villar Gómez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue</th>
<th>JE 46876</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum</td>
<td>Shemsuddin Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Shroud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Linen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>TT 120 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

- TG 916.

### Reference:


### Other documents and titles:

- Maspero, Momies royales, p. 572-7
- Gold plaque covering the flank incision (Smith, The Royal Mummaries CG, 1912, p. 152)
- Ushabti box (the second one)
- Colour of Davis (Cairo JE 49946)
- Note in a Sakhmet statue of Amenhotep III from the forecourt of the Mut temple (Janens-Winkeln, doc. 56, p. 30)

### References:

- Doc. 28, p. 84.
THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

Alba María Villar Gómez

Document

Owner

Genealogy

Plates

References

ID-Owner: 27

Owner: Henuttawy (A)

Name transliteration: Henuttawy (A)

Herrg-Owner:

From:

TT 120 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri

Type of document:

Papyrus

Material: Papyrus

Chronology:

Dynasty: 21st

Reign: Menkheperra

Notes about the document:


Other documents and titles:

- Mummy belt (Maspero, Mummies royales, p. 576-7)
- Gold plaque covering the flank incision (Smith, The Royal Mummies CG, 1912, p. 102)
- Ushabtis (Collection Hoffmann, nos 208-221)
- Figure of Davis (Cairo JE 69946)
- Hats in a Sarcophagus statue of Amenhotep III from the forecourt of the Mut temple (Jansen-Winkeln, doc. 56, p. 30)
- Note in a Sekhmet statue of Amenhotep III from the forecourt of the Mut temple (Jansen-Winkeln, doc. 56, p. 30)

References:


PDB55
Alba Maria Villar Gómez

**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

| ID-Doc: | 55 | Location/ Museum: | Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo |
| Type of document: | Papyrus | Material: | Papyrus |
| From: | TT120 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri |

**Chronology**
- **Dynasty:** 21st
- **Province:** Henuttawy

**Notes about the document:**
- TG 916. Amduat.

**Other documents and titles:**
- Mummy ball (Maspero, Momies royales, p. 576-7)
- Gold plaque covering the faulk incision (Smith, The Royal Mummas CG, 1912, p. 102)
- Osirid Box (the second one)
- Ushabtis (Collection Hoffmann, nos 206-221)
- Figure of Cares (Cairo JE 40949)
- Note in a Sahmet statue of Amenhotep III from the forecourt of the Mut temple (Jansen-Winkeln, doc. 56, p. 50)
- Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): dwAt 1wt-1r; Hryt wrt xnrt tpyt n Imn-Ra; Hmt-nTr n Imn-Ra; Hmt-nTr n Mwt wrt nbt ISrw; Hmt-nTr n In-Hrt-5w sA Ra; aAt n pr n Mwt nbt ISrw Hsyt aAt n Imn m WAst; Hryt mnawt n Mwt nbt ISrw; nbt tAwy; Hmt-nsw wrt; Hmt-nsw wrt tpyt n Hm.f nb tAwy;mwt-nsw; mwt-nsw wrt n nb tAwy; mwt n nb tAwy; mwt n Hmt-nsw wrt nbt tAwy; mwt n pA Hm-nTr tpy n Imn; mwt n pA imy-r mSa wr n MHw 5maw; mwt n dwAt-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sAt-nsw n Xt.f mr.f; sAt Hmt-nsw wrt .

**References:**
- Doc. 28, p. 86-87.
- Doc. CAIRO 47, p. 269-270.
- Doc. 59 (women).
- Genealogical tree from p. 155.

| ID-Owner | Owner | Name transcription: |
| 21 | Henuttawy (A) | Henuttawy (A) |

| Hierog-Origin: |
| Images: |
| References: |
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

| ID-Doc: | 56 |
| ID-Catalogue: | JE 26272 |
| Location/ Museum: | Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo |
| Type of document: | Ushabti box |
| Material: | Wood |
| From: | TT 320 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri |

#### Chronology:
- Dynasty: 21st
- Reign: Menkheperra
- Specific date: Only "Mother of Khonsu the Child". TG 916.

### Notes about the document:
- Astor (OMRO 74, p. 30 n. 94) that this owner was the daughter of Ramesses XI is accepted by most commentators.

### Other documents and titles:
- Mummy belt (Hampson, Monies reynas, p. 576-7)
- Gold plaquette covering the flank incision (Smith, The Royal Mummies CO, 1912, p. 102)
- Ushabti box (the second one)
- Statue of Osiris (Cairo JE 46946)
- Notes about the skeleton status of Amenhotep III from the forecourt of the Mut temple (Jansen-Winkeln, doc. 56, p. 30)

Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007):

\[ \text{dwAt} 1\text{wt-}1\text{r}; \text{Hryt wrt xnrt tpyt n} \text{Imn-Ra}; \text{Hmt-nTr n Imn-Ra}; \text{Hmt-nTr n Mwt wrt nbt ISrw}; \text{Hmt-nTr n In-Hrt-5w sA Ra}; \text{aAt n pr n Mwt nbt ISrw Hsyt aAt n Imn m WAst}; \text{Hryt mnawt n Mwt nbt ISrw}; \text{nbt tAwy}; \text{Hmt-nsw wrt}; \text{Hmt-nsw wrt tpyt n Hm.f nb tAwy}; \text{mwt-nTr}; \text{mwt-nsw}; \text{mwt-nsw wrt n nb tAwy}; \text{mwt n nb tAwy}; \text{mwt n pA Hm-nTr tpy n Imn}; \text{mwt n pA imy-r mSa wr n MHw 5maw}; \text{mwt n dwAt-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw}; \text{sAt-nsw n Xt.f mr.f}; \text{sAt Hmt-nsw wrt}. \]

### Images and references:
- [Image](http://www.flickr.com/photos/horemachet/1313783273/in/faves-46901897@N07/)
- [Reference](http://www.flickr.com/photos/horemachet/1313783273/in/faves-46901897@N07/)

### References:
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Location/Museum</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M399</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes about the document:

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): The real owner is Psusennes I, but in this document appear 2 cartouches of his mother:
- the first one with the name of Henuttawy (A) with her title Duat of Hathor
- the second one with the title just Mother of Khonsu

Aston (2009, p. 47); gold vessel inscribed for Henuttawy (A) and Psusennes I, found in front of the sarcophagus, in TG22 (Psusennes I c. 1000 BC). JE 85996.

