THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

AMENHOTEP III AND AKHENATEN:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE COREGENCY ISSUES

A YEAR-TWO RESEARCH PAPER SUBMITTED TO

FACULTY READERS:

PETER F. DORMAN AND W. RAYMOND JOHNSON

DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY

LESLIE E. BAILEY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

27 MARCH 2000

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS v

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS vii

Section

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 History of the Coregency Debate 1

1.2 Effects of the Coregency Settlement 3

1.3 Scope of the Paper 3

2.0 EVIDENCE FROM THEBES 4

2.1 Tomb of Surer (TT 48) 4

2.2 Tomb of Kheruef (TT 192) 5

2.3 Tomb of Ramose (TT 55) 7

2.4 Third Pylon at Karnak Temple 8

2.5 Bowing in Scenes 10

2.6 Elder Woman 11

2.7.0 Queen Tiye's Wooden Shrine 12

2.7.1 ATEN NAMES 13

3.0 EVIDENCE FROM AREAS OUTSIDE OF THEBES AND AMARNA 14

3.1 Soleb Temple Reliefs 14

3.2 Kahun Papyri 15

3.3 Athribis Block 16

3.4 Meidum Graffito 18

3.5 Men and Bek Graffito at Aswan 19

3.6.0 Dahshur Graffito 20

3.6.1 DOUBLE DATING 21

3.7 Tomb of Vizier Aper-el at Saqqara 21

4.0 EVIDENCE FROM AMARNA 22

4.1 Earlier Proclamation of Akhenaten 22

4.2 Persecution of Amen 23

4.3 Two Courts 24

4.4.0 Amenhotep III at Amarna 25

4.4.1 AMENHOTEP III'S BUILDINGS & ESTATES 26

4.4.2 AMARNA WINE DOCKETS 27

4.4.3.0 STELA FROM PANESHY'S HOUSE 27

4.3.3.1 Double Nb-mAat-ra Prenomen 28

4.4.4.0 SARCOPHAGUS OF MEKETATEN 29

4.4.4.1 Phonetic Prenomen 29

4.4.5 GRANITE BOWL 30

4.4.6 OFFERING TABLE 31

4.4.7.0 LINTEL IN THE TOMB OF HUYA 31

4.4.7.1 Baketaten 33

4.4.8 PLASTER HEADS 34

4.4.9 STATUETTES 35

4.5.0 Kingship and Theology 37

4.5.1 AKHENATEN'S SED FESTIVALS 37

4.5.2 AMENHOTEP III'S DEIFICATION 39

4.6 Durbar 41

4.7.0 Amarna Letters 42

4.7.1 EA 27 44

5.0 TUTANKHAMEN'S PARENTAGE 46

5.1 Hermopolis Block 46

5.2 Soleb Lion 47

5.3 Astronomical Instrument 47

5.4 Luxor Temple 48

5.5 Amarna Letter EA 9 48

6.0 CONCLUSIONS 49

ILLUSTRATIONS 52

APPENDIX 68

BIBLIOGRAPHY 70

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1: Amenhotep IV offers to Amenhotep III and Tiye in Kheruef's Tomb

Figure 2A: Amenhotep IV in Tomb of Ramose—Traditional Style

Figure 2B: Amenhotep IV in Tomb of Ramose—Amarna Style

Figure 3: Simut in Ramose's Tomb

Figure 4A: Prow of Royal Barge on Third Pylon

Figure 4B: Stern of Royal Barge on Third Pylon

Figure 5A: Early Form of Aten Name

Figure 5B: Late Form of Aten Name

Figure 6A: Sketch of Athribis Block

Figure 6B: Reconstruction of Athribis Block

Figure 7: Men and Bek Graffito at Aswan

Figure 8A: Dahshur Graffito—Hieratic

Figure 8B: Dahshur Graffito—Hieroglyphic

Figure 9: Panehsy's Stela (British Museum EA 57399)

Figure 10A: Phonetic Spelling of Amenhotep III's Prenomen

Figure 10B: Seated Maat Goddess Sign

Figure 10C: Spelling with Maat Goddess

Figure 10D: Hieratic Phonetic Spelling

Figure 11: Granite Bowl Fragment Inscriptions

Figure 12: Offering Table Inscriptions

Figure 13A: Lintel from Huya's Tomb—Left Panel

Figure 13B: Lintel from Huya's Tomb—Right Panel

Figure 14: Banquet Scene from Huya's Tomb

Figure 15A: Plaster Head (Berlin 21299)—Front View

Figure 15B: Plaster Head (Berlin 21299)—Side View

Figure 16: Amenhotep III Statue (Brooklyn Museum 48.28)

Figure 17A: Plaster Head (Berlin 21356)—Front View

Figure 17B: Plaster Head (Berlin 21356)—Side View

Figure 18: Amenhotep III Statuette (MMA 30.8.74)

Figure 19: Triad Statuette (UC 004)

Figure 20: Akhenaten and Nefertiti Statuette (Louvre E. 15593)

Figure 21: Durbar from Meryre II's Tomb

Figure 22A: Photograph of Hieratic Docket of EA 27

Figure 22B: Restoration of Hieratic on EA 27

Figure 22C: Hieroglyphic Transcription of Hieratic EA 27

ABBREVIATIONS

ASAE	*Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Egypte, Kairo*
BAEE	*Boletín de la asociación Española de egiptología*
BiOr	*Bibliotheca Orientalis*
BSFE	*Bulletin de la Société Française d'Egyptologie*
CAH	*The Cambridge Ancient History*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
CANE	*Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
CdE	*Chronique d'Égypte*
CoA	*The City of Akhenaten*. London: Oxford University Press.
EG	*Egyptian Grammar, Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. Alan Gardiner. London: Oxford University Press.
GM	*Göttinger Miszellen*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JARCE	*Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
LÄ	*Lexikon der Ägyptologie*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
MDAIK	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo*. Cairo.
MIO	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
SAK	*Studien zur Altägyptischer Kultur*

SAOC	*Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
URK IV	*Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Heft 20. Historische Inschriften Amenophis' III.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag
ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Probably one of the most exasperating controversies in modern Egyptology concerns whether Amenhotep III ruled jointly with his son Amenhotep IV. For over a century, scholars have been debating the issues of whether there was a coregency between the two Eighteenth Dynasty pharaohs. At the end of the nineteenth century, W. M. F. Petrie was the first to propose a coregency "in order to resolve the complex chronologies and apparent contradictions."[1] Since that time, innumerable words have been published either advocating or refuting the possibility that Amenhotep III and Akhenaten ruled simultaneously for any given number of years. The Appendix of this paper delineates the historiography of the debate in order to supplement the next section.

1.1 History of the Coregency Debate

In tracing the history of the coregency controversy, a contentious element involves the amount of time that Amenhotep III and Akhenaten could have shared the throne. As with every issue within the coregency problem, there is no scholarly agreement. Although Petrie envisioned a coregency lasting four years, Ludwig Borchardt thought that a maximum of five years was more probable. Based on the time that the Aten's name was changed, J. D. S. Pendlebury and H. W. Fairman concluded that a coregency lasted into year 9 of Akhenaten. By the 1950s a long coregency of eleven to twelve years was interpreted, and Cyril Aldred became its main defender. Wolfgang Helck was the first to refute Fairman's theories by denying the existence of any coregency between the two kings. Afterwards in 1959, F. J. Giles argued for a twelve year joint rule in his dissertation. Studies by E. F. Campbell and Erik Hornung in the early 1960s were published disclaiming a coregency. By the late 1960s, Donald Redford reanalyzed the coregency

[1] Elisabeth Delange, "In Pursuit of a Pharaoh: 200 Years of Passion and Intellect," in *Egypt's Dazzling Sun: Amenhotep III and His World*, Arielle P. Kozloff et al. (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1992), 25.

issues, refuting the notion that Amenhotep III and Akhenaten ruled concurrently; meanwhile Kenneth Kitchen upheld that an eight year coregency may have transpired. After a thorough research of all ancient Egyptian coregencies in the mid-Seventies, William Murnane concluded that at most a coregency of two years was possible. By the late twentieth century, the long coregency position gained new momentum with the theories of W. Raymond Johnson. At present, however, some scholars still prefer a more conservative two year length of co-rule: "a welcome change from the unjustifiable dogmatism so often expressed against any coregency."[2]

As has been exposed in the brief outline of the history above, the answer to the question of a joint rule of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten is far from resolved, notwithstanding a comment published by Redford this past year: "There persists in some quarters the mistaken notion that Akhenaten enjoyed a coregency with his father. This has long since been disproven to the satisfaction of the present writer and in the vast majority of the scholarly world."[3]

In a book review of Redford's *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*, Kitchen assays Redford's dismissal of a coregency as follows:

> Thus, Redford—despite much admirable work—has failed to produce any finally convincing Egyptian evidence against the supposed coregency…. Hence, we must conclude that Dr. Redford has certainly not disproven the alleged coregency of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten in a definitive fashion, anymore than others have established it.[4]

Contrary to Redford's majority opinion, Johnson states that "Egyptologists are still split down the middle over the question."[5] Thus, there is no agreement concerning which Egyptologists are on either side of the argument. Some, such as William Hayes, have changed their position

---

[2] K. A. Kitchen, review of *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes: January 12, 1977*, edited by Janet Johnson and Edward Wente, *Serapis: The American Journal of Egyptology* 4 (1977-78): 71.
[3] Donald Redford, "The Beginning of the Heresy," in *Pharaohs of the Sun: Akhenaten, Nefertiti, Tutankhamen*, eds. Rita Freed et al., (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston in association with Bulfinch Press/Little, Brown & Co., 1999), 59, n. 1.
[4] K. A. Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," *CdÉ* 43, no. 85 (Jan. 1968): 318-20.
[5] W. Raymond Johnson, "The Setting: History, Religion, and Art," in *Pharaohs of the Sun*, 46.

during their careers.[6]

1.2 Effects of the Coregency's Resolution

The fact that the coregency controversy forces scholars to reevaluate the evidence leads to a better understanding of ancient Egypt and allows the dialectic method used in analyses to prosper. "Beyond the particulars, however, the debate on the coregency has been useful in generating much needed discussion of the criteria we use for interpreting the cryptic data of the monuments and their bearing on Egyptian history."[7]

The Eighteenth Dynasty, for modern scholarship, still poses many unanswered problems in addition to Amenhotep III and Akhenaten's alleged co-reign. In theory, the resolution of the coregency would be essential for a correct understanding of many of the aspects of the period. The substantiation of familial relations among the royalty of the era might be resolved, specifically in determining how Tutankhamen was related to Amenhotep III. If the number of years of a joint rule were established, the chronologies of preceding and subsequent kings would have to be adjusted. A long coregency of twelve years means that Akhenaten's length of sole rule would be five years, and this revised time scale would have a significant effect on the chronology of events in the entire ancient Near East during this period.

1.3 Scope of the Paper

One objective of this paper is to demonstrate the disparity of viewpoints on each issue as well as the complexities involved. Although it would be misleading to promise the reader that this paper will provide an answer to the coregency question, it is hoped that the paper will stimulate more discussions, excavations, and investigations in the future. In addition, perhaps one day this perplexing question of coregency may be answered.

---

[6] William C. Hayes, "Egypt: Internal Affairs from Tuthmosis I to the Death of Amenophis III," in *CAH* Part 1, revised edition of Vol. 2, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1962), 12, n. 7.
[7] William Murnane, "The Bark of Amun on the Third Pylon at Karnak," *JARCE* 16 (1979): 18.

In *The City of Akhenaten Part III*, Fairman posited approximately twelve arguments in favor of a coregency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten based on his and Pendlebury's interpretations of evidence. Since then, the amount of evidence used to support a joint rule has more than doubled. It is a goal of this study to summarize the thirty or so arguments that have been used over the years in order to endorse a coregency between Amenhotep III and his son. As a deviation from Murnane's classification of the issues into "functional categories,"[8] the author will explore each piece of evidence geographically.

2.0 EVIDENCE FROM THEBES

The proper place to begin this examination of the evidence for a coregency is in Thebes where Amenhotep III ruled for thirty-eight years. Some Theban tombs dating from his reign contain depictions that scholars have interpreted as suggestive evidence of coregency.

2.1 Tomb of Surer (TT 48)

Borchardt proposes a coregency of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten based on his impression of one of the mutilated scenes in an inner room of the tomb of Surer.[9] In a relief of royal statues being dragged in a procession lacking inscriptions, an additional statue of a king was later incised into the setting. Borchardt believes that the extra statue was added as an afterthought since it overlapped the other figures, and because it was not placed on the same level with the other statues. His interpretation of the destruction of the tomb led Borchardt to speculate that Surer had fallen out of favor towards the end of Amenhotep III reign.[10] "Since the royal statue is a late edition, and since %*wrArA* [Surer], being out of favor, would hardly have been

[8] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, SAOC 40, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1977), 123.
[9] Ludwig Borchardt, "Amenophis IV. Mitkönig in den letzen Jahren Amenophis III.?" in *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten: Seinen Wissenschaftlichen Freunden und Bekannten zu Seinem 70. Geburtstage am 5. Oktober 1933*. (Leipzig: Privatdruck, 1938), 22ff.
[10] As noted by Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*, Near and Middle Eastern Series vol. 3, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), 112.

able later to add a figure of his former lord, Amenhotep III, Borchardt naturally assumes that Akhenaten is the king whose figure is added."[11] Noting that some of the reliefs of the tomb depict either the second or the third jubilee of Amenhotep III, Borchardt infers that a coregency began in either year 34 or 36 of Amenhotep III.