## Other documents and titles:

- Mummy ball (Masspero, Momies royales, p. 576-7)
- Gold plaque covering the flank incision (Smith, The Royal Mummiess CG, 1912, p. 102)
- Ushabti Box (the second one)
- Ushabti (Collection Hoffman, nos 208-221)
- Figure of Diana (Cairo JE 49494)
- Note in a Sarcophagus of Amenirdis II from the forecourt of the Mut temple (Jansen-Winkeln, doc. 56, p. 30)

Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007):

```
-dwAt 1wt-1r; Hryt wrt xnrt tpyt n Imn-Ra; Hmt-nTr n Imn-Ra; Hmt-nTr n Mwt wrt nbt ISrw; Hmt-nTr n In-Hrt-5w sA Ra; aAt n pr n Mwt nbt ISrw Hsyt aAt n Imn m WAst; Hryt mnawt n Mwt nbt ISrw; nbt tAwy; Hmt-nsw wrt; Hmt-nsw wrt tpyt n Hm.f nb tAwy;mwt-nsw; mwt-nsw wrt n nb tAwy; mwt n nb tAwy; mwt n Hmt-nsw wrt nbt tAwy; mwt n pA Hm-nTr tpy n Imn; mwt n pA imy-r mSa wr n MHw 5maw; mwt n dwAt-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sAt-nsw n Xt.f mr.f; sAt Hmt-nsw wrt
```

---

## References:


---
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue</td>
<td>CG 61024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Coffin ensemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>TT 320 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes about the document:


Aston (2009, p. 221): coffin contemporary to Pinudjem I, year 1 of Psusennes I, c. 1048 BC. (or maybe year 1 of Amenemhet II).

#### Other documents and titles:

- Horvat (Maspero, Momies royales, p. 569)
- Garments (Maspero, Momies royales, p. 569)
- Papyri BM EA 10490 (Niewinski, LONDON 59, p. 337)
- Canopic chest (Cairo TN 20/12/5/11)
- Ushabti (L. or des pharaons, p. 120)

Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): **hryt wrt nxnrt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw**; **hsyt aAt n Imn m WAst**; **hryt mnawt n Mwt**; **nt pr**; **hryt Spswt**; **iry-patt**; **wrt Hsywt**; **hnwt tAwy**; **nt tAwy**; **hmt-nsw wrt n nb tAwy**; **mwt-nsw mst kA nxt**; **mwt-nsw n nb tAwy**; **sAt mwt-nsw**.

See Taylor (1998) for the genealogy of DB Own. 38.

#### References:


---

**ID-Relative**

### Kinship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative’s name</th>
<th>Hierog-Relative</th>
<th>142</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relative’s Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative’s title</th>
<th>268</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great One of the Sacred Musical Group of Khonsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tree genealogy

[Diagram of genealogy]

---

**Images:**

[Images of mummies and coffins]

---

**References:**

- Doc. 57, p. 30-32.
- Doc. 72, p. 116-117.
- Doc. 54 (woman), p. 295-301 4.4.4.1. She defends another genealogy: Nedjemet as mother of Smendes.
- For the genealogy and the genealogical tree of Herihor’s family.
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

## The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

### Global

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc:</th>
<th>56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>BM EA 10541 + Louvre E 6258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location/Museum:

- British Museum, London / Musée du Louvre, Paris

### Type of document:

- Papyrus
- Material: Papyrus

### Chronology:

- Dynasty: 21st
- Regna: Pinudjem I

### About the document:

- Book of the Dead.
- Aston (2009, p. 221): this papyrus is now split into three parts: BM EA 10541, Louvre E 6258 and ex Mook Collection.

### Other documents and titles:

- Shroud (Maspero, Momies royales, p. 569)
- Grave clothes (Maspero, Momies royales, p. 569)
- Papyrus BM EA 10490 (Noerski, LONDON 59, p. 337)
- Canopic chest (Caro Th, 20/12/5/11)
- Ushabti (L’or des pharaons, p. 120)


- See Taylor (1998) for the genealogy of DB Own. 38.

### Images:

- [Image](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?partid=1&assetid=821173&objectid=109846)

### References:


---

**References:**


---

**PDB60**
### THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### ID-Owner:
- **ID**: 161
- **Type of document**: Mural relief
- **Location/Museum**: in situ
- **From**: Khonsu Temple at Karnak
- **Type of document**: Material: Stone
- **Dynasty**: Ramesses XI-Herihor
- **Specific date**: Reign:
  - **Specific date**:
  - **Specific date**:
- **Notes about the document**:
  - DB Own. 39, who is the first daughter in the famous scene of the procession in Khonsu Temple, is here represented attending how her mother carries an infant before the shrine of the goddess Mut.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name transliteration</th>
<th>Nicknames</th>
<th>Other name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Title's owner</th>
<th>Translation title's owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Great One of the Sacred Musical Group of Khonsu</td>
<td>wrt xnrt n 2nsw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Title</th>
<th>Owner's name</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Other title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neghret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Relative</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Haplographic</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Relative</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu the Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu-Ra Lord of Thebes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Great Overseer of the Works of Khonsu's Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naguib, S.-A. (1990). Le Clergé féminin d’Amon thébain à la 21&quot;e Dynastie. Leuven.</td>
<td>p. 230, 4.4.4.1: DB Own. 38 and 39, p. 205: the wrt (son of a god is related with the main (husband) who serve the same deity; however, her husband is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey, E. (1979). Scenes of King Herihor in the Court with Translations of Texts. The Temple of Khonsu I. OIP 100. Chicago.</td>
<td>p. 12-14 and plates 26 (l. 41) and 38 scene B (l. 9). In this publication she is called Shesebeke.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

## Owner

- **Owner:** Tadrosbeket
- **Name transcription:** T-3t-3b-tk

## Type of Document

- **Location/Museum:** in situ
- **Type of document:** Mural relief
- **Material:** Stone
- **From:** Khonsu Temple at Karnak

## Chronology

- **Dynasty:** Transition 20th-21st
- **Ramesses XI-Herihor**
- **Specific date:**
  - Great One of the Sacred Musical Group of Khonsu
  - wrt xnrt n 2nsw

## Notes about the Document

Scene of Herihor's family procession, where DB Own. 39 is the first princess.

## Other Documents and Titles

- Epigraphic Survey (1979): Smayt n Imn; Hryt Spswt; sAt-nsw.
- Other documents and titles:

## Images and References

- Reference:

---

## Kinship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Hierog-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Nejdmet</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Herihor</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Genealogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother of the God Khonsu the Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu in Thebes Nefertiuptah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mother of Khonsu-Ra Lord of Thebes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Great Overseer of the Works of Khonsu's Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue: Cat. 1784</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum:</td>
<td>Museo Egizio, Torino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes about the document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late 21st D.

This papyrus does not appear in the Museo Egizio di Torino collection online, at least as Cat. 1784.

### Other documents and titles:

Naguib (1990): Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; nbt pr.

- Father: it-nTr mry

### References:

- Doc. TURIN 13, p. 169.
- Doc. 95 (women).

Maybe DB Own. 40 is just a Nurse of Khonsu the Child or "xxv": however, I keep the designation done by Naguib, that is "xxv".
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### Alba María Villar Gómez

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**

- **Document**: 61
- **Owner**: Wendjebaunefedjet
- **Name transliteration**:  \( \text{W-n-Dw-n-} \)
- **Hierog-Owner**: | Other name: |
- **Chronology**: 21st
- **Dynasty**: Psusennes I

**Note about the document:**


**Other documents and titles:**

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

- \( \text{imy-r Hm-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.} \)

**References:**

- Doc. 114, p. 64.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### Alba María Villar Gómez

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Werdjebauermprdet</td>
<td>Wn-wjbr-n-Dt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum**
- Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document**
- Inner coffin
- Material: Silver

**From**
- NRT III, Tanis

**Chronology**
- Dynasty: 21st
- Reign: Psusennes I

**Notes about the document**
- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): just remains of a silver "coffin". The Third one after the sarcophagus and the wooden coffin. 684 is the find number.

**Other titles:**
- imy-r Hm-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

**Other documents and titles:**
- For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

**Images**

**References**
- Doc. 116 p. 65.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID: 60</td>
<td>ID-Catalogue: M600</td>
<td>Location/ Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td>Type of document: Inner coffin</td>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: NRT III, Tanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty: 21st</td>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign: Psusennes I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes about the document: Jansen-Winkeln (2007): just remains of gilded wooden &quot;coffin&quot;, with inscriptions. Second coffin, inside the stone sarcophagus, and over the silver one. 680 is the find number. Aston (2009, p. 41): TG 1. Found in the burial chamber. Gilt wooden coffin,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other documents and titles: For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other titles: imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**  
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ID-Catalog:</td>
<td>M676+677+678+679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canopic jars</td>
<td>Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td></td>
<td>NRT III, Tanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chronology:**
- Dynasty: 21st
- Reign: Psusennes I

**Notes about the document:**
4 travertine canopic jars.

**Other documents and titles:**
For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

**References:**
- Doc. 118 p. 65.
### Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Wendjebauamun-fetabet</td>
<td>Win-gwrb-n-Djw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Material: Bronze

### Type of document: Ushabtis

### Location/ Museum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/ Museum</th>
<th>Ushabtis</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRT III, Tanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 263 is the find number. From the vestibule/antechamber of NRT III.
- Montet (p. 54): 39 bronze uhabtis. I registered as a complex/collection.
- L’or des Pharaons (doc. 15 p. 132): 16 of them were recovered JE 88591, 89797, 89799-89812. But we already know around 45 of them belonged to private collections and Institutes. They registered the title of Steward and Chief Steward.
- Ojo, otra muestra de la importancia de este personaje es que algunos de sus uhabtis eran imy-r 10 (Cerny JEA 34).

### Other documents and titles:

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

Other titles: imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-patr, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

### Other documents and titles:

- Doc. 120, p. 66.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Location/Museum:
- **NRT III, Tanis**

#### Type of document:
- Faience ushabtis

#### Notes about the document:

- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 262 is the find number.
- From the vestibule/antechamber of NRT III.
- Cernival & Yoyotte (1987, doc. 16, p. 132): Montet said there is a collection of 360 ushabtis + 6 chief statues. There are just 3 of them from the Cairo Museum: JE 86069A.

#### Other documents and titles:

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

#### Images:


#### References:

The inscription is an offering formula to Khonsu.


For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

Other titles:
imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

Images:

Montet, P. (1951). La nécropole royale de Tanis, II. Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis. Paris, pl. 55. Even though this ring is not mentioned as part of the objects that conform the plate, in p. 75 Montet indicates that this is the plate where the object is. Between all of them, this ring seems the correct option.

**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

Alba María Villar Gómez

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Document Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Location/| Type of document: | From: | Material: |
| Museum: | Pectoral with scarab | MRT III, Tanis | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Owner:</th>
<th>Name transliteration:</th>
<th>Nickname:</th>
<th>Other name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Specific date:</th>
<th>Notes about the document:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 719 is the find number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pectoral with scarab.*


**Other titles:**

- imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

**Other documents and titles:**

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

**Images:**


**References:**


**Montet, P. (1951).** La nécropole royale de Tanis, II. Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis. Paris, plate 49.


**Doc. 123, p. 66.**

**Montet, P. (1951).** La nécropole royale de Tanis, II. Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis. Paris, p. 75, fig. 28.

**Montet, P. (1951).** La nécropole royale de Tanis, II. Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis. Paris, plate 49.
The original owner was a HAP PA-rn-nfr, possibly from the end of the 18th D.; DB Own. 41 might have added his name and title on it.

A squared pendant.

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 763 is the find number. For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

Other documents and titles:
For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

Other titles:
imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

Other documents and titles:

References:
Doc. 126, p. 66.
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

## The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue</th>
<th>M772</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Tube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>NET III, Tanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

- Montet (1960: planche 53): "un bague de canne ornée d’une inscription".
- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 772 is the find number.

### Other documents and titles:

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

### Images:


### References:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue</th>
<th>M772</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Tube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>NET III, Tanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

- Montet (1960: planche 53): "un bague de canne ornée d’une inscription".
- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 772 is the find number.

### Other documents and titles:

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

### Images:


### References:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue</td>
<td>M773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Silver and gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Nekt III, Tanis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty</td>
<td>21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign</td>
<td>Psusennes I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

Other documents and titles:

- Owner: ID-Owner: Hm-nTr (priest of Khonsu)
- Nickname: Other name: Hm-nTr n 2nsw (Great Steward of Khonsu in Thebes)
- Other titles: Neferhotep imy-r pr wr n 2nsw m WAst Nfr-Htp
- Chronology: Dynasty: 21st, Reign: Psusennes I
- Notes about the document: Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 773 is the find number. A king's concession to DB Own. 41.
- Silver cup decorated with gold inlay. Inscription of Nr. 775 is published (which must be nearly identical from Nr. 773). A king's concession to DB Own. 41.
- Psusennes I, JE 87743. Plate 54 Montet 1951.
- Other titles: imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

Images:

[Image]

References:

- Doc. 129, p. 67.
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>HR75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum:</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Boxed</td>
<td>Material: Silver and gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>NET III, Tanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes about the document:

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 775 is the find number. Silver cup decorated with gold inlay. This is the so-called "swimmers' cup". A king's concession to DB Owner 41.


#### Other documents and titles:

For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

Other titles:

imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

#### References:


#### Images:

- ![Image Link](http://www.flickr.com/photos/10647023@N04/2245657526/in/set-72157601684850179/lightbox/)

**McD 129, p. 67.**
This isolate canopic jar (find number 307) was found in the vestibule/antechamber of NRT III. Jansen-Winkeln (2007: p. 57) called it "Vase a fond arrondi"; he also called it "canope" in p. 54 fig. 17. Aston (2009, p. 43): found in the vestibule. Travertine jar. JE 87770.

### Other titles:
- imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw.

### Other documents and titles:
For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.

---

### References:
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Location/Museum</th>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Notes about the document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
<td>Box</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>MET III, Tanis</td>
<td>Aston (2009, p. 42): gold and inlaid bowl, JE 87741. Found on the top of the silver coffin. Other titles: imy-r Hmw-nTrw nbw; Hm-nTr Wn-DbAw-n-9dt n pr Wsir nb 9dt; imy-r mSa; wr imy-r mSa HAwty nA pDtyw pr-aA anx wDA snb; iry-pat, HAty-a; it-nTr mry; sDAwty bity; imy-r smrw waw. For the rest of documents found in his burial chamber, see Aston 2009: 41-43.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Name transliteration</th>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Other names</th>
<th>Hierog-Owner</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue</th>
<th>Location/Museum</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>Notes about the document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Wn-n-nun-pedjet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Box</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### References:
- Montet, P. (1951). La nécropole royale de Tanis, II. Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis. Paris, p. 83 and fig. 30 of p. 82. See also plate 54.
ID-Owner: 42  
Owner: Ankhefenamun  
Name transcription: 42

Notes about the document:
Montet (1960 p. 87 and plate IV figure 1): he said that DB Own.42 was a High Priest of Khonsu the Child; probably because of his reading of this document.
Lull (2002, p. 37): more than 200 blocks from the tomb of this owner. Also several blocks (16) from the burial of his grandson.
Jansen-Winkeln (2007): block of DB Own. 42's burial reused to build the tomb of Sheshonk III.  
There are different mentions to Psusennes I, and also to a General (aA-xpr-Ra, imy-r mSa n pr Imn-Ra nsw-nTrw) and to the family of the owner (part d). Also mentioned a man Sm-wr-A-a-A-m-bAh-Imn and a woman anx.s (?)(DB Own.43).