An obvious flaw of Borchardt's argument is that the added statue could have just as easily been of Amenhotep III, since there is no way of determining whom the statue was supposed to represent. It seems likely that the statue may have been of Amenhotep III because it was adorned with a robe similar to one worn by the statue of this king in the jubilee reliefs of Kheruef's tomb.[12] Furthermore, no evidence exists "that Akhenaten 'legitimized' scenes from earlier ones by having his own statue surcharged over or inserted into the scene."[13] Concerning this first coregency issue, Murnane concludes, "no one has taken this argument seriously."[14]

2.2 Tomb of Kheruef (TT 192)

Another badly damaged Theban tomb also has been used in support of a coregency between the two pharaohs. The first point of contention from the tomb of Kheruef entails a scene that depicts Amenhotep IV making offerings to his parents, thereby introducing the recurring problem of how to interpret scenes of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten shown together. The south side of the Entrance Corridor (Figure 1) contains this scene, and one wonders whether Amenhotep III is being represented as dead or alive. Since the royal parents are shown wearing sandals, and the elder king is not on a pedestal (i.e., not a statue), Fairman deduces that the depiction shows a living and deified Amenhotep III being worshipped by his son and coregent.[15]

---

[11] E. F. Campbell Jr., *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters, with Special Reference to the Hypothetical Coregency of Amenophis III and Akhenaten*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1964), 13.
[12] As observed by Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, 14.
[13] Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, 14.
[14] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 157.
[15] H. W. Fairman, "The Inscriptions," in *CoA, Part III: The Central City and the Official Quarters, Vol. 1: Text*, J. D. S. Pendlebury et al., (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), 155-6.

Among the fragments recovered from nearby the scene, an inscription with the epithet "[beloved of] Sokar" was found. Although some scholars consider this epithet as referring to Amenhotep III's expiration, the epithet

> cannot constitute a reliable indication that Amenhotep III was already deceased since this epithet might have instead been applied to him in connection with his celebration of the jubilee. In the Kheruef throne scene of the third jubilee the living Amenhotep III is "beloved of Ptah Sokar," and the rites connected with the erection of the *djed* pillar on the morning of the jubilee attest to Sokar's prominence in this festival.[16]

Redford interprets the scene from a different perspective, surmising that the scene is an "idealized portrayal," not specific to an historical event.[17] He writes: "The controversy over whether a figure in this type of scene is alive or dead is wholly irrelevant."[18] Since other prior coregencies have been evidenced from pictorial representations of two kings together, a complication arises in determining if an authentic coregency is being shown, or if the king is being shown associated with another for propagandistic reasons.

Another point of contention deriving from Kheruef's tomb involves the chronology of the construction of the tomb. A coregency might be invoked on the premise that as "one moves into the interior of the tomb one sees progressively later stages of Kheruef's career memorialized on the walls."[19] Therefore, the construction of TT 192 suggests that scenes of Amenhotep III's Sed-festival must have been carved as much as ten years later than the entrance scenes that depict Amenhotep IV.[20]

> If [this] chronology is followed, there is of necessity an interval of about ten years between the decoration of the entrance and that of the portico. *A priori* this is not possible. If, moreover, the tomb of Kheruef were still being worked on toward the end of a long coregency, would one not expect the anachronistic scenes near

---

[16] Edward Wente, review of *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty* by Donald Redford, *JNES* 28: 274-5.
[17] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt*, 115.
[18] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt*, 115.
[19] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 148.
[20] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 148.

the entrance to have been altered?[21]

2.3 Tomb of Ramose (TT 55)

Like the Tomb of Parennefer (TT 188) at Thebes, the tomb of the southern vizier Ramose also reflects both the conventional art style of Amenhotep III (Figure 2A) on the left side of a central doorway on the rear west wall in the transverse hallway and in equipoise the beginnings of the new stylistic forms of the Aten cult introduced by Amenhotep IV (Figure 2B) on the right side. Unlike Parennefer's tomb, Ramose's tomb was not abandoned when the relocation of the capital to Amarna transpired, and no record of Ramose has been found at the new capital. However, some scenes were partially sketched in ink, and some reliefs were not cut. Thus, Aldred believes that "Ramose died while work was in progress" early during Amenhotep III's fourth decade of reign.[22] From this assumption, Aldred attempts to determine when the vizier died. Ramose's name does not materialize amongst the "dockets attesting contributions to the king's second and third jubilees," moreover his name is missing in a roster of officials listed on an endowment stela for the mortuary temple of Amenhotep, son of Hapu,[23] dated to year 31 of Amenhotep III. Therefore, based on a coregency beginning in Amenhotep III's year 28, Ramose would have been dead by year 4 of Amenhotep IV.[24]

To support a long coregency of 11/12 years, Aldred then reconstructs a complicated argument detailing a hypothetical chronology by using Ramose's date of death at approximately year 31 of Amenhotep III. He elaborates on the course of events with the promotion of Simut, the fourth prophet of Amen, depicted in Ramose's tomb on the South Wall of the first hall (Figure 3); a scene which was finished in haste. Simut is first attested as the fourth prophet in

[21] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 149.
[22] Cyril Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, (New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc., 1988), 176.
[23] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 151.
[24] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 151.

Amenhotep III's year 20, and before his death, he advanced to the rank of the second prophet.[25] This promotion apparently occurred only after the demise of Anen (the second prophet) and Amenemhat (the third prophet).

> Aldred sets out to pinpoint the date of Simut's advancement more closely. He finds among the jar dockets from Malqata a number, probably dating to year 34, which record donations of honey made by the Greatest of Seers, Amenemhet. Identifying the office as that of the local pontificate of Re-Atum at Karnak, Aldred proceeds to equate this Amenemhet with the third prophet of Amen. But one holder of this solar pontificate is already known for Amenhotep III's reign, and that is Anen. Since presumably Amenemhet could not take over this office until the death of its previous occupant, Anen must have died not later than Amenhotep III's year 34. At the same time the general shuffle of the four highest offices, with Simut advanced one or perhaps two grades, must have occurred.[26]

With these assumptions Aldred is able to plot the sequence of events in Simut's career coinciding with the regnal years of the coregent pharaohs.

A problem of this convoluted argument is that it is only as strong as its component parts, and Murnane views the components as being infirm.[27] Skepticism may be expressed about the estimation of the date of Simut's promotion, the identity of the two Amenemhats, and the succession in the offices of *wr mAAw*. "The significance of Ramose's disappearance from the Malqata dockets is lessened when one realizes that no one holding the title of vizier appears in these materials after Amenhotep III's thirtieth year."[28] The endowment stela dated to year 31 of Amenhotep III is precarious as contemporary evidence since the piece has been assessed as a Twenty-first Dynasty document due to its philological characteristics.[29] Although Aldred's reconstruction constitutes an impressive argument, it relies too much on assumption. Moreover, it would seem that the ancient Egyptians would have been more explicit in denoting a coregency

[25] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 177.
[26] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt*, 133.
[27] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 151.
[28] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 151.
[29] Wente, review of *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 275.

instead of hiding it behind a façade so complex.

2.4 Third Pylon at Karnak Temple

The next argument used to support a coregency involves the Third Pylon at the Great Temple of Amen at Karnak, where on the east face of the North Tower palimpsest figures exist. Amenhotep III is depicted offering to the god in the royal barge, and behind him on the prow (Figure 4A) and also the stern (Figure 4B) smaller effaced human figures mimicking Amenhotep III's stance are visible. If the effaced figures are determined to be of Amenhotep IV, this would be "a crucial identification, for both kings would have been shown acting together within the same context and their association would lend valuable support to a coregency."[30]

Hornung argues that the "representation…displays a sculptor's correction and is by no means the later erasure of a 'coregent' depicted on a smaller scale—in fact, two coregents would have had to be of the same size!"[31] Murnane notes that the figures were executed more so in the Amarna-style rather than the traditional style of Amenhotep III, citing the "strongly accented belly" and the figure's stance, in which the thighs cross one another at a sharp angle.[32] From the partial inscriptions related to the palimpsest figures, Murnane found that cartouches were originally there. His analysis of the prow scene reveals that in one cartouche the nomen "Horemheb" is apparent.[33] In the stern scene, Murnane was able to discern that in the prenomen cartouche, the sun disc remains at its top: "The surviving sun disc can be projected as having been 35mm high. The remaining space below this sign is at most 150mm down to and including the base of the name ring."[34] Only a pharaoh with a short name would fit in this space, leaving a choice between Amenhotep III (*Nb-mꜣat-rꜥ*) and Tutankhamen (*Nb-xprw-rꜥ*). Murnane

[30] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 162.
[31] Erik Hornung, *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*, trans. D. Lorton, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), 30.
[32] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 162-3.
[33] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 164.

eliminated the option of Amenhotep III since then both figures would be performing the same function in the relief. Tutankhamen's prenomen remains as the only option, and for Murnane, "it may be significant that a figure of Amenhotep III was shown on board the barque of Amen in the Opet Festival reliefs executed under Tutankhamen in the Great Colonnade at Luxor."[35]

Johnson disagrees with the identification of Tutankhamen; for him, the ghost figures must be of Amenhotep IV since the carving is analogous with the program of other figures of Amenhotep IV, *not* Tutankhamen.

> Tutankhamen's figures on the same barges in the Colonnade Hall at Luxor Temple are all appropriated by Horemheb (figures of Amenhotep III also present on the barges). If the Third Pylon figures were Tutankhamen, Horemheb would have appropriated them, too. They were so carefully erased because they were Amenhotep IV, whose images were *never* appropriated, but were erased or destroyed. [The] best (and closest) parallel: porch of the Third Pylon, where smiting figures of Amenhotep IV were erased and filled-in with plaster rather than be appropriated.[36]

Other scholars, such as Aldred, assess the smaller figures as being of the coregent, Amenhotep IV as well.[37]

2.5 Bowing in Scenes

Interestingly, the Third Pylon may present another argument in support of a coregency. Murnane observes that bowing figures on the stern of the king's barge represent the "only perceptible Amarna influence that is contemporary with Amenhotep III."[38] It seems that in portrayals made during the Amarna period, Egyptian officials are depicted bowing their backs before their lord more deeply than ever before.[39] Therefore, the presence of the deep bowing

---

[34] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 165.
[35] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 167.
[36] Johnson, email communication with author, 13 March 2000.
[37] Aldred, *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*, (New York: The Brooklyn Museum in association with Viking Press, 1973), 19, fig. 4 caption.
[38] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 168.
[39] Hornung, *History of Ancient Egypt: An Introduction*, trans. D. Lorton, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), 100.

figures on the Third Pylon might indicate a coregency. "At most," writes Murnane, "this would be evidence for a coregency of Amenhotep III with Amenhotep IV—not with Akhenaten."[40] Similarly in the tomb of Khaȧemhat (TT 57), whose owner served during Amenhotep III's reign, a scene details officials bowing radically as they grasp cattle.

> None of these figure looks like those found on the Third Pylon, and if the influence of Amenhotep IV/Akhenaten is regarded as a necessary catalyst for such uncharacteristic features, their presence in a relief of Amenhotep III could be seen as indirect evidence for a coregency of this king with his son.[41]

2.6 Elder Woman

A few scholars have used an unidentified mummy, which was discovered in 1898 in the royal cache found in the tomb of Amenhotep II (KV 35), in order to defend a coregency. It has been claimed that a hair sample from the "Elder Woman B," (Cairo Museum's mummy CG 61070), matches the lock of hair found in the tomb of Tutankhamen within a sealed wooden coffinette inscribed with the name "Queen Tiye."[42] Aldred considers that the determination of Tiye's age of death could prove to be "a critical factor" in deciding if there was coregency between Amenhotep III and his son.[43]

A scarab issued during regnal year 2 of Amenhotep III, known as the Cattle Hunt Scarab, indicates that Amenhotep III was married to Tiye by his second year of reign at the latest. Amenhotep III had completed a full thirty-seven years on the throne, and during his son's reign (barring a coregency) there is evidence that Tiye lived into Akhenaten's reign until at least year 14.[44] This accounts for fifty-one years of Tiye's life; however, it is uncertain how old she was when she married Amenhotep III.

---

[40] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 168.
[41] Murnane, "The Bark of Amun on the Third Pylon at Karnak," 17.
[42] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 105 with original source being Wente and Harris, "Mummy of the Elder Lady's Tomb," *Science* 200 (1978): 1149-59.
[43] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 181.

Based on the above computations and on the medical analysis performed on mummy CG 61070, Aldred's argues for a period of joint rule.