Other documents and titles:
Jansen-Winkeln (2007): Sia was an important man of state in his own right, as Granary Superintendent of Granaries of Pharaoh (as successor to Akhefenamun?). In the cult, he was a God’s Father of Amun and Khons.

Images:

References:


THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

Alba María Villar Gómez

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

Location/Museum:
Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

Type of document:
Statue

From:
Tanis

Chronology:
Dynasty: 21st
Raign: Psusennes I

Notes about the document:
Lull (2002, p. 44): this statue was purchased by the Antiquities Services in 1944; it was found in a tell closed to Tanis.

Kitchen (2004, p. 265 n.228): Psusennes I is here called "the great god" in relation to a qny, "palladium" (portable image in carrying-chair), typical of funerary cults of kings, this monument was most likely made soon after the death of Psusennes I; that means, under Amenemope.


Other documents and titles:

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): Sya was a high rang dignitary. He was Royal Director of the Pharaoh (von Känel 1984: 34).

Kitchen (2004: 266, according to Montet 1960: 88 blocks 8, 9, 10 and 11).

Kitchen (2004: 267: Sia was an important man of state in his own right, as Granary-Superintendent of Granaries of Pharaoh (as successor to Akhefenamun?). In the cult, he was a God's Father of Amun and Khons.

More interesting by far is his function as a funerary priest, eventually, of the "late, great" Psusennes -


Doc. 131, p. 68-69.


References:

References:

Images:

References:

Doc. 131, p. 68-69.


### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name transcription:</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sauperaaebahamun</td>
<td>Swn-pr-t-p-n-bn-h-Imn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Other name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Location/Museum:** Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:** Block statue

**Material:** Diorite

**From:** Tanis

**Chronology:** 21st

**Specific date:**

- Psusennes I

**Notes about the document:**

- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): from Tanis?


---

**Other documents and titles:**

- reused blocks in Tanis (HTV IV, No. 11 from DB Own. 42, Kh. 16/A. 74 and 8629/A. 79) (von Känel 1984, p. 42)

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): hr-s3 n nAwy-tm k nImn nImn-Ra nsw nTrw;i mry pr;i mry pr-Hd n nb

---

**Images:**

[Image](image1)

References:


- p. 42, Addendum: before 1984, some of DB Own. 42's blocks were attributed to the owner of some reused blocks found in Tanis (DB Own. 42).

- p. 45 n. 4: in 1984, this statue was assigned to the owner of some reused blocks found in Tanis (DB Own. 42).

- p. 42, Addendum: before 1984, some of DB Own. 42's blocks were attributed to the owner of some reused blocks found in Tanis (DB Own. 42).

- p. 34: Block Kh 16/A. 74 attributes to DB Rel. 62 the title of "Directeur de la Maison de Pharaon devant Amon" and "Directeur de la Fortesse de la
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

---

**GLOBAL**
- **Document:** THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU
- **Owner:** Alba María Villar Gómez
- **Genealogy:**
- **Plates:**
- **References:**

**Location/ Museum:**
- **Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo**

**Type of document:**
- **Sarcophagus**
- **Material:** Granite

**From:**
- **NRT III, Tanis**

**Chronology:**
- **Dynasty:** 21st
- **Reign:** Amenemope

---

### Notes about the document:


**Aston (2009, p. 49):** TG3 Amenemope c. 992 BCE; since she may never have been buried in this tomb the next person buried here was Psusennes' immediate successor, Amenemope, interred in the chamber originally prepared for Mutnodjemet.

---

### Other documents and titles:

All these documents come from the tomb of Psusennes I of Tanis (NRT III):
- Schwalbenschwanze of Bronze, JE 87858-9 (Jansen-Winkeln doc. 22, p. 47)
- Bracelets, fund number 536, 549 (Jansen-Winkeln doc. 46, p. 53)
- Beak shell, fund number 401 (Jansen-Winkeln doc. 83, p. 58)
- Silver bowl, fund number 408 (Jansen-Winkeln doc. 90, p. 59)
- Golden diadem bowl inscribed for Psusennes I and Mutnodjemet, M776 (from area 4, tomb of owner 41; Jansen-Winkeln doc. 99, p. 60)
- Ushabtis of bronze, from different collections (Jansen-Winkeln doc. 107, p. 61)

**Jansen-Winkeln (2007):** wrt xnrt tpyt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTr 2- nw n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hmt-nTr n Mwt wrt nbt ISrw; aAt n pr Mwt wrt nbt ISrw; nbt tAwy; Hmt-nsw wrt tpyt n Hm.f; sAt-nsw; snt-nsw.

---

### References:


---

### Images:

- [Image](image1)
- [Image](image2)

---

### PDB81
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>ID-Catalogue: Berlin 8523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td>Egyptian Museum, Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td>Material: Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chronology:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Specific date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**

Hieratic letter with a decision of an end of a contract of lands in Thebes; withdrawal of lease termination, from Shed-su-Khonsu to the Kushite (Nubian) Pay-neb-andjed.

Without indication of origin or reign.

**Other documents and titles:**


**Images:**

1. [Image](#)

**References:**


Doc. 56, p. 215.

http://www.reshafim.org.il/ad/egypt/texts/letters.htm

**Translation of the letter:**

PDB82
### The Priesthood of Khonsu
#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

**ID-Doc:** 78  
**Location/Museum:** Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vaticano  
**Type of document:** Outer coffin  
**From:** Thebes

**Chronology:**  
**Dynasty:** 21st  
**Specific date:**

**Notes about the document:**

Niwinski (1988): outer coffin; early 22nd D.; no inventory number; she was called Dl-Mwt.

Gasse (1996): inner coffin; end of 21st- beginning 22nd D. Catalogue number is 1-2, and the inventory number is 25008.1/2.2; it probably comes from Deir el-Bahari; DB Own. 46's name was Dwny-nfr-Mwt (abbreviated as Dwn-Nfr?); and her surname was Dl-Mwt.

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): DB Own, 46 is just named as Dl-Mwt. Middle-late 21st D.; Sarg Vatikan 25008.

**Other documents and titles:**


### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>25/2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum:</td>
<td>Musée d'archéologie méditerranéenne, Marseille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Inner coffin</td>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chronology:

- **Dynasty:** 21st
- **Specific date:**

#### Notes about the document:

- **Niwinski (1988):** from the Clot-Bey collection, acquired by the Musée Borély (Marseille) in 1861. Probably middle 21st. D. Inventory number 25(2)-3.
- **Jansen-Winkeln (2007):** Theban burial early 21st Dynasty. He also kept Niwinski's location and inventory number for this document.

The Musée Borély (Marseille) was closed in 1989 and the coffin ensemble was transferred to the Musée d'archéologie méditerranéenne, which kept the Clot-Bey Egyptology collection. Consequently, I have changed Niwinski's location of the coffin, even though I kept his inventory number; the inventory number from the museum catalogue is 25(1).

#### Other documents and titles:

- **Papyrus Wiener 3889 (Niwinski VIENNA, p. 374; Piankoff nº 16/17)**
- **Ushabti box St. Petersburg 821**
- **Papyrus Ludii AMI 40 of his daughter (Niwinski LEIDEN 1 and LEIDEN 1bis, p. 310-311)**

- **Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007):** 
  - It-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr mry
  - I mn m Ipt-Swt; it-nTr
  - Ss Hwt-nTr n Mwt; Ss Hwt-nTr iHw imntt nb n Imn; Hsy aAt sA Hsyw m WAst Imn; imy-r Hwt-nbw n Imn; Hry sAwtyw sSw n pr-Hd n pr Imn.
  - **wife:** nbt pr; Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw.
  - **daughter:** nbt pr; Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hsyt aAt n nbw nHH; Hsyt n pA a(t) n Mwt.

#### Images:

  - Inner case.

  - Inner case.

#### References:


  - Doc. 286, p. 156. He does not mention Mut and Khonsu in these titles.

  - p. 56 n. 28: similar rank than Owner 24.

  - Doc. 96 (men).

## The Priesthood of Khonsu

### Alba María Villar Gómez

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLID/SAL Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Owner: 47</td>
<td>Owner: Khonsuamep</td>
<td>Name transliteration: Khonsu-amep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document: Papyrus</td>
<td>Material: Papyrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Thebes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/ Museum: Musée du Louvre, Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:


### Other documents and titles:

- Papyrus Vienna 3850 (Veinstein VIENNA, p. 374; Plankoff nº 16/17)
- Ushabti box St. Petersburg 821
- Papyrus Leiden AMS 40 of his daughter (Niwinski LEIDEN 1 and LEIDEN 1bis, p. 310-311)
- Naguib (1990) and Jansen-Winkeln (2007): it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; it-nTr mry IImn m Ipt-Swt; it-nTr; sS Hwt-nTr n Mwt; sS Hwt-nTr iHw imntt nb n Imn; Hsyt aAt sA Hsytw m WAst Imn; imy-r Hwt-nbw n Imn; Hry sAwtyw sSw n pr-Hd n pr Imn.
- Naguib (1989): 7nt-Imn nbt pr; Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw.
- daughter (6Ay-w-Hrt): nbt pr; Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hsyt aAt n nbw nHH; Hsyt n pA a(t) n Mwt.

### Images:

- [Image](http://www.louvre.fr/activite/detail_parcours.jsp?CURRENT_LLV_PARCOURS%3C%3Eid=1013419867326674&CURRENT_LLV_CHEMINEMENT%3C%3Eid=1013419867326674&bmLocale=en)

### References:

- Doc. PARIS 12, p. 353.
- Doc. 96 (man).
- p. 58 n. 28: similar rang than Owner 24.

### Owner:

- http://www.louvre.fr/activite/detail_parcours.jsp?CURRENT_LLV_PARCOURS%3C%3Eid=1013419867326674&CURRENT_LLV_CHEMINEMENT%3C%3Eid=1013419867326674&bmLocale=en
### Global Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Document:</th>
<th>Material:</th>
<th>Location/Museum:</th>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Notes about the Document:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mural relief</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Annals of the Priest of Karnak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Specific Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Owner Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title's Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Tit Owner</th>
<th>Title's Owner</th>
<th>Translation Title's Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Third priest of Khonsu in Thbes Neferhetep</td>
<td>3-r-p h mt x hwn n Wst Nfr-Htp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Documents and Titles

Jansen-Winkeln (2007): 3-r-p h mt x hwn n Wst Nfr-h...  

### Images and References


Doc. 35, p. 131 and planche 11.

Doc. 40, p. 61-62.
Alba Maria Villar Gómez

THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

ID-Doc: 82
ID-Catalogue: CG 42189

Location/Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo
Type of document: Block statue
Material: Stone
From: Cache of Karnak

Chronology:
Dynasty: 22nd
Reign: Osorkon I

Notes about the document:
This statue was set up in Karnak by the son of the owner (DB Rel. 73).
The titles related with Khonsu appear in sections: c and e (plates).
COLLATERAL BRANCH OF NESPAKHUTY'S FAMILY

Other documents and titles:

Images:

References:


Genealogical tree and plates.
CG 42188 is a statue of the father of the owner; however, the branch connected to the Khonsu priesthood is the one of DB Own. 49’s wife.

PDB87
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

#### NESPAKASHUTY’S FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>BM EA 645</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum:</td>
<td>British Museum, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Stela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>early 22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign:</td>
<td>Shoshenk I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes about the document:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID-Owner:**

- **Owner:** Anynamenhot (i)
- **Name transcription:** 30mn-em-at (i)

**Hier-Owner:**

- **Other name:**

**ID-Tit Owner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title's owner</th>
<th>Transcription title's owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Third high-priest of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other documents and titles:**

- Offering table St. Petersburg Hermitage 2262

**Images:**


**References:**

- p. 100 Table 1 (genealogical tree): identification between DB Rel. 72 and DB Rel. 280.

---

### Genealogy

#### NESPAKASHUTY

- **Father:** Nespakashuty (ii)
  - Son: Djeddjehuty (i)
- **Son:** Djeddjehuty (i)
  - Father: Nespakashuty (ii)
  - Son: Third high-priest of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep
  - Son: Third high-priest of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep

**Tree genealogy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Relative</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Djeddjehuty (i)</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Relative</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Third high-priest of Khonsu in Thebes Neferhotep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Relative</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Nespakashuty (ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Alba María Villar Gómez**

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Location/Museum:
- Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

#### Type of document:
- Block statue
- Material: Stone

#### Dynasty:
- Early 21st Dynasty

#### Specific date:
- Specific date unknown

#### Notes about the document:
- Fragment of the torso.

**NEPESAKASHUTY’S FAMILY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Title’s owner</th>
<th>Transliteration title’s owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Third Hm-nTr priest of Khonsu in Thebes</td>
<td>Hm-nTr in Ms W-nsw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other documents and titles:**
- Bierbrier, M. L. (1975). **The Late New Kingdom in Egypt (c. 1300-664 B.C). Liverpool.** p. 100 Table 1 (genealogical tree): identification between DB Rel. 72 and DB Rel. 280.