> [In] view of Elliot Smith's report that her lustrous hair bore no trace of grey, she was certainly younger than 51 and probably little more than 40 at death, making it possible for her to be the mother of the child-princess Baketaten [Section 4.4.7.1]. Thus if the medical experts have correctly identified the mummy of Tiye, her son's reign must have overlapped her husband's by a margin of 10 years or more.[45]

Within this same line of reasoning, Bentley also advocates a coregency based on the estimated age of death of being forty years old as determined by the medical specialists on the mummy in question.[46]

This argument makes two assumptions: the first, that CG 61070 is in fact Queen Tiye, and second that the medical specialists can accurately determine the age of death of a mummified person. Gay Robins dismisses the latter assumption by warning:

> Although it is tempting to assume that the estimated ages of death of the royal mummies can be used as a starting point for establishing chronology, it appears that we must accept that…those based on recent scientific examination are not accurate enough to be used absolutely for this purpose, and that no historical or chronological arguments based solely on evidence of age of death of a mummy can be considered valid.[47]

In Section 4.4.7.1, Tiye's life span and its relation to Baketaten will also be considered.

2.7.0 Queen Tiye's Wooden Shrine

The shrine intended for Queen Tiye's sarcophagus is used by some scholars to support a coregency theory as well. Found at the entrance passage of KV 55, this dismantled wooden shrine was manufactured for Tiye during the later years of Akhenaten's reign (after year 9) since

---

[44] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 181.
[45] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 182.
[46] Julia Bentley, "Amenophis III and Akhenaten: Co-regency Proved?", *JEA* 66: 165.
[47] Gay Robins, "The Value of the Estimated Ages of the Royal Mummies at Death as Historical Evidence," *GM* 45 (1981): 66.

the late form of didactic name of the Aten is employed.[48] Section 2.7.1 clarifies the distinctions between the "late" and the "early" forms of the Aten's names and how they are used for dating purposes.

On the left and right transverse above the door of the shrine and on one of the side panels, Amenhotep III's cartouche is present in association with Tiye.[49] Dated after year 9 of Akhenaten, the cartouches (Figure 10A) contain *Nb-mAat-ra* spelled without the seated Maat goddess determinative, and this is termed a "phonetic" spelling by Egyptologists. Normally, Amenhotep III's prenomen, Nebmaatre, used the seated Maat goddess sign; however, during the Amarna period, Akhenaten avoided employing the names of the gods other than the Aten in inscriptions. A closer examination of this phenomenon will be covered in Section 4.4.4.1 since the phonetic spelling of the name manifests itself in several other items in this study.

With the issue of the phonetic spelling set aside for the moment, Redford reasons that the occurrence of her husband's name this late in time derives from Tiye's status and position. Thus, there is no reason to believe that the shrine represents evidence of a coregency.

> Tiye was a plebian by birth. Her only claim to be an heiress, in fact, her only claim to fame at all, lay in her marriage to Amenhotep III. … After her husband's death, Tiye's power would continue supreme if it were repeated insistently that she had been Amenhotep III's queen. This is what seems to have been done; and this, the present writer submits, is the only satisfactory explanation….[50]

However, Johnson disagrees with Redford's "only satisfactory explanation," arguing that after Amenhotep III's death, Tiye would have not needed any identity to enforce her legitimacy other than her identity as "King's Mother."[51]

---

[48] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*, Writings from the Ancient World Society of Biblical Literature, vol. 5, ed. Edmund S. Meltzer, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 100.
[49] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt*, 109-10.
[50] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt*, 110-11.
[51] Johnson, email communication with author, 13 March 2000.

2.7.1 ATEN NAMES

At this point, it is important to explain the Aten names and to note their purpose in dating objects from Akhenaten's reign. Figure 5A illustrates the "early" Aten name, and this form was used from year 3 to year 9 of Amenhotep IV/Akhenaten's reign. It is translated as: "Re-Horakhty who rejoices in the horizon/in his name as Shu/light who/which is Aten." After year 9, Akhenaten changed the name of the Aten into what is known to modern scholars as the "late" name, and it has been translated as: "Re, ruler of the dual horizon, who rejoices in the horizon/in his name as Re the father(?), who returns as Aten."[52] Thus, items made after year 9 can be distinguished from items made prior in time by the Aten name form.

3.0 EVIDENCE FROM AREAS OUTSIDE OF THEBES AND AMARNA

Before discussing the Amarna evidence, it is worthy to note that other locations, aside from Thebes and Amarna, may hold clues as to whether a coregency existed between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten.

3.1 Soleb Temple Reliefs

In the Nubian temple of Soleb, which was almost wholly created by Amenhotep III, the north side of the pylon depicts a few scenes made by Akhenaten before his fifth or sixth year. The reliefs depict Akhenaten receiving the life sign from his father and also pouring libations and burning incense for the deified Amenhotep III identified as "Nebmare, Lord of Nubia."[53] Fairman, following the unpublished writings of James Breasted and N. Davies, cites that "'Akhenaten' was surcharged over 'Amenhotep' and that the original prenomen was 'Neferkheprure.'"[54] Conversely, J. Janssen records "that the original celebrant was Amenhotep

[52] John Baines, "The Dawn of the Amarna Age," in *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on His Reign*, eds., David O'Connor and Eric H. Cline, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), fig. 8.1 caption.
[53] Fairman, "The Inscriptions," *CoA Part III*, 154.
[54] Fairman, "The Inscriptions," *CoA Part III*, 154.

III himself and that his cartouches were usurped by his son."[55] Edward Wente later disputed Janssen's decipherment. After consulting some of Breasted's original notes, he is "firmly convinced that the cartouches of Akhenaten were *not* carved over those of Amenhotep III's in scenes 6 and 7."[56] Thus, the whole debate revolves around whose notes of these reliefs are more accurate.

Redford reinforces the anti-coregency position specifying that Akhenaten stands before the deified Amenhotep III, which is distinct from him standing in front of a mortal.[57] The proof of his deification is that the inscription describes the carving of Amenhotep III as "Nebmare, Lord of Nubia." Further evidence derives from same temple in which Amenhotep III himself stands before the god "Nebmare, Lord of Nubia."[58] Because, Akhenaten is facing a god instead of a living king, Redford believes, the Soleb temple reliefs are irrelevant to a discussion of whether Amenhotep III was living or deceased when the scenes in question were incised.

3.2 Kahun Papyri

Four papyri discovered at Kahun have been used to advocate a long coregency. The papyri, involving the business transactions of two men, Mesy and Nebmehy, are: (1) P. Berlin 9784, dated to regnal year 27 of Amenhotep III; (2) P. Gurob II.1, dated to regnal year 33 of Amenhotep III; (3) P. Gurob II.2, dated the same as (2); and (4) P. Berlin 9785, dated to regnal year 4 of Amenhotep IV.[59]

Without a coregency, the dates of these papyri tally to approximately fifteen years; however, with the argument for a long coregency, the length of time is reduced by about ten

[55] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 153.
[56] Wente, review of *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 274.
[57] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 96.
[58] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 96.
[59] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*, 43-6.

years.[60] For Kitchen, Aldred's interpretation represents a "more 'economical' view of the people and transactions than would the addition of a decade and a half extra required of the anti-coregency lobby."[61]

Redford presumes that the reappearance of the same individuals mentioned in the papyri is "the only reliable evidence" on which an argument can be founded, albeit insecurely.[62] Consequently, he refutes at length why the four papyri must be taken at the maximum duration of time rather than at the minimum. Wente on the other hand, mistrusts his hypothesis:

> Redford's notion that they cover a longer span of time than a coregency would permit is based partially on the assumption that two generations are represented in the lists of witnesses. However, this certainly cannot be proven since none of the witnesses who had children also serving as witnesses in year 2 and 3 appears as a witness in the early group in year 27.[63]

Since not enough is known about the characters or the circumstances represented in the papyri, both Kitchen and Murnane conclude that the entire issue cannot be determined either way and is therefore indecisive as applied to the coregency case.[64]

3.3 Athribis Block

Athribis in the delta disclosed a limestone block (52x42x59 cm) adorned with the obliterated bottom portions of three cartouches. During the excavation in 1938, the block was copied by Alan Rowe in a sketch (Figure 6A) and then left *in situ*.[65] If the drawing is accurate, as well as Fairman's reconstruction of the cartouches (Figure 6B), then the nomen of Amenhotep IV (*Imn-Htp nTr HqA WAst*) and the prenomen of Amenhotep III appear juxtaposed. "This block is further evidence of a coregency," declares Fairman, "the conclusion appears inescapable that by

---

[60] Aldred, "Year 12 at el-Amarna," *JEA* 43 (1957): 114.
[61] Kitchen, review of *Akhenaten, Pharaoh of Egypt*—A New Study by C. Aldred, *JEA* 57 (1971): 218.
[62] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 131.
[63] Wente, review of *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 275.
[64] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 316, and Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 157.
[65] F. J. Giles, *Ikhnaton: Legend and History*, (London: Hutchinson and Company, Ltd., 1970), 85.

his fifth year at the latest, at least outside of the Theban area, Amenhotep IV was the dominant partner in the coregency and Amenhotep III little more than a figurehead."[66] The ordering of the cartouches suggests a scene in which the son was in front of his father and both were facing the same direction; "this probable association" alludes to a coregency.[67] However, since no architectural context exists for the block, this scenario cannot be proven.

The main objection to this piece of evidence is that there might have been a scribal error; i.e., the nomen of Amenhotep III, *Imn-Htp HqA WAst*, was mistaken for *nTr HqA WAst* of Amenhotep IV.

> Such a mistake is attested on one of the documents from Kahun, but the writing of Amenhotep III's nomen in that document is probably influenced by that of Amenhotep IV, who is also mentioned in the text, and it is doubtful that an error of this sort would have occurred in a formal second inscription.[68]

Kitchen as well doubts a carving error on a massive block from a monument where check was supposed to be maintained.[69] Another theory employed in order to refute a coregency is that the block was part of a dado or frieze of alternating cartouches.[70] "Even if Redford's dado were true, why should Amenhotep IV erect in Athribis a monument embodying his father's name with his own—unless a coregency were in being?"[71]

3.4 Meidum Graffito

An enigmatic graffito from the pyramid temple of Meidum has caused some Egyptologists, such as Fairman, F. L. Griffith, and Howard Carter, to interpret it as evidence for a coregency.[72] It reads as follows:

---

[66] Fairman, "A Block of Amenophis IV from Athribis," *JEA* 46 (1960): 82.
[67] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 161.
[68] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 162.
[69] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 316.
[70] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 143.
[71] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 316.
[72] Fairman, "The Inscriptions," *CoA Part III*, 156.

> Year 30, under the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Nebmare, the son of Amen, satisfied [with] truth, Amenhotep ruler of Thebes, lord of might, ruler of happiness, who loves him(?) who hates falsehood; [*rdit hA TAy Hr st it.f*,] establishing his inheritance [in] the land.[73]

The phrase *rdit hA TAy Hr st it.f* , is translated as either "causing the male to sit down upon the seat of his father,"[74] or as "installing the male heir in the place [or, upon the seat] of his father,"[75] or as "causing the male to rejoice on the seat of his father,"[76] This short phrase has generated much philological debate to the point that Murnane states that "some very elevated meanings," i.e., a coregency commencing in the thirtieth year of Amenhotep III, have been made.[77]

Fairman, himself, admits that this is an unusual way to describe a coregency; however, he is inclined to believe that it is evidence.[78] Redford opposes Fairman's view by arguing that the key to correctly understanding the phrase lies in the "addition after the prenomen of 'son of Amen'."[79] He sees this as a stock phrase used by the Egyptians in formal inscriptions with Amen; the "father" placing his "son" (the king) on the throne. This leads to the question of how to interpret the use of the divine determinative (*EG* sign no. G7) after *it*. Is *it* with this determinative indicating "king" or "god?" Redford, thus, opts for *it.f* meaning Amen with the "epithet 'son of Amen' being possibly a semantic antecedent."[80] He writes,

> The imagery is clearly apropos of only one event, in fact the single most important event of Amenhotep III's thirtieth year, viz. the first *sd*-festival. The re-establishment of the king on his ancestral throne and the reconfirmation of his inheritance are precisely what the *sd*-festival is concerned with.[81]

Kitchen accepts that the divine determinative could indicate that it was meant for either for a

---

[73] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 117.
[74] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 117
[75] Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, 15 (whose transliteration of the passage the author used).
[76] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 126.
[77] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 126.
[78] Fairman, "The Inscriptions," *CoA Part III*, 156.
[79] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 119.
[80] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 119-20.
[81] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 120.

king or for a god. But, he does not take the epithet "son of Amen" to be an antecedent for *rdit*, particularly because "all the other epithets and participles of the text relate to Amenhotep III as their antecedent subject, and none to Amen."[82]

> The "male" [TAy] is therefore much more likely to be a son of Amenhotep III, unless one adopts Helck's suggestion about it reflecting the installation of sons in the official posts of their fathers and therewith assume that the determinative is an erroneous one. Thus, if on other grounds, a coregency should turn out to be the right solution some day, the Meidum graffito would then still merit consideration.[83]

Murnane rejects all of the above and argues four other points against using this graffito as evidence for a coregency: (1) with this sort of text found at Meidum, as with most other Eighteenth Dynasty graffito found there, the whole *raison d'être* was to "cause one's name to live"; (2) the text is incomplete; (3) while it is true that references to the king as an heir are recurrent, in this case the word TAy does not seem to be used in a royal association here; and (4) the phraseology that follows the stock phrases, i.e., "who loves him(?) who hates falsehood; causing the male to sit down (?) upon the seat of his father, establishing his inheritance [in] the land," can be interpreted as "describing specific benefits that flow from the king."[84] For Murnane, this graffito resonates more with the private concerns of its author instead of being used for "more 'historical' explanations, and its value to the coregency debate is therefore nil."[85]

3.5 Men and Bek Graffito at Aswan

Figure 7 depicts a graffito carved on a granite boulder on the east side of the Nile at Aswan. The Aten names dated it to the later half of the eighth year of Akhenaten. On the left side, Bek is shown worshipping an image that was once Akhenaten, and on the right side, Amenhotep III is shown being worshipped by Bek's father Men. Giles and others judge the

---

[82] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 316.
[83] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 316.
[84] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 126.

graffito as evidence for a coregency.

The first rebuttal concerns the epithet over Amenhotep III's portrayal: "ruler of rulers" (*HqA HqAw*). The title "ruler of rulers" was used to designate the Colossi of Memnon by the ancient Egyptians; furthermore, Men and Bek are called the "overseer of works in the Red Mountain," a location where the stone for the colossi was quarried. Therefore, it is probable that the image of Amenhotep III shown in the relief is one of the Memnon colossi, especially since a smaller statue is depicted standing next to the king's seat. Redford amplifies the first rebuttal with: "The fact that Men and Bek, father and son, *both* bear the titles "chief sculptor" and "overseer of works in the Red Mountain, and suggests that they held office successively [expressing] their faithful service to successive sovereigns."[86]

Another argument against a coregency involves the use of *Nb-mAat-ra* as both Amenhotep III's nomen and prenomen, an idiosyncrasy which appears quite frequently in objects deriving from Amarna, for example in the stela from Panehsy's house (Section 4.4.3.0). "Le *nomen Nb-mAat-ra* au lieu de *Imn-Htp HqA-WAst* est nécessairement une appellation posthume."[87] A discussion of the "double *Nb-mAat-ra*" problem is in Section 4.4.3.1. Finally, Murnane propagates a psychological explanation for the graffito:

> The fact that it is Amenhotep III's statue that is represented hardly suggests an association between the living king in a coregency. Given that Men and Bek (like the kings they worshipped) were father and son, and given the Egyptian mentality where family ties and tenure of office were concerned, this relief could be nothing more than a bit of conspicuous self-advertisement, prominently displayed for the edification of passers-by and touting a successful record of service by two generations through two reigns.[88]

3.6.0 Dahshur Graffito

---

[85] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 126.
[86] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 99.
[87] Marc Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, Collection de l'Institut d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Antiquité Université Lumière-Lyon 2, Vol. 3, (Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 1998), 75.

In 1994, James Allen raised the hopes of the pro-coregency scholars with his publication of hieratic graffito found at the pyramid of Senwosret III at Dahshur on a papyrus bundle column. Allen originally read the fragmentary script (Figure 8A), and transcribed it into hieroglyphs (Figure 8B). His translation is:

> Year 32, month [X of …, day Y], under the reign of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt [Nebmaatre], [corresponding to year Z under the reign of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt] Neferkhepeure [waenre]. [There came the scribe] Ra-[… [89]

If Allen's reconstruction of such a fragmentary text is correct, it might imply at least a seven year coregency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten based on the occurrence of a double date.

Unfortunately, upon a reexamination of the text, Allen retracted his original identification of the pharaoh by observing that in at least one instance Tuthmosis III used *nfr-xprw* in his titulary. Thus, Allen now believes that the graffito is more likely referring to year 32 of the reign of Tuthmosis III.[90] This recent potential, yet disappointing, evidence raises an important fact: Egyptologists are still looking for something that might actually prove a joint rule of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten.

3.6.1 DOUBLE DATING

The Dahshur graffito introduces another issue into the coregency question, namely the use of double dating. A double dated document is one of the most definitive pieces of evidence for a coregency. For example, the stela of Antef (CCG. No. 20516) is dated to year 30 of Amenemmes I and the year 10 of Sesostris I.[91] Under this system, Middle Kingdom coregencies can be positively identified, and to ease matters more, during the Middle Kingdom "the regnal year had been

---

[88] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 160.
[89] James P. Allen, "Further Evidence for the Coregency of Amenhotep III and IV?" *GM* 140 (1994): 7-8.
[90] Allen, "Addendum," in *Amarna Letters: Essays on Ancient Egypt c. 1390-1310 BC. Vol. 3*, ed., Dennis Forbes, (San Francisco: KMT Communications, 1994), 152.
[91] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 2.

arbitrarily synchronized with the civil calendar."[92] By the New Kingdom, however, the system changed as the Eighteenth Dynasty reckoned "each regnal year from accession day to accession day, no attempt being made to bring regnal and civil year into harmony with one another."[93] In sum, double dates do not seem to occur during New Kingdom, so the absence of any document containing a double date in the case of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten means nothing.

3.7 Tomb of Vizier Aper-el at Saqqara

Another modern archaeological discovery in Saqqara, which is sometimes used in the coregency controversy, is the hypogeum or family tomb of the vizier Aper-el, who claimed the title of "First Servant of Aten." Since the results of the excavations are still unpublished, it is difficult to reach any definitive historical conclusions based on the tomb.[94] Some objects buried with Aper-el date to the reign of Amenhotep III, e.g. a small chest and faience earrings.[95] In addition, many jar sealings, containing the name "Neferkheprure beloved of (Osiris) Wenennefer" (= Amenhotep IV), were found within the tomb. It has been verified that "Aper-El's tenure as vizier extended from late in the reign of Amenhotep III into that of Amenhotep IV"[96] Writing in 1995, Murnane divulges that any other conclusions concerning the coregency are premature. Marc Gabolde, however, has already dismissed the relevancy of the tomb to the coregency controversy.

> Le fait que les funérailles d'Âperia / Âperel aient visiblement été conduites en conformité avec les pratiques osiriennes traditionnelles et que l'art amarnien soit singulièrement absent du mobilier funéraire de la tombe du vizir, n'est, de son côté, en rien une indication en faveur de l'existence d'une corégence entre Amenhotep III et Amenhotep IV. Le contenu de la tombe d'Âperia / Âperel n'a,

[92] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 31.
[93] Alan Gardiner, "Regnal Years and Civil Calendar in Pharaonic Egypt," *JEA* 31 (1945): 23.
[94] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*., 77.
[95] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 77.
[96] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period*, 53.

> en somme, livré aucun document en faveur de la corégence entre Amenhotep III et Amenhotep IV.[97]

4.0 EVIDENCE FROM AMARNA

In year 5, Akhenaten founded a new capital on virgin soil at Akhetaten, today known as Amarna. In order to demarcate the boundaries of the new city, Akhenaten erected a series of boundary stelae.

4.1 Earlier Proclamation of Akhenaten

Boundary stela X at Amarna contains a text known as the Earlier Proclamation of Akhenaten that, depending on its interpretation, might have significance as to whether Amenhotep III and Akhenaten ruled simultaneously. Although badly damaged, Murnane restores the text as follows:

> Now, as my father Hor-Aten lives! As for the […] in Akhetaten, it was worse than those which I heard in regnal year 4; it was worse than [those] which I heard in regnal year 3; it was worse than those which I heard [in regnal year 2; it was] worse [than those which I heard in regnal year 1]; it was worse [than] those which (King) [Nebmaat]re heard; [it was worse than those which] (King) [Okheprure (?) heard]; it was worse [than] those which (King) Menkheperre heard; [(and) it was] worse [than] those heard by any kings who had (ever) assumed the White Crown.[98]

Murnane restores a repetitive form of listing the years; thus, Akhenaten speaks of the years as having occurred sequentially back in time to before his father's reign. "[T]he words," Murnane reasons, "seem more consistent with a view of Amenhotep III as having been deceased from his son's fourth year if not indeed his first."[99] However, it could be argued that "what Nebmaatre heard" might have transpired during his sole rule before he and his son shared the throne. Kitchen offers another appraisal:

---

[97] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 79.
[98] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period*, 78.
[99] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 127.

> The retrograde sequence in an Amarna boundary stela quite naturally goes right through the years of the reigning king in whose name it is inscribed, before recording events before year one in which citation of the previous reign (Amenhotep III) became inevitable—it has nothing to do with the existence or otherwise of the coregency.…[100]

4.2 Persecution of Amen

An integral fact that needs to be ascertained in order to prove or to disprove a coregency is the definitive dating of when Akhenaten unleashed his iconoclastic fury against Amen. If there was a coregency between father and son, with the former being an adherent to the Amen cult and the latter worshipping the Aten, then the determination of point of time of Akhenaten's reign in which he dispatched his henchmen to destroy all traces of the hated Amen throughout Egypt would theoretically establish a maximum length of joint rule. The underlying assumption is: how could Amenhotep III, who was one of the most prodigious builders in Egyptian history, be erecting monuments to Amen, while his son and coregent was doing everything within his power to obliterate the name of Amen all over Egypt?[101]

Logically, those Egyptologists who favor either no coregency or a low term of co-regnal years place Akhenaten's persecution of Amen early in his reign, whereas the long coregency advocates date the persecution to the later years of the heretic pharaoh's reign. Redford deduces that the event happened after approximately year 5 of the pharaoh's rule.[102] W. S. Smith surmises that the iconoclasm began with the move to Amarna in year 6.[103] Kitchen, however, admonishes that: "Full scale *open* hostilities between Aten and Amen before year 8/9 of

---

[100] Kitchen, review of *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes*, 71.
[101] Robert K. Ritner, "An Introduction to Ancient Egyptian Religion" (EGYPT 360) class lecture, 15 February 1999, University of Chicago.
[102] Redford, *Akhenaten: The Heretic King*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 141-75.
[103] W. Stevenson Smith, *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*, 2nd edition revised with additions by William Kelly Simpson, (New York: Penguin Books, 1981), 303.

Akhenaten remain to be proven."[104] Basing his dating on the change of the Aten's name, Hornung estimates the persecution to have been inaugurated around year 9.[105] Aldred and Johnson appraise the time of the episode to year 12. Johnson hypothesizes: "If the older king's plan was indeed to equalize all of Egypt's cults in an effort to temper Amen's power, Amenhotep III's sudden death just might have caused Akhenaten and the devastated population to lash out at the god in grief."[106] It must be noted here that in the tomb of Amenhotep III (KV 22), "the name Amen is overall intact."[107] It seems odd that after a coregency ended with the death of the senior pharaoh, causing his son to unleash a persecution, that the detested name of Amen would be spared from being eradicated in the recently demised pharaoh's tomb.

4.3 Two Courts

Giles speculates—"Amenhotep III must have been aware that the apparent physical peculiarities of his son had, as well, mental parallels."[108] Consequently, when the idea to build a new capital way from Thebes and Memphis was made by or forced upon Amenhotep IV, Amenhotep III consented. "Therein a sort of mini-kingdom the young king could practice his religious revolution while in the rest of Egypt business went on as usual."[109] This statement raises the issue of two courts into the coregency debate, of which Aldred is a strong proponent.[110] Redford deems this theory as a "formidable obstacle" to the acceptance of a coregency between the two pharaohs. He emphasizes three points of contention: (1) that both religions, Amenism and Atenism, would be anathema to one another; (2) that two separate and distinct dating

---

[104] Kitchen, review of *The Chronology of the Amarna Letter, with Special Reference to the Hypothetical Coregency of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten* by E. F. Campbell, *JEA* 53 (1967): 180.
[105] Hornung, *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*, 87.
[106] Johnson, "The Setting: History, Religion, and Art," 48.
[107] Hornung, *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*, 30.
[108] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 33.
[109] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 33.
[110] Aldred, "The Second Jubilee of Amenhotep II," *ZÄS* 94 (1967): 3-4.

systems would be employed; and (3) that two separate bureaucracies would be needed.[111] Kitchen assesses Redford's first point as being "baseless" in the years preceding Akhenaten's persecution of the god Amen.[112] Kitchen contradicts Redford on the third particular: "Two separate administrations for the whole land is overdrawn; two courts with their own serving officers and sources of supply are no problem."[113] On the contrary, Murnane agrees with Redford's opposition, and he cites testimony from the tomb of Ramose (Section 2.3).