**References:**
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>KE_PMII_1003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID-Owner:</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Dyddjehutyxaafankh (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicknames:</td>
<td>Other name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiereg-Owner:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/ Museum:</th>
<th>In situ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Column base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Granite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Karnak Temple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes on the document:

**Inscription at East-Karnak.**

** Nepakashuty's Family **

#### Other documents and titles:

- *Images:*

- *References:*

- *Jansen-Winkeln (2006 and 2007):* Hm-nTr w n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTrw 3-nw n Mwt; wr mAAw n Imn-Ra n Iwnw rsi; Hm-nTr n MnTw nb WAst Hry-ib Iwnw-Smaw; Hm-nTr n Imn-Htp pA wbA; Hm-nTr n Wsir n W-pqr; Hm-nTr n 9Hwty PA-wdyt; sS nsw mSa n tA r Dr.f; sS; imy-r mSa; imy-r iHw n pr Ra tp Hwt pr Imn; imy-r nfrw; sSm tA rsi; rx-nsw; rwD aA.

**Collateral Branch of Nespakashuty's Family**

The statue was dedicated by the mother of the owner.

**Notable Relative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Other names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>Nespakashuty (ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Padikhonsu (iii)</td>
<td>Ankhefenkhonsu (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Bakenkhonsu (ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Documents and Titles**


1. Sit-ep priest of Khonsu-Ra, Lord of Thbes
2. Sit-ep priest of Khonsu Who Exalts the Crowns

**References**


### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc: 101</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue: J 152 / CG 42232</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum: Museum of Luxor, Luxor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document: Block statue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material: Limestone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Cache of Karnak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes about the document:

CG 42232, but now the statue is in Luxor. The name of HPA Harsiese B appears in the statue.

**Neferhotep's Family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner: ID-Owner:</th>
<th>Name transliteration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Djeddjehutyiuefankh (i)</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuneminet (i)</td>
<td>Grandfather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nespakashuty (ii)</td>
<td>Great-grandfather</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other documents and titles:


PDB92

#### References:

Legrain, M. G. (1914). Statues et Statuettes d’Es Rois et de particuliers (CG Nos 42192-42250), vol. III. Le Caire, plate XLI.

Doc. 44, p. 205-207.
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### The Priesthood of Khonsu

#### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/ Museum:**
Musée du Louvre, Paris

**Type of document:**
Stela
**Material:**
Limestone

**From:**
Sarapœum, Memphis

**Chronology:**
Dynasty: 22nd
Reign: Year 2
Specific date: Year 2

**Notes about the document:**
As suggested by Malinine et al. (1968: 41) and despite the 41 year between both stelae, I am assuming that the individuals mentioned in DB Doc. 128 and 129 are the same. Additionally, DB Own. 85 might be the father of DB Own. 84 (see PM III p. 789). If not, we would have more servants of Khonsu attested by the Memphite stelae.


**Vandier (1965):** E. LXXIII of Mariette.
PM III p. 208: 4th Apis.

**Other documents and titles:**
Vandier (1965): it-nTr n PtH; Hm-nTr n Nbt-1tpt (1wt-1r) n 2A-nfr; sHD smw Hwt 4qr.
-father: it-nTr n PtH; Hm-nTr n Nbt-1tpt (1wt-1r).

**Images:**

**References:**


As suggested by Malinine et al (1968: 41) and despite the 41 year between both stelae, I am assuming that the individuals mentioned in DB Doc. 128 and 129 are the same. Additionally, DB Own. 85 might be the father of DB Own. 84 (see PM III p. 789). If not, we would have more servants of Khonsu attested by the Memphite stelae.


### The Priesthood of Khonsu

**Document Owner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Location/Museum</th>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
<th>Notes about the document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Musée du Louvre, Paris</td>
<td>Stela</td>
<td>Memphis, Memphis</td>
<td>Dynasty: 22nd</td>
<td>DB Own. 85 might be the father of DB Own. 84 (see PM III p. 789). If not, we would have more servants of Khonsu attested by the Memphis stelae. Vandier (1966): E. LXXIII bis of Mariette.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID-Owners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name transliteration</th>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Other name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Pami/Parmu</td>
<td>P. nill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. nill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID-Tit-Owner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Tit-Owner</th>
<th>Title's owner</th>
<th>Title's owner's owner Tranliteration title's owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Pnm-pi n pA-Xrd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>ntw n Bhsw pr-hl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID-Relative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Relative</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Relative's title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Pauaia</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Images and References**

Look at DB Own. 84 and 85 for the cult of Khonsu at Memphis.

References:


p. 69-70: the cult of Khonsu at Memphis. p. 69: an individual might have borne titles at Leontopolis as well as in Memphis. This priestly family of Leontopolis came to Memphis, and the members of its two later generations bore the same titles there than in their home town.
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

### The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alba María Villar Gómez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GLOBAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc: 158</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue: 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Location/Museum:** Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vaticano

**Type of document:** Papirus

**Material:** Papirus

**From:** Thebes

**Chronology:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty: 21st - early 22nd</th>
<th>Specific date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes about the document:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Marucchi (1891): 22nd D.

Gasse (1993): Nº Inventory 48812, nº catalog 11; dated to the end of 21st-beginning 22nd D because of the style of the vignette, the text and the name of the owner.

Book of the Dead.

### Other documents and titles:

Gasse (1993): \( \text{xnmtt n 2nsw pA-Xrd} \)


### References:


The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

### Genealogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Nesiamon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name transliteration:</th>
<th>N-2wmm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nickname:</th>
<th>Other name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of document:</th>
<th>Material:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thebes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty:</th>
<th>Specific date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st - early 22nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes about the document:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gasse (1993): Nº Inventory 38592; Book of the Dead. End of the 21st D. or beginning of the 22nd D. Probably from Thebes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other documents and titles:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**The Priesthood of Khonsu**

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Museum</th>
<th>Museum of Art of Cleveland, Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Outer coffin, Material: Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>21st - early 22nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identification of the Document:**
- **ID-Owner:** 113
- **Owner:** Neskhonsu
- **Name transcription:** No transcription

**Identification of the Owner:**
- **ID-Owner:** 113
- **Name:** Neskhonsu
- **Nickname:** None
- **Other name:** None
- **Hieroglyphs:** None

**Notes about the Document:**
- His name only appears on the exterior of the coffin, where it's seen 5 times in full, and twice in abbreviation.
- Late 21st-early 22nd D.
- Old accession Number 352.14 a.
- New accession Number 1914.714 a-b.
- Probably from Deir el-Bahri.
- Outer anthropoid coffin.
- His name only appears on the exterior of the coffin, where it's seen 5 times in full, and twice in abbreviation.
- Late 21st-early 22nd D.

**Chronicology:**
- 21st - early 22nd

**Specific date:**
- Late 21st-early 22nd D.

**Other documents and titles:**
- Nurse of Khonsu the Child
- Nurse of Khonsu the Child
- Nurse of Khonsu the Child
- Nurse of Khonsu the Child

**Other documents and titles:**
- **Relevant documents:**

**Images:**
- Image 1
- Image 2
- Image 3

**References:**

**This is the first mention of this coffin.**
**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**

**Alba Maria Villar Gómez**

*The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty*

**GLOBAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc:</th>
<th>167</th>
<th>Location/Museum:</th>
<th>Liverpool City Museum, Liverpool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue:</td>
<td>19196</td>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Stela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyps:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dynahship:</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes about the document:**


DB Owner 51’s titles are recorded on this stela, and DB Own. 50 and 140 are named as ni n (main bad, line 6).