> The vizier Ramose is last attested at Amenhotep III's first jubilee (year 30, hypothetically year 3/4 of Amenhotep IV) but he would have been serving the junior partner at the same time. It is, after all, Amenhotep IV who appears as the dominant living element in Ramose's tomb, which would have been executed at about this period, while Amenhotep III is mentioned only in the text of the prayer on the east wall. If there was a long coregency, the evidence from Ramose's tomb would argue against two administrations for Egypt at this time.[114]

4.4.0 Amenhotep III at Amarna

The following pieces of evidence have convinced some scholars that not only was there a coregency but that Amenhotep III was in residence with his son at Amarna at some point. "That Amenhotep III resided at Amarna is to be inferred, so it is argued, from the references which have been found to his estate and mansion there."[115]

4.4.1 AMENHOTEP III'S BUILDINGS AND ESTATES

Excavations at Amarna have yielded references to the house and to the estate of Amenhotep III. The dockets on the supply jars read as follows:

1. [Regnal year…], Wine of the House of Nebmaatre
2. [Regnal year] 10: wine of the Estate of Nebmaatre-in-the-Bark [of the] western [river], the chief [vintner…].
3. [Wine of the Estate of] Nebmaatre, [of the] oasis, which is in the western

---

[111] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 149.
[112] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 317.
[113] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 318, and Josef W. Wegner, "The Nature and Chronology of the Senwosret III-Amenemhat III Regnal Succession: Some Considerations Based on New Evidence from the Mortuary Temple of Senwosret III at Abydos," *JNES* 55, no. 4 (1996): 274ff.
[114] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 260.
[115] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 174.

river.

4. Regnal year 17: wine of the Estate of Nebmaatre …. The chief of the basin, […]nakkht.[116]

Likewise, in the tomb of Ramose in Amarna[117] (Tomb no. 11), an inscription in the entrance passage states: "the steward of the House of Nebmaatre, Ramose."[118] P. van der Meer conjectures that these inscriptions signify that it was "likely that Amenhotep III lived at Akhetaten."[119] Redford dismisses this argument as being *non sequitur*; he refutes this coregency issue with two counter-arguments: The first is the differentiation between physically residing in an area and owning property within an area. Secondly, "there is not the slightest grounds for believing that at a given site all the dockets and sealings mention only buildings located at that site. Dockets from the Ramesseum and Malqata conclusively disprove this."[120] Surprisingly, Aldred even suspects that pro-coregency argument is invalid:

> The fact that several buildings at Amarna were associated with Amenhotep III only serves to emphasize the importance there of the cult of the dead ancestors since houses of Tuthmosis I, Amenhotep II and Tuthmosis IV are also mentioned in Amarna, and no one would claim that those kings ever lived there.[121]

4.4.2 AMARNA WINE DOCKETS

Wine jar dockets from Amarna appear as unsteady in confirming a coregency as in the previous section. In this case, two fragmentary dockets, found in the residential quarters of Amarna, reveal only regnal dates without mentioning a king. The first docket, from a scribe's home, is dated to year 28, and the second, extracted from the southwest quarter of the North Suburb, is dated to year 30.[122] Fairman's argument[123] rests on the following assumptions: (1) the

---

[116] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period*, 95-6.
[117] Not to be confused with the Theban Ramose, the southern vizier.
[118] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period*, 184.
[119] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 146.
[120] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 146-7.
[121] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 174.
[122] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 94, n. 32.
[123] Fairman, "The Inscriptions," *CoA Part III*, 154.

dates on the dockets pertain to Amenhotep III's reign; (2) the jars were not reused; and (3) immediately after the dockets were written, the containers were moved to Amarna.[124] As in the previous section, Aldred acquiesces to Redford in that both scholars find Fairman's reasoning inconclusive. Giles supplements the unreliability of the wine jar dockets as evidence by noting that Amenhotep III is not necessarily the only pharaoh that these dockets could have been referring to: "Horemheb is known to have done a great deal of quarrying at Akhetaten."[125]

4.4.3.0 STELA FROM PANESHY'S HOUSE

Near Panehsy's house (R 44.2) in the South Suburb of Amarna, a stela (British Museum EA 57399) was discovered which portrays Amenhotep III and Tiye seated before a table of offerings (Figure 9). For some scholars, the existence of this stela bespeaks of Amenhotep III's residence at Akhetaten during the long coregency since the late form of the Aten name is incised on the stela. Of note is that the goddess Maat *is* present in the two cartouches of Amenhotep III's name, and hence, the phonetic spelling does not appear in the relief of the stela. As with the Graffito of Men and Bek (Section 3.5) Amenhotep III's prenomen, Nebmaatre, is repeated instead of using the traditional prenomen and the nomen, hence, avoiding the nomen that includes the name of Amen. The mere omitting of the nomen *Imn-Htp HqA-WAst* from Amenhotep III's names, replacing the prenomen with *Nb-mAat-ra* and resulting in a "double *Nb-mAat-ra*" in Amenhotep III's titulary, forces some Egyptologists to reject the hypothesis of a coregency. Gabolde asserts:

> C'est donc la confirmation que tous les monuments où Amenhotep III a pour *nomen* original "Nebmaâtre" ont été réalisés *après* la mort du roi. La stèla provenant de la maison de Panehsy, comme les autres documents d'Amarna, d'Assouan et de Thèbes discutés plus haut qui mentionnent également "Nebmaâtre," représente sans ambiguïté Amenhotep III défunt.[126]

---

[124] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 93.
[125] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 62.
[126] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 69.

Redford enhances this argument with a discussion of the meaning and purpose of the class of small private stelae found at Amarna by first noting their private nature. In sum, he evaluates EA 57399 as a cult object, stressing the stela's use in private piety, rather than filial piety.[127]

4.3.3.1 Double Nb-mAat-raPrenomen

Since in both the Panehsy stela and in the Men and Bek graffito the double *Nb-mAat-ra* prenomen appears, it may have some significance on the coregency case. The negation of a coregency based on this circumstance has already been expressed in the above sections. The mere fact that the goddess Maat appears in these items, dated to the late part of Akhenaten's reign, elucidates that it was not before year 9 that the persecution of Amen and other gods could have happened (Section 4.2). In addition, Johnson recognizes that in many instances (e.g., the Colossi of Memnon and the cult statue no. J838 in the Luxor Museum), Amenhotep III's nomen was replaced with *Nb-mAat-ra*, containing the seated Maat goddess, by Akhenaten's henchmen. At no time was his nomen ever changed to reflect the phonetic spelling of *maat* (Section 4.4.4.1).[128] Therefore, Akhenaten permitted the Maat goddess to be used in titles well into his reign.

4.4.4.0 SARCOPHAGUS OF MEKETATEN

The Royal Tomb of Amarna contained a fragment from the red granite sarcophagus of Meketaten, which contains the prenomen of Amenhotep III beside the name of Akhenaten. Unfortunately, Egyptologists cannot give the exact date of the princess's death; however, it is probable that her death postdates year 12 of Akhenaten because she shown with the royal couple in foreign tribute scenes (e.g., Figure 21). "If Meketaten was born before her father's accession, she might already have possessed mortuary equipment when her grandfather died; but

[127] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 100.

Meketaten's birth, like her death, is an event for which no one can fix a certain date."[129]

Fairman dismisses the notion that this inscription was a memorial to the princess's grandfather, and he sees it as proof that Amenhotep was alive when Meketaten died.[130] The fact that Amenhotep III's prenomen precedes that of Akhenaten's impresses Giles, and he argues:

> If there had in fact been no coregency, we should have the anomalous situation in Egyptian history of a ruler placing the name of his father—dead 12 years—on the coffin of a daughter…. It would be much more probable that such a doubly inscribed object would have been prepared during the joint reign….[131]

Thus, both scholars interpret a coregency extending into year 12 of Akhenaten. On the other hand, Redford sees no coregency and refutes this notion by deeming that the inscription was meant to accentuate family relationships.

4.4.4.1 Phonetic Spelling of Prenomen

As in the inscriptions on Tiye's wooden shrine (Section 2.7.0), the prenomen of Amenhotep III, *Nb-mAat-ra*, on the princess's coffin is spelled phonetically without the Maat goddess sign (Figure 10A). This adjustment to the prenomen is attributed to "Akhenaten's abhorrence of imputing divinity to any human being, animal, or thing apart from the Aten."[132] Redford explains:

> The modification of Amenhotep III's prenomen was thus done at Akhenaten's own behest. But did Amenhotep III on his own monuments ever write *mAat* phonetically, without the seated goddess? A thorough search by the present writer has failed to turn up a single example of the prenomen of Amenhotep III [i.e., in monumental inscriptions] known to have been inscribed during that king's lifetime in which the seated goddess [Figure 10B] is suppressed in favor of a purely phonetic writing. Even such late texts as the Sinai Inscriptions, the Silsileh inscription, the mortuary texts of Kheruef's tomb, and those of Amenhotep's own tomb in Biban el-Moluk, shown [Figure 10C] consistently. If there were a coregency approaching a decade or more, is it not a little strange to find no trace

---

[128] Johnson, email communication with author, 26 March 2000.
[129] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 103.
[130] Fairman, "The Inscriptions," *CoA Part III*, 156.
[131] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 70.
[132] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 104.

> of a phonetic writing, especially during the later years of Amenhotep III's reign?[133]

In every inscription included in *Urk IV Heft 20*, the seated goddess appears in the cartouche. Redford does note, however, that Nebmaatre is spell phonetically or with the feather of *maat* in hieratic writings (Figure 10D).[134] Johnson verifies this information by citing that the hieratic wine jar dockets from Malqata[135] (dating from years 9 through 35 of Amenhotep III) contain the phonetic spelling with the *maat* feather as well as other papyri and scarabs.[136] However, Johnson considers Redford's assessment of "attaching too much importance to the phonetic writing of Nebmaatre" as being misleading.[137]

4.4.5 GRANITE BOWL

Figure 11 depicts the inscriptions that remain on four fragments of a pink granite bowl excavated near the desert altars at Amarna. Murnane translates the text on the rim of the bowl as follows: "King of Upper and Lower Egypt … [Live] the father, Heka-[Aten]… Nebmaatre … in Akhetaten"[138] Again, *Nb-mAat-ra* is spelled phonetically (Figure 10A). For Fairman, this is evidence of a coregency.[139] Likewise, Giles attests that the phrase "in Akhetaten" is meaningful as it may commemorate a "visit or prolonged stay by Amenhotep III and Tiye in that city."[140] Redford remains unconvinced with the theory:

> The presence of Amenhotep III's prenomen dating from *ca*. the ninth year of his successor no more proves that he was alive at the time than the sporadic occurrences of other king's names on monuments dating from the reigns of their successors proves that they survived into succeeding reigns. The most these miserable fragments allow is a cautious suggestion, and nothing more, that a cult

---

[133] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 104.
[134] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 104, n. 73.
[135] Hayes, "Inscriptions From the Palace of Amenhotep III," *JNES* 10, n. 1 (1951), 44-8, figs. 4-8.
[136] Johnson, email communication with author, 26 March 2000.
[137] Johnson, email communication with author, 26 March 2000.
[138] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period*, 88.
[139] Fairman, "The Inscriptions," *CoA Part III*, 155.
[140] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 67.

> of Amenhotep III continued after his death, and this is already suggested by other evidence.[141]

4.4.6 OFFERING TABLE

The names of Amenhotep III (spelled phonetically) and Akhenaten together with the late forms of the Aten name are found on a small limestone offering table (Figure 12), which originally was held on the hands of a statue, unearthed at Amarna. For both Fairman and Giles, this is indicative of Amenhotep III's presence at Amarna, and thus states a coregency. Furthermore, Giles perceives the repetition of the phonetic spelling *Nb-mAat-ra* as being significant, remarking that its position on the table gives it a greater place of honor.[142]. Aldred, however, is skeptical:

> [T]he nature of the object and its finding place, suggest that an offering was to be made to the Aten by its means on behalf of one or both kings; but in the absence of the statue itself, it is impossible to say which of the donors was represented, or whether both of them were. Again, the problem is to decide whether Amenhotep III is associated with his son as a living coregent or as a dead ancestor, as a giver of offerings or a receipt of them.[143]

Both Murnane and Redford believe that the offering table is a cult object.

4.4.7.0 LINTEL IN THE TOMB OF HUYA

In Huya's tomb in Amarna (Amarna Tomb No. 1), a lintel on the North Wall's inner doorway in the First Room depicts pendant carvings which are back to back on two separate panels. The left side panel (Figure 13A) portrays Akhenaten and Nefertiti with four of their daughters facing them. The right side (Figure 13B) depicts Amenhotep III sitting alone, facing Tiye and Baketaten. The Aten names in these reliefs date this scene to after the ninth year of Akhenaten. The literal interpretation of the lintel may be a "memorial of a coregency but the tomb owner may well have meant it allusively—perhaps to honor Queen Mother Tiye (whose

---

[141] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 111.
[142] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 67.

steward he was) or to stress the harmonious relations between the senior and junior branches of the family."[144] Another option for the interpretation of the lintel is that it represents filial piety.[145]

Since the inscriptions reveal no usage of the traditional epithets denoting the demise of Amenhotep III, Aldred reasons as follows:

> The appearance of the two rulers and their families opposite each other in the same scene, however, can be ambiguous during this period because religious practice at Amarna avoided the epithet *mAa-xrw* (justified) with its Osirian overtones of "deceased", after the name of dead royalty, in favor of *anx r nHH* (living forever).[146]

Antithetically, Robert Delia maintains that this is unpersuasive proof of the survival of Amenhotep III into this time period because both epithets *di anx* and *mAa-xrw* cannot be used as gauges for determining whether the king was deceased.[147]

The hand gestures, which Amenhotep III and his family make, appear as well in the discussions concerning the being of Amenhotep III in the Huya lintel scene. It would appear that Amenhotep III is making the *nis* gesture (*EG* sign no. A26), which usually denotes beckoning or calling, and thus can be referred to as a "summoning gesture" with the thumb of the one who is summoning appearing on the top of the hand. Conversely, the hand mannerisms of Tiye and Baketaten suggest that they are making "greeting gestures" with their palms held toward the person being greeted.[148] Nevertheless, one must bear in mind that this is a scene from Amarna where the conventions of art were altered. Johnson's analysis is as such:

---

[143] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 175.
[144] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 158.
[145] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 108.
[146] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 174.
[147] Robert D. Delia, review of *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* by William Murnane, *Sarapis: The American Journal of Egyptology* 5, no. 2: 54.
[148] Richard Wilkinson, *Reading Egyptian Art: A Hieroglyphic Guide to Ancient Egyptian Painting and Sculpture*, (New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc., 1996), 25.

> Amenhotep III and Nefertiti both extend their right hands toward their respective families in a distinctively active manner, a gesture utilized extensively in Amarna art to indicate active communication between the different figures. The right hands of Queen Tiye and Baketaten raised in worship have often been interpreted as an indication that Amenhotep III is dead, but the gesture might instead commemorate their reverence for Amenhotep III the living, deified king, just as the daughters of Akhenaten and Nefertiti worship their divine parents with fans in the pendant scene.[149]

The lintel scene, as with the Panehsy stela (section 4.4.3.0), discloses that the living dowager queen Tiye is depicted in conjunction with her supposedly dead husband. Since the idea of an dead man being with his wife who is alive may appear a bit odd, Wente offers an explanation:

> The distinction between life and death, the present and the future, is obscured in the tomb context both because of the Egyptian's particular concept of death and its aftermath, and because tomb decoration was carried out not in terms of the immediate but in terms of the tomb as a "mansion for eternity."[150]

4.4.7.1 Baketaten

Huya's tomb also presents another coregency problem—that of Baketaten concerning genealogy and chronology. This enigmatic princess is known only from Amarna, and some references to her appear in Huya's tomb, in particular in the lintel scene (Section 4.4.7.0); in Iuty's workshop scene having her statue made; in the banquet scene (Figure 14); and in the "sunshade" scene with Tiye. A text above her representation in the banquet scene on the east side of the South Wall in the First Room designates her as "The King's bodily daughter, his beloved, Baketaten."[151] As with Tutankhamen (Section 5.0), it is questionable whether to accept the claims of paternity literally. Who Baketaten's mother was presents even more difficulties, as some scholars opt for Sitamun. In support of a long coregency, other scholars consider Tiye to be her mother, meaning that Tiye would have been approximately forty years old when

[149] Johnson, "Amenhotep III and Amarna: Some New Considerations," *JEA* 82 (1996): 72.
[150] Wente, review of *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 276.

Baketaten was born. Without a coregency, Tiye's age of giving birth to Baketaten nears fifty years old, on the assumption that she was twelve when she married Amenhotep III.

In Huya's tomb, Baketaten appears with a sidelock, and many Egyptologists have noted her size in relation to the depictions of Akhenaten's daughters. These features, combined with Tiye's estimated age of giving birth, estimate the age of Baketaten at fourteen years in the Huya scenes.[152] Redford refutes this theory by writing that the

> entirely unwarranted manipulation of the numbers and [the] assumptions regarding Tiye's age at various times in her life do not command the respect of the uncommitted reader. Moreover, [this] statement to the effect that the sidelock of Baketaten proves her to be a child at the time is baseless. Grown men could be shown wearing the sidelock, as the procession of princes at Luxor and Medinet Habu bear witness; the sidelock seems to have been merely a sign of sonship.[153]

Conversely, Wente claims that Redford's incorporation of processions of princes at Luxor and Medinet Habu into the argument is unfounded, as the lintel is not analogous to it. "At Medinet Habu the princes were not even named during Rameses III's time but were carved on the wall without consideration as to their identity or comprehension of reality."[154]

4.4.8 PLASTER HEADS

The excavations of workshop of the sculptor Tuthmosis in the South Suburb of Amarna yielded two uninscribed life-size plaster heads. The two heads presently reside at the Ägyptishes Museum: The first one, Berlin 21299 (Figures 15A and B), does not resemble any portraits of Akhenaten.[155]

> As in the case of several other pieces in this group, it is thought to have been cast from a mould taken from a statue, but certainly no statues have survived from the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty which present the lifelike qualities of the plaster casts from Amarna. It has been argued from close examination of the piece in

---

[151] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period*, 131.
[152] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 75.
[153] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 108.
[154] Wente, review of *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 274.
[155] Johnson, "Amenhotep III and Amarna," 73.

> Berlin that heads molded in clay formed the basis for the casts, although some of them certainly look like death masks, it was once maintained that they could have been made from impressions taken from the face of a living or dead person.[156]

According to Johnson, Berlin 21299's wide face, broad neck, and other features are reminiscent of the EA no. 57399 stela of Amenhotep III (Section 4.4.3.0 and Figure 9). It is also similar to a statue of Amenhotep III (Figure 16) from the Brooklyn Museum (no. 48.28).[157] If Berlin 21299 is indeed a representation of Amenhotep III, is it sufficient evidence to prove that he lived at or visited Amarna?

The second plaster head, Berlin 21356 (Figures 17A and B) was identified by Borchardt as being a death mask of Amenhotep III.[158]

> This, however, seems unlikely since the evidence afforded by the mummy of that king and by certain reliefs and statues of his later years indicated that he was grossly obese at the time of his death. The hollow cheeks of this mask are not those of a corpulent man and there is moreover a certain muscular tension about the mouth that does not suggest the complete relaxation of death.[159]

Clearly, both Berlin 21356 and Berlin 21299 cannot be of the same man. If one of the uninscribed heads does represent Amenhotep III, it would more likely be Berlin 21299.

4.4.9 STATUETTES

Two statuettes have also entered into the coregency debate. The first one is a headless statuette, MMA 30.8.74 (Figure 18). Thought to have come from Thebes, this dark serpentine statuette, is adorned in a peculiar costume in which "one would not hesitate to attribute [it] to the reign of Akhenaten were it not for the fact that the prenomen Nebmaatre is not erased" on the statuette's inscriptions.[160] Hayes suggests that it probably was carved at Thebes during a

---

[156] Smith, *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*, 277.
[157] C. Vandersleyen, "Les deux jeunesses d'Amenhotep III." *BSFE*111 (1988): 12.
[158] Aldred, *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*, 180.
[159] Aldred, *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*, 180.
[160] William Peck, "Two Scribes and a King of Dynasty XVIII," *in Chief of Seers: Egyptian Studies in Memory of Cyril Aldred*, ed., E. Goring et al., (New York: Keegan Paul International, 1997), 229.

coregency of the two kings.[161] The other alternative for MMA 30.8.74 is that it was a commemorative figurine produced after the death of Amenhotep III.

The second statuette under consideration in this section is one that resides in the Petrie Museum at University College in London. UC 004 (Figure 19) was previously identified by Aldred as being a triad of Akhenaten, Nefertiti, and one of their daughters, after it was excavated at Amarna by Petrie. This uninscribed votive statuette's closest parallel is Louvre E. 15593 (Figure 20), which is inscribed with the names of Akhenaten and Nefertiti and the later names of the Aten.[162]

In a recent *JEA* article, Johnson challenges Aldred's identification of UC 004 as representing Akhenaten and family. He notes that the queen in UC 004 has a double line under her breast, and this feature combined with the tripartite wig, which the queen wears in UC 004, is a rarity for Nefertiti's representations. This "strongly suggests that the queen represented here is not Nefertiti but Tiye."[163] Gabolde, however, disputes Johnson's re-identification by specifying that a piece in the Cairo Museum ([JE] 63854 = nº exposition 13422) depicts Nefertiti in a tripartite wig.[164] The next observation which Johnson makes concerning UC 004 is that the king in the statuette also evinces "artistic peculiarities that set it apart from similar statuettes, which represent Akhenaten."[165] A dissimilarity exists in that UC 004 has a squarish stomach (as seen in the statuette's profile) as opposed to the characteristic teardrop belly in Akhenaten's representations. Again, Gabolde is not convinced that Amenhotep III is being represented in UC 004, and he cites other statues of Akhenaten as counter-arguments. Thus, Gabolde concludes:

---

[161] Hayes, *The Scepter of Egypt: A Background for the Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Vol. 2 The Hyksos Period and the New Kingdom (1675-1080 BC*), 4th printing (revised), (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, distributed by Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1990), 237.
[162] Johnson, "Amenhotep III and Amarna," 74-5.
[163] Johnson, "Amenhotep III and Amarna," 76.
[164] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 86.
[165] Johnson, "Amenhotep III and Amarna," 76.

"Ce document ne prouve donc rien, surtout pas la corègence entre Amenhotep III et Amenhotep IV/ Akhenaten."[166]

4.5.0 Kingship and Theology

It would be impossible to write about Amarna without examining some theological issues especially as they pertain to divine kingship. In the subsequent sections, several issues will be investigated.

4.5.1 AKHENATEN'S SED FESTIVALS

Two issues of contention that emerge among Egyptologists in the coregency conflict must now be posed: how many Sed festivals did Amenhotep IV/Akhenaten celebrate, and in what year(s) of his reign did the festival(s) occur? According to Eric Uphill, it is not certain how many Sed-festivals Akhenaten celebrated.[167] Redford's latest research discloses that in his third year, Akhenaten celebrated a festival at Thebes in the *Gempaaten*.[168] In the past, other scholars have maintained that this Sed-festival was held in year 4[169] or in year 2.[170] For Aldred, year 2 is significant because, on the presumption of a long coregency, it coincides with year 30 of Amenhotep III, the year of the elder pharaoh's first *Ḥb-sd*. Subsequently, Aldred theorizes that Akhenaten then celebrated two additional jubilees, each of which correlated with his father's Sed festivals: the second in year 6 of Akhenaten (year 34 of Amenhotep III) and the third in year 9 of Akhenaten (year 37 of Amenhotep III).[171] However, the opposing viewpoint asserts that "there is really no positive evidence to support [the view that the second and third festivals were held at

---

[166] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 86.
[167] Eric Uphill, "The Sed Festivals of Akhenaten," *JNES* 22 (1963): 123.
[168] Redford, "The Beginning of the Heresy," 56.
[169] Wente and Charles C. Van Siclen III, "A Chronology of the New Kingdom," in *Studies in Honor of George Hughes: January 12, 1977* eds., E. F. Wente and J. H. Johnson, SAOC 39, (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1976), 221.
[170] Aldred, "The Beginning of the el-Amarna Period," *JEA* 45 (1959): 32.
[171] Aldred, "The Beginning of the el-Amarna Period," 32-33.

Amarna]."[172] Redford, moreover, mistrusts the notion of the first *Hb-sd* being held simultaneously with that of Amenhotep III since his excavations in East Karnak have failed to expose any reference to either Amenhotep III or Tiye.[173] Murnane, however, does not think that there is enough evidence to support the multiple *Hb-sd* theory:

> In sum, there is hard evidence for only one jubilee—the early festival celebrated at Karnak. A further festival held at Amarna in years 8/9 could be postulated from the change in Aten's titulary but it must be admitted that there is no corroborative evidence. There is no reason to suppose that that there was an intermediate jubilee, held in years 5/6. It is possible, but not certain, that he celebrated one other in year 8/9. In any case, Aldred's proposed synchronism with Amenhotep III's three jubilees seems to be unfounded.[174]

B. Gunn suggested that the Aten had celebrated its own jubilees with Akhenaten.[175] In year 8/9 of Akhenaten, the Aten's name was modified, disposing of the epithet, *imy Hb-sd*, ("he who is in the jubilee"), in favor of *nb Hbw sd* ("Lord of Sed Festivals"). It has been surmised that this changed signaled the event of the third jubilee of Akhenaten. As with the jubilees of Akhenaten, the notion that the Aten itself celebrated jubilees is just as disputed. After analyzing occurrences of the title *nb Hbw sd,* Eric Uphill noted that the title was often adopted by any king who had celebrated more than one jubilee. He concludes:

> These titles are so similar to those accorded to the Aten in the reliefs of Akhenaten that it seems likely that the Aten was never considered to have been celebrating Sed Festivals with Akhenaten as Gunn suggested, but was in fact only attending them as any god would have done at the Sed Festival of a king.[176]

Johnson, on the other hand, proposes that the three jubilees of Amenhotep III were directly linked to the Aten's name changes. Instead of calibrating Amenhotep III's jubilees with those of Akhenaten or Akhenaten's with those of the Aten's, Johnson posits that Amenhotep

---

[172] Wente and Van Siclen III, "A Chronology of the New Kingdom," 221.
[173] Redford, review of *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* by William Murnane, *JEA* 69 (1976): 182.
[174] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 147.
[175] B. Gunn, "Notes on the Aten and His Names," *JEA* 9 (1923): 169ff.
[176] Uphill, "The Sed Festivals of Akhenaten," 123.