**NEPSAPASHUTY’S AND NERERAUM’S FAMILY**

**Other documents and titles:**


**Images:**

Reference:


**References:**

- Doc. 137, p. 410-411.

- p. 16. DB Own. 51’s titles are garbled since he is called Second Prophet of Khonsu and Scribe of the Temple of Osiris, instead of Third Prophet of Khonsu and Prophet of Osiris.

- Genealogical tree.
# The Priesthood of Khonsu

## Alba María Villar Gómez

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

### Document Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc:</th>
<th>134</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of document:</td>
<td>Pyramidion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum:</td>
<td>Musée du Louvre, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty:</td>
<td>21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes about the document:</td>
<td>Dated back to the 21st D. because of the titles, style and because of the inscription on face south (Rammant-Peeters p. 62, and p. 134 for the spelling of god’s father title). Title 63 related to Family of Ankhpakhered afterwards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Genealogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Hierog-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Plates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title’s owner</th>
<th>Transliteration title’s owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>God’s Father of Khonsu</td>
<td>it-nTr n 2nsw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Overseer of the Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child</td>
<td>imy-r mnayw n 2nsw pA-Xrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Feeder priest of Khonsu the Child</td>
<td>xnmty n 2nsw pA-Xrd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandier, J. (1954). Manuel d'Archéologie égyptienne. Paris. Vol. II, 523 fig. 306.</td>
<td>Doc. 56, p. 60-62. n. 2: about title Nurse of Khonsu the Child it is said that Wild dated it only after the Saite Period, and Kees knows an example of Amasis reign. n. 4: it is the first time that the title Overseer of the Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child is mentioned; this document, because of its style, should be dated back earlier than the Arin-PA-kened family monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierret, P. (1874). Recueil d'inscriptions inédites du Musée égyptien du Louvre. Paris. Vol. II, p. 67: it is the first time that the title Overseer of the Wet-nurses of Khonsu the Child is mentioned; this document, because of its style, should be dated back earlier than the Arin-PA-kened family monuments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GL. ID.</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc:</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>BM EA 58159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:**
British Museum, London

**Type of document:**
Pyramidion

**Material:** Limestone

**From:** Thebes

**Chronology:**
Dynasty: 21st
Specific date: Thebes and dated back to the 21st D. because of the ductus of the inscriptions and the style of the images (Rammant-Peeters p. 50; and p. 134 for the spelling of god’s father title).

According to the British Museum Database, the inventory number is BM EA 58519, and not BM EA 58159. However, I keep the nomenclature used by Rammant-Peeters and Leahy in the DB.

According to Leahy

**Notes about the document:**

From Thebes and dated back to the 21st D. because of the ductus of the inscriptions and the style of the images (Rammant-Peeters p. 50; and p. 134 for the spelling of god’s father title).

According to the British Museum Database, the inventory number is BM EA 58519, and not BM EA 58159. However, I keep the nomenclature used by Rammant-Peeters and Leahy in the DB.

According to Leahy

**Other documents and titles:**


**Images:**

References:

- Doc. 45, p. 49-50.

Osiris, Isis and Harsiese are represented; also pr Wsir is always mentioned. These two elements seem to indicate the relationship between the owner and the worship of Osiris.


Although he might have been a local priest holding Theban titles, the more natural interpretation, in view of the evidence cited above is that he further exemplifies both the Theban hold
Randall-Maciver and Mace (1902 p. 99, No 32): glass or pottery ushabtis.


PDB103
THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU
The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

Alba Maria Villar Gómez

ID-Doc: 192
Location/Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo
Type of document: Bowl
Material: Gold
From: NRT III, Tanis

Chronology:
Dynasty: 21st
Specific date:

Notes about the document:
Find number 403.

Other documents and titles:
- bricks from Karnak
- bricks from Luxor Temple
- scarab CG 37426
- bricks from el-Hibeh
- bricks from Medamud
- bricks from Gebelein
- scarab CG 37426

Naguib (1990): [...]

Images:

References:

Other relatives:
263 Mother of Khonsu
264 Mother of the God Khonsu
265 The Great of the Domain of Khonsu
266 God’s Father of Khonsu
267 Wet-nurse of Khonsu
268 Priest of Anubis

Other documents:
Doc. 85, p. 58.
| ID-Owner | 139 Owner: Harytubehet | Name transliteration: Hbyt-wt|-ht | Nicknames: | Other names: Hpy-nmd |
| Location/ Museum: | Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo |
| Type of document: Papyrus | Material: Papyrus |
| From: Bab el-Gasus |

**Chronology:**

| Dynasty: 21st |
| Reign: Siamun |

| A.133 |
| Notes about the document: This document refers to the title "God's Mother of Khonsu" in relation to the mother of the owner, Istemkheb (D) (DB Own. 35). |

| Other documents and titles: |
| Coffin ensemble JE 29736 |
| Outer shroud |
| Mummy belt |
| Papyrus JE 31986 |
| Ushabti box Wien 6253 |

| Naguib (1990): wrt xnrt n Imn m sAHW t-Amn; Hmt-nTr |
| wrt ISrw; Hmt-nTr |
| wrt IMn n pr-md; Smayt n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; nbt pr; sAt n Hryt wrt xnrt tpyt n IMn-Ra nsw nTrw. |
| She is a daughter of HP Pinudjem II and a granddaughter of Menkheperra. |

| Images: |

| References: |

---

**THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU**

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty
### The Priesthood of Khonsu

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

| ID-Doc: | 140 | ID-Catalogue: | Dodola1 |
| Location/Museum: | Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo |
| Type of document: | Graffito |
| Material: | Wood |
| From: | TT110 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri |

#### Notes about the document:
On the chest of the coffin CG 61018 (Ramesses I). This individual was present on the removal of Ramesses I from Sethos I’s tomb.

#### NESEPASKASYUTY’S FAMILY

- **ID-Tit Owner**
  - Title: Third Hm-nTr priest of Khonsu in Thbes Neferhotep
  - Transliteration title’s owner: Siamun

#### Other documents and titles:

- Hieratic graffiti TT 320 (doc. 20 p. 118 and doc. 33 p. 140-142, Jansen-Winkeln)

  - Jansen-Winkeln (2007): it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTr n Imn-Htp pA wbA; Hm-nTr n Wsir n W-pqr; sS sHnw n pr Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS nsw sSm nfrw; stm n tA Hwt Wsir-mAat-Ra 4tp-n-Ra n pr Imn; imy-r mSa tA st mry Hwty; rwD aA.

- **Father** (BAk-n-2nsw)

#### Images:


#### References:

The Priesthood of Khonsu

The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty

Alba María Villar Gómez

ID-Doc: 198
ID-Catalogue: Docket A2
Location/Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo
Type of document: Graffito
Material: Wood

From: TT 220 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri

Chronology:
- Dynasty: 21st
- Reign: Siamun
- Specific date: year 10, fourth month of the winter season, day 17

Notes about the document:

On the chest of the coffin CG 61019 (Sethos I), below the docket of Herihor. This individual was present on the removal of Sethos I from his own tomb, NESPAKASHUTY’S FAMILY

Other documents and titles:


Jansen-Winkeln (2007): it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTr n Imn-Htp pA wbA; Hm-nTr n Wsir n W-pqr; sS sHnw n pr Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS nsw sSm nfrw; stm n tA Hwt Wsir-mAat-Ra n tp-n-Ra n pr Imn; imy-r mSa tA st mry Hwty; rwD aA.