III's second Sed festival in year 34 was aligned with Aten's first jubilee in year 5 of Akhenaten. Additionally, he believes in year 9 when the Aten's name was changed, Amenhotep III celebrated his third jubilee, and the Aten celebrated its second.[177]

4.5.2 AMENHOTEP III'S DEIFICATION

Nigel Strudwick commented in 1999 that Johnson's theories on Amenhotep III 's deification represent "a fascinating and badly needed new approach to the period."[178] Advocating a long coregency, Johnson bases his conclusions on art historical analysis. Curiously, "Amenhotep III has often been amalgamated with 'art history' as if he should be restricted to this one tier of Egyptology."[179] The use of this methodology in general has created many skeptics since art historians represent a minority within the field of Egyptology, and their methods depend more on subjective interpretations rather than textual objective evidence; thus, their discipline is "not highly regarded by their peers."[180] "All too often art historical exegesis relies almost exclusively on formal considerations by which stylistically similar details are the sole criteria by which comparisons are effected and issues of dating and identification are resolved."[181] Since, William Kelly Simpson has noted that ancient Egypt bequeaths to the modern world both textual and two- and three-dimensional communicative evidence, which conveys its meanings in subtle ways, one would hope that both forms of communication would be combined.[182]

As concisely as possible, Johnson's model encompasses his impression that Amenhotep III's last artistic style, being comprised of exaggerated youthfulness and solar symbolism and

---

[177] Johnson, email communication with author, 13 March 2000, and Johnson, "Monuments and Monumental Art under Amenhotep III: Evolution and Meaning," in *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on His Reign*, 93.
[178] Nigel and Helen Strudwick, *Thebes in Egypt: A Guide to Tombs and Temples of Ancient Luxor*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), 223.
[179] Delange, "In Pursuit of a Pharaoh: 200 Years of Passion and Intellect, 25."
[180] Robert Steven Bianchi, "An Elite Image," in *Chief of Seers*, 34.
[181] Bianchi, "An Elite Image," 34.
[182] William K. Simpson, "Remarks," in *The Art of Amenhotep III: Art Historical Analysis*, ed., L. M. Berman, (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1990), 81-2.

indicating his apotheosis, was probably a result of his Sed festival celebrations.[183] In addition to Amenhotep III's art styles changing, Akhenaten's art styles changed as well. In considering these alterations, Johnson infers that both kings' art styles followed parallel lines: Amenhotep III's art style went from the traditional to a new style, hyperbolizing his assimilation with the creator god, while Akhenaten's style also shifted to a new style. On the premise that "concurrent artistic programs suggest concurrent reigns,"[184] Johnson adds a theological motivation for the change: in the Heliopolitan cosmology, creation begins when Atum was separated from his first born son, Shu, who then separated from his twin sister, Tefnut. Thus, Akhenaten's new art style and iconography accentuate his role as Shu with Nefertiti symbolizing Tefnut. "In order to rule as deified king/Atum, Amenhotep III may have required a junior coregent/firstborn son/Shu nearby, since Atum cannot exist without Shu."[185] Akhenaten's worship of the living Aten, which the king called "his father," might have "had as its focus Akhenaten's real, deified, living father Amenhotep III."[186] This supposition may answer Redford's wonderment of "whether one of the subconscious factors motivating the young man was a fixation with a father-image."[187]

As with all other issues presented in this paper, Johnson's coregency paradigm has been challenged. John Baines writes:

> There have been attempts to link this variety to the phases of his reign and to ideological or iconographic factors. Some of these points must be valid, but the variation probably related also to the unprecedented level of artistic activity in the reign and to the simultaneous existence of numerous ateliers and styles. Similar variations can be observed for the early Nineteenth Dynasty. The alternative that has been proposed, that variation and the presence of analogous trends under Akhenaten are evidence for a coregency of Amenhotep III and his son seems implausible to me.[188]

---

[183] Johnson, "The Revolutionary Role of the Sun in the Reliefs and Statuary of Amenhotep III," *Oriental Institute News and Notes* 151 (fall 1996): 1-3.
[184] Johnson, "The Setting: History, Religion, and Art," 46.
[185] Johnson, "The Setting: History, Religion, and Art," 46.
[186] Johnson, "The Setting: History, Religion, and Art," 46.
[187] Redford, "The Sun-Disc in Akhenaten's Program: Its worship and Antecedents, II," *JARCE* 17 (1980): 26.
[188] John Baines, "The Dawn of the Amarna Age," in *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on His Reign*, 298.

Johnson's hypothesis of the Aten being equivalent to the living Amenhotep III exemplifies that the entire "Akhenaten Problem" has become even more complex.[189] Speaking as an historian Murnane observes: "It must be also admitted that records from Amarna make it hard to demonstrate that Amenhotep III filled the role of 'living god' at the heretic capital."[190] To confirm this statement he refers to Panehsy's stela (Section 4.4.3 and figure 9):

> nothing specific in this piece identifies him as the living embodiment of the sun-god: indeed, since he wears none of the insignia (such as the *shebyu*-collar) which are supposed to reflect his identity, there is nothing to distinguish Amenhotep III here from similarly passive images of Akhenaten.[191]

With regard to both the opinions that the traditional and the new (revolutionary) art styles overlap and that "concurrent artistic programs suggest concurrent reigns," Redford wrote in 1976: "There is no conclusive proof (certainly not from the Theban necropolis!) that the styles overlapped and the evidence of the Tenth Pylon blocks suggest a relatively swift passage from one to the other."[192] Lastly, James Romano notes the skepticism felt towards the methodology of art historical and archaeological models in general:

> Archaeologists and art historians are trained to separate their subjects, be they artistic styles, cultures, etc., into groups. Any such scheme is, however, only an imperfect model for what truly happened. We must remember that these patterns are, at best, symbols that have been devised to suggest a general ordering of events. When we call upon them to serve as a rigid historical framework, we ask them to do more than they are capable of doing.[193]

4.6 Durbar

Both the Amarna tombs of Huya (Section 4.4.7.0) and of Meryre II (Amarna Tomb No.

---

[189] Murnane, "Nature of the Aten: Akhenaten and His God: Problems and Proposals," in *Amarna Letters (KMT) Vol. 3*, 34.
[190] Murnane, "Nature of the Aten," 38.
[191] Murnane, "Nature of the Aten," 38.
[192] Redford, review of *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 183.
[193] James Romano, "A Second Look at 'Images of Amenhotep III in Thebes: Styles and Intentions' by W. Raymond Johnson," in *The Art of Amenhotep III: Art Historical Analysis*, 54.

2) each contain a scene of a durbar, which for Aldred represents evidence of a coregency.[194] Figure 21 illustrates the durbar or foreign tribute scene from the East Wall of the Main Chamber of Meryre II's tomb.

> In both of these tombs there are scenes which appear no where else during the reign, either at Amarna or Thebes, and show the royal family attending the great durbar which was held at Akhetaten late in the reign. Each of the two versions of the scene is different in the prominence it gives to certain events in the ceremony, but both are accompanied by similar texts which is the only example in the Amarna tombs to bear a precise date—Year 12, Month 6, Day 8.[195]

Since the gifts represented in the scene are not the typical staples, such as timber and grain, but valuable luxury gifts, and since native Egyptians are present in the procession, Aldred concludes that these scenes commemorate Akhenaten's accession to sole rule, and thus signify that Amenhotep III ruled with his son until year 12 of Akhenaten's reign.

In his rebuttal of this theory, Redford first notes that the text accompanying both scenes lack a reference to the occurrence of a coronation.[196] Moreover, "even those tombs that seem to have been decorated early in the reign (e.g., nos. 89 and 226 of the Theban necropolis, both early in the reign of Amenhotep III) yield not a trace of evidence that the tribute scene was to be understood as taking place at the time of the coronation."[197] Thus, one may can there is solid evidence to show that these scenes are not intended to depict tribute received at the king's coronation; however, they could just be denoting booty or *inw*. Both Kitchen and Murnane agree with Redford's appraisal.

4.7.0 Amarna Letters

[194] Aldred, "Year 12 at el-Amarna," 114ff.
[195] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 178.
[196] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 123.
[197] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 123.

Aldred postulates that the event, which brought the foreign delegates to Amarna in the durbar/coronation, is documented in a docket on one of the Amarna Letters, EA 27.[198] (Section 4.7.1). At this point, it will be necessary to examine to what extent the Amarna Letters may support a coregency of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. Redford, as with many scholars, considers the letters to be an important source of information for the history of this period, and possibly, they might aid in uncovering answers to some questions concerning the coregency. Kitchen, however, cautions that "Redford perhaps expects more from the letters than they can give."[199]

The first question that needs to be addressed is: if there was no coregency and Amenhotep III was deceased when the later Amarna correspondence occurred, why were the tablets from his reign in Thebes transported to Amarna? Campbell answers this with the following remark: "It would be safe to assume that the ones brought from Thebes were those which would supply enough background to permit Akhenaten and his officials to continue the correspondence in a knowledgeable way."[200] He continues his argument by theorizing that the letters written to Amenhotep III earlier in his reign were brought to the new capital when the court was transferred there. Since the tablets were stored together, it has been suggested that the corpus of texts "represented a 'portfolio' for the 'secretary of state.'"[201] Giles, however, doubts this view:

> The idea that this archive served as a portfolio for a "secretary of state" seems even less probable since the documents were in a foreign language. Egyptian officials even if they were acquainted to some extent with this "lingua franca" of diplomatic correspondence would…have wanted an Egyptian translation to avoid

[198] Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*, 180.
[199] Kitchen, "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology," 318.
[200] Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, 65.
[201] Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, 36.

any misunderstanding.[202]

Moreover, if Egyptian translations were made, more than likely they would have been done on papyrus; papyrus appears an easier medium to transport and to use as a reference.

The pro-coregency scholars argue that the out-of-date tablets from Amenhotep III were not brought to Amarna since they were contemporary with the events, and the elder pharaoh received them at the new capital. "The letters addressed to Amenhotep III…are striking evidence of his residing in the city."[203] In view of this coregency, Redford makes an interesting point: "There is no letter among the 340-odd addressed to both kings as coregents; the addressee is either specifically named (*Nimmuaria* or *Napkhururiya*) or the letter is addressed simply to the 'king, my lord.'"[204]

A second question that the Amarna archives introduces is—how would a coregency of an extended duration affect the events and chronologies of Egypt's other ancient Near Eastern contemporaries? Campbell perceives a disastrous affect: "If a 12 year coregency…be accepted, the net effect would be to narrow the space of time covered by letters 7, 8, 10, 11 to a maximum of three or four years: this is certainly not enough time."[205] The maximum amount of time the archive covers would be about thirty years. The minimum number of years, based on a twelve year coregency, would be approximately eighteen. Thus the length of the coregency is an inverse function of the duration of the events in the letters, i.e., the longer the coregency, the shorter the interval of the correspondence. One of the main objections to the long coregency theory is the condensing of Šuppiluliuma's Syrian campaigns into a shorter time span. Unfortunately, the limits of this paper prevent an in-depth analysis of how events in Near Eastern

---

[202] Giles, *The Amarna Age: Western Asia*, The Australian Centre for Egyptological Studies 5, (Warminster: Aris and Phillips Ltd., 1997), 45, n. 57.
[203] Giles, *Ikhnaton*, 69.
[204] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 155.

history would be compromised by a long coregency.

4.7.1 EA 27

Probably the most discussed coregency issue is the hieratic docket, supposedly recording receipt of the document, on Amarna Letter EA 27 (Figure 22A). Many scholars consider the interpretation of the docket to be critical to the coregency question. Because the tablet is broken just where the inscription begins, the date is obscure. In other words, the date may be "[regnal year] 2" or "[regnal year 1]2." It is held that if the docket reads "year 12" then there is evidence for a long coregency, depending as well on the context of the cuneiform text (see below). Even if the inscription permits "year 2," some Egyptologists contend that a short coregency is possible. "A relatively limited coregency of less than two years still seems most like—the principal (but not sole) evidence for this restricted span being the controversial "year 2" notation."[206]

In 1889 Adolph Erman deciphered the enigmatic beginning of the inscription as "year 12." Since then many scholars have seen the broken hieratic inscription as "year 2." Giles, who accepts the "year 12" reading to support a long coregency, devises a clever annotation to add to any readings made after 1889: "it is worthy of note that such tablets as this tend to deteriorate, especially along the edges."[207]

W. Fritz performed the most recent study of EA 27 in 1991. Figure 22B illustrates the hieratic drawing based on his restoration and Figure 22C depicts his transcription into hieroglyphs. Thus, his transliteration is: "(*HAt-zp*) 2, *I prt, sw* (*9?*)…"[208]; reading "regnal year 2, first month of *Peret*, day 9(?). In referring to Fritz's analysis, Murnane concludes that his own reading of the date is still ambiguous.