-father (Hm-nTr)

Images:

References:

Doc. 15 p. 115.


Doc. 100 Table 1 (genealogical tree): identification between DB Rel. 72 and DB Rel. 280.
## THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

### Alba María Villar Gómez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc: 199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Catalogue: DocketA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Museum: Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document: Graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material: Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: TT 120 (Royal Cache), Deir el-Bahri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasty: 21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign: Siamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific date: year 10, fourth month of the winter season, day 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes about the document:

On the chest of the coffin CG 610120 (Ramesses II).

This individual was present on the removal of Ramesses II from Sethos I’s tomb.

### NESPAKASHUTY’S FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Relative’s name</th>
<th>Hierog-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Amuneminet (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Grandson</td>
<td>Djeddjehutyiuefankh (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other documents and titles:

- Hieratic graffiti TT 320 (doc. 20 p. 118 and doc. 33 p. 141-142, Jansen-Winkeln)
- Jansen-Winkeln (2007): it-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTr n Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; Hm-nTr n Imn-Htp pA wbA; Hm-nTr n Wsir n W-pqr; sS sHnw n pr Imn-Ra nsw nTrw; sS nsw sSm nfrw; stm n tA Hwt Wsir-mAat-Ra 4tp-n-Ra n pr Imn; imy-r mSa tA st mry Hwty; rwD aA.

### Images:


### References:

- Doc. 15 p. 115-116.
- p. 100 Table 1 (genealogical tree): identification between DB Rel. 72 and DB Rel. 280.

---

**ID-Owner:** 140
**Owner:** Nespakahuty (ii)
**Name transformation:** No-ne-ne-he-bty (ii)
**Nickname:**
**Other name:**

**Hierarchy Owner:**

### ID-Tit Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title’s owner</th>
<th>Transliteration title’s owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third (see-up) priest of Khonsu in Thbes Naferherheb</td>
<td>see-up H-nw-n Blnu in Wst Nfr-hby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ID Relative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative’s title</th>
<th>Tree genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third (see-up) priest of Khonsu in Thbes Naferherheb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Images:**

### THE PRIESTHOOD OF KHONSU

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GL-DEAL</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Plates</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID-Doc.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>ID-Catalogue: CG 6011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location/Museum:** Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo

**Type of document:** Outer case

**Material:** Wood

**From:** Sab el-Gasus

### Notes about the document:

**SAMS DOC. THAN DB DOC. 28 (DB OWN. 141=USURPER).**

A.139.

Niewinski (1979, p. 55, doc. F about DB Doc. 29): the style of the coffin is of the period of Pinudjem II or Puseens pontificate.

Niewinski (1988): outer coffin, inner lid and mummy-cover. Destany’s list unknown (Jansen-Winkeln sais A.139, as well as for DB Doc. 29). Je 59621.

Aston (2009): pependegous date this burial to HP Pinudjem II, c. 1001-976 BC.

The usurper of the coffins (CG 6010-6011-6012-6013) was DB Own. 141, possibly the great-granddaughter of HPA Menkheperra (mummy-braces inscribed during the pontificate of HP Pinudjem II). However, the owner of the coffins was DB Own. 18, or at least the owner of this outer case.

**Other documents and titles:**

- CG 6010, 6012, and possibly 6013 (doc. 19, p. 190 Jansen-Winkeln)
- Doc. 29 DB=coffins. Lilienfeld F 9310.1a
- Papyrus St V3 10122
- Papyrus St V3 10011
- small anonymous papyrus found around her neck CG 58602
- ushabtis (Housel et898); Berlin 11974, C 66181, 46817-46818, Louvre E.22108
- wood stela Je 29308
- shroud A.139
- mummy-braces Pinudjem II
- Chassinat (1909): herny n 2nsw = ntr nsw ntrw; Hsyt n Pia n Mwt; nbt pr; Hryt tiwt.

**Images:**

**References:**


# The Priesthood of Khonsu

**The Third Intermediate Period: The 21st Dynasty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-Doc</th>
<th>ID-Catalogue:</th>
<th>Location/Museum:</th>
<th>Type of document:</th>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Chronology:</th>
<th>Notes about the document:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>153A:2_Khonsu</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td>Mural relief</td>
<td>Khonsu Temple at Karnak</td>
<td>Transition 20th-21st</td>
<td>The Temple of Khonsu II: Dedicatory inscription of Herihor (First Hypostyle Hall, South Wall, Diorsey, Lintel);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Owner Information

- **Owner:** Herihor
- **Name transcription:** Bhr-bfr
- **Nickname:** Other name: |

### Title's owner

- **Title:** Great Overseer of the Works of the Domain of Khonsu
- **Translation title's owner:** |npr-ir-k b wry

### Kinship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Relative</th>
<th>Relative's name</th>
<th>Hierog-Relative</th>
<th>ID-Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>Nedjemet</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Tahheitsobeket</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Pashedicsobeket</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Nauny ?</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other documents and titles:

- Lull (2006):
  - Civil titles: imy-r kAwt wr m pr 2nsw; mH ib aA n nb tAwy; mH ib aA n nTr nfr; smr aA m rA Dr.f; TAy xw Hr wnmy (n) nsw; sS-nsw; imy-r niwt; TAty; sA-nsw n Ks; imy-r xAswt rsy; xrp Smaw tA mHw; imy-r kAwt mnw nbw n Hm.f; imy-r Snwty n pr-aA.
  - Military titles: imy-r mSa wr Smaw tA mHw; imy-r mSa wr; imy-r mSa; HAwty nty HAt nA mSa n Kmt (r) Dr.s; HAwty.
  - Religious titles: Hm-nTr tpy n Imn-Ra; Nb irt ixt.

### Other documents and titles:

- Lull (2006):
  - Civil titles: imy-r kAwt wr m pr 2nsw; mH ib aA n nb tAwy; mH ib aA n nTr nfr; smr aA m rA Dr.f; TAy xw Hr wnmy (n) nsw; sS-nsw; imy-r niwt; TAty; sA-nsw n Ks; imy-r xAswt rsy; xrp Smaw tA mHw; imy-r kAwt mnw nbw n Hm.f; imy-r Snwty n pr-aA.
  - Military titles: imy-r mSa wr Smaw tA mHw; imy-r mSa wr; imy-r mSa; HAwty nty HAt nA mSa n Kmt (r) Dr.s; HAwty.
  - Religious titles: Hm-nTr tpy n Imn-Ra; Nb irt ixt.

### Images and References:

- Herihor's titulary: p. 81.

### References:

- Herihor’s titulary: p. 81.
In the same statue another individual is mentioned: Ph-ne-re, a God’s Father of Atum.

References:
Fig. 46, p. 77.
Fig. 47, p. 78.
The statue, with a figure of Osiris on front, bears figural decoration of Osiris, Horus and Isis, as well as Amun-Ra and Amenemopet.