---

[205] Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, 53.
[206] Nicholas Reeves, "The Royal Family," in *Pharaohs of the Sun*, 81.
[207] Giles, *The Amarna Age*, 45.
[208] W. Fritz, "Bemerkungen zum Datierungsvermerk auf der Amarnatafel Kn 27." *SAK* 18 (1991): 218.

> My own first hand examination of the docket in East Berlin, back in 1984, was less conclusive: the signs indicated by the traces are shaped somewhat eccentrically, no matter which readings are adopted, so neither opinion can be excluded and a coregency of up to 11 years is still possible.[209]

Based on the cuneiform text of the letter, Redford will even accept a coregency: "If year 2 is restored only a very short coregency amounting to but a few months at the most is possible. If year 12 is restored, a coregency of not less than eleven years is as good as proved."[210]

The cuneiform text of the letter itself pertains to the Mitanni king, Tušratta, reminiscing in passing about the friendship he had with the addressee's father, and how he hopes that it will continue into the future.

> Consequently, the letter is rightly understood to be written by Tušratta to Akhenaten after the latter's entry to sole rule. The allusion to "the great feast for the mourning (*isinu rabu ana kimri*)" shows that the funeral rites for Amenhotep III were either still in progress or had just been concluded.[211]

However, this assumption leads to another problem—modern philological research in Akkadian has wholly revised the translation of *kimr*(*um*), and it is no longer believed to be signifying a "mourning."[212] Concerning the *kimru*-feast, Moran writes: "The festival is to be understood as celebrated in the Mittani capital, not in Egypt, and it has nothing to do with the funeral rites for Amenhotep III or with *sd*-festivals…."[213] If this is true, EA 27, whether it reads year 12 or year 2, may not have any bearing on the coregency question at all.

5.0 THE PARENTAGE OF TUTANKHAMEN

The consanguinity of Tutankhamen to Amenhotep III is a major issue in the coregency controversy. If Tutankhamen died around the age of eighteen and ascended the throne at about

---

[209] Murnane, "Round Table: Further Evidence for the Coregency of Amenhotep III and IV? Three Views on the Graffito found at Dahshur" in *Amarna Letters, Vol. 3*, (KMT) 29.
[210] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 146.
[211] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteen Dynasty*, 146.
[212] Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, 24.
[213] W. L. Moran, trans., *The Amarna Letters*, (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 91, n. 19.

the age of ten, then his birth must have happened before year 8/9 of Akhenaten.[214] In numerous inscriptions, Tutankhamen claims that his father was Amenhotep III; therefore, a long coregency can only support this relationship.

5.1 Hermopolis Block

An Amarna block discovered at Hermopolis contains an inscription that reads: as "The king's son of his body, his beloved, Tutankhaten."[215] Unfortunately, the text does not specify of which king he is the bodily son. Murnane, after examining the usage of the title "King's Son of His Body," advances the following:

> The title was sometimes applied to a more distant blood relationship, however, as in the case of the royal grandchildren who occasionally appeared during the New Kingdom as "King's Son/Daughter", Tutankhamen could have been related to the dynasty through a collateral line of the family.[216]

5.2 Soleb Lion

Amenhotep III commissioned two red granite lions (British Museum EA 2 and 34), which were installed at Soleb temple. Subsequently, Tutankhamen added an inscription that reads:

> May the gods grant peace to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the Lord of the Two Lands, Lord who performs the ritual, Nebkheprure, the Son of Re, Lord of the Crowns [Tut]ankhamen [Ruler-of-Upper Egyptian-Heliopolis], who renewed the monument of his father, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands Nebmaatre Image of Re, Son of Re, Amenhotep Ruler of Thebes: he made it as his monument for his father, Amen-Re Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, Atum Lord of Heliopolis, Yah, that he might achieve the condition of "given life like Re" forever continually.[217]

5.3 Astronomical Instrument

In the Oriental Museum, the collection holds what is termed as an "astronomical

---

[214] J. D. Ray, "The Parentage of Tutankhamun," *Antiquity* 49 (1975): 46.
[215] Ray, "The Parentage of Tutankhamun," 46.
[216] Murnane, "The Return to Orthodoxy," in *Pharaohs of the Sun*, 178.
[217] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*, 217.

instrument" (OI 12144). The inscription indicates "*it (n) it (n) it*", (𓇋 𓅓𓅓𓅓), as the association between Tutankhamen and Tuthmosis IV.[218] The question remains as how to interpret "father of the father of the father" or "his father's father's father." This inscription could be disentangled by reading "great grandfather" thus separating Tutankhamen by three generations from Tuthmosis IV.[219]

> This in itself is sufficient to establish that Tutankhamen could not have been a son of Amenhotep III. Such a conclusion accords well with what is now generally felt to be the improbability of a long coregency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten which would in effect make Tutankhamen a son of the latter.[220]

Another interpretation of the hieroglyphs yields *it (n) it.f* or "his father's father" (grandfather); thus affiliating Tutankhamen to Tuthmosis IV by two generations, making Amenhotep III his father. Lastly, the term could have simply meant "ancestor" or "forefather" without specifying the number of generations Tutankhamen was removed from Tuthmosis IV.[221] Murnane perhaps sums the issue up the best: "The usefulness of this genealogical information is compromised, however, by the vagueness of the term that expresses the connection."[222]

5.4 Luxor Temple

In at least eight instances in the texts on the architraves of the Great Colonnade at Luxor temple, Tutankhamen calls Amenhotep III "his father."[223] In addition throughout the colonnade, one can see

> the efforts which the later "Amarna pharaohs" made to associate themselves with Amenhotep III, both as a great king and as the last orthodox ruler before the heresy. Ritual scenes on the doorjambs and columns, for example, regularly alternate Tutankhamen and Amenhotep III as the celebrants, to convey an

---

[218] Reeves, "Tuthmosis IV as 'Great-Grandfather' of Tutankhamun," *GM* 56 (1981): 66
[219] Reeves, "Tuthmosis IV as 'Great-Grandfather' of Tutankhamun," 66.
[220] Reeves, "Tuthmosis IV as 'Great-Grandfather' of Tutankhamun," 66.
[221] John Larson, "The Tutankhamen Astronomical Instrument," *Amarna Letters: Essays on Ancient Egypt c. 1390-1310 BC, Vol. 2*, ed., Dennis Forbes, (San Francisco, KMT Communications, 1992), 84.
[222] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*, 218.
[223] Larson, "The Tutankhamen Astronomical Instrument," 84.

> impression (no doubt deliberately) that the two were collaborating in the hall's decoration.[224]

M. Eaton-Krauss concurs with the political propaganda viewpoint that might have been designed to correlate Tutankhamen with the last legitimate ruler.[225]

5.5 Amarna Letter EA 9

From the Amarna letters, a similar problem of interpretation develops, but this time it is from the Kassite side. In EA 9, Burra-Buriyaš, king of Karaduniyaš, writes to Nibhurrereya, king of Egypt, and stresses the fact that his *abu*, Kurigalzu, was a contemporary of the addressee's *abu*. As with the Egyptian term *it*, the Akkadian *abu* produces the same dilemma: whether to interpret the term as "father" or as "ancestor." Moran translates the term as "ancestor,"[226] whereas Giles prefers "father."

> Here I think one must take the word "father" very seriously, (it seems unlikely that "*abu*" here means simply predecessor)…but if this were indeed the case, one must accept that, as Kurigalzu must have been a contemporary of Amenhotep III, then Tutankhamen's father (as well as Smenkhkare's) must have been Amenhotep III. Hence the coregency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten would receive the support of important new evidence.[227]

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

One generalization used in order to sum up the coregency issues is that each item included in this paper is subject to interpretation; thus, the strength and validity of each item is governed by a subjective method, lacking conclusive proof. Hence, the items may be termed more appropriately as "circumstance evidence" rather than as "evidence." From an historian's point of view, definitive proof requires textual evidence; on the other hand, art historians accept that their subjective aesthetic assessments and chronologies are sufficient proof. Some examples

---

[224] Murnane, *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*, 216.
[225] M. Eaton-Krauss, "Akhenaten versus Akhenaten," *BiOr* 47 (1990): 552, n. 86.
[226] Moran, *The Amarna Letters*, 18.
[227] Giles, *The Amarna Age*, 95.

are, as follows: Aldred is content with interpreting the durbar as a coronation scene in year 12; Redford is satisfied with taking the Soleb temple scenes as nothing more than Akhenaten's veneration for a deity; Johnson believes that his observations of the art styles of the two pharaohs, supported by theological notions, is substantial enough to reconstruct a chronology in which both kings reigned together; and Murnane considers his analysis of the cartouches on the Third Pylon as adequate evidence that the reliefs do not represent a coregent. Moreover, some scholars are willing to combine several issues listed in this paper as evidence that a coregency transpired. It has been noted that that "[o]ne of the strongest arguments in favor of the coregency is the sheer weight of the various small pieces of evidence."[228] This comment then begs the question of whether people are looking for quantity or quality in judging evidence.

A striking feature of all the items combined is that are all mutually exclusive. One would tend to think that all the items would be additive, totaling up to a coregency of a definitive length. However, this appears not to be the case. The problem of how to interpret the evidence induces different scholars to estimate different amounts of years that the two kings could have reigned together. For example, the Soleb temple reliefs, the Surer and Kheruef reliefs, and the Athribis block lend well to a five year co-reign, but these items may not assist as much with a longer coregency.[229]

The quality of the evidence is questionable as well since many items rely on conjecture. One wonders how much relevancy the following quote has on the coregency of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten.

> Experience teaches us to be wary of such assumptions, however, it has happened all too often in the history of chronological study that one or another "inconvenient" historical puzzle has been "solved" by the simple expedient of

[228] Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, 26.
[229] Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty*, p. 148.

inventing a coregency or collateral reign.[230]

Assumptions are to be found in some of the issues, for example: Aldred's argument concerning the tomb of Ramose incorporates speculations about Simut and his associates, the meaning of the phraseology in the Meidum graffito, and the identity and age of death of the Elder Woman. Since many of the items from Amarna (the offering table, the granite bowl fragments, and Panehsy's stela) derive from private rather than royal venues, it is difficult to accept them as conclusive proof because the monarchy did not issue them, and because they may be construed as being solely cult objects. Royal items, such as Tiye's shrine and Meketaten's coffin, hint at a coregency if one is willing to forgo the change of Amenhotep III's name as being significant; however, it does not seem to be out of the ordinary for the granddaughter or the wife of a deceased king to be paying homage to him in their funerary equipment. Concerning the phonetic spelling of Amenhotep III's name and the use of *Nb-mAat-ra* twice in his titulary, one has to wonder if the elder pharaoh would have allowed his son to change his name considering the high esteem that the ancient Egyptians held for one's name.

A strong piece of evidence may be the lintel from Huya's tomb; however, it is subject to interpretation once again. In addition, it does seem rather strange that, if Amenhotep III was alive at Amarna, he would not be present in the banquet scene which Huya's tomb contains. Probably the most convincing items are the Kahun papyri and the Athribis block, yet not enough is known about them to verify a coregency. In view of the new lexicographical Akkadian studies, the application of EA 27 to the coregency problem is even questionable.

The intention of this paper has not been to disprove or to prove a coregency between Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. As has been noted, the interpretation of the items by individual scholars allows one to advocate or refute the possibility of a coregency. Egyptology would be at

[230] F. Cryer, "Chronology: Issues and Problem," in *CANE*, vol. 2, ed. J. Sasson, (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1995), 653.

loss to consider the entire matter resolved at this point in time, considering that no one knows what is yet to be discovered in Egypt. In addition, this examination of both the old and the new arguments concerning the coregency hopefully has synthesized the problem into a concise summary in order to objectively present the issues for future reference. Moreover, it is also hoped that the reader has seen how vexatious the coregency has been over the years, encompassing a variety of opposing viewpoints.

FIGURE 1: Amenhotep IV offers to Amenhotep III and Tiye
South Side of Entrance Corridor in Kheruef's Tomb
(Epigraphic Survey, *Kheruef*, pl. 11B)

FIGURE 2A: Amenhotep IV in Conventional Art Style
Left Side of Central Doorway, Rear West Wall
Ramose's Tomb
(Freed, et al., *Pharaohs of the Sun*, p. 146, fig. 107)

FIGURE 2B: Amenhotep IV in Amarna Art Style
Right Side of Central Doorway, Rear West Wall
Ramose's Tomb
(Freed, et al., *Pharaohs of the Sun*, p. 146, fig. 107)

FIGURE 3: Simut the Fourth Prophet
South Wall of First Hall in
Ramose's Tomb (Davies, *Ramose*, pl. 27)

FIGURE 4A: Third Pylon Prow, East Face of North Tower
(Aldred, *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*, p. 19)

FIGURE 4B: Third Pylon Stern, East Face of North Tower
(Forbes, ed., *Amarna Letters vol. 2*, pp. 15-16)

FIGURE 5A: "Early" Aten Name Form
(O'Connor and Cline, eds., *Amenhotep III*, fig. 8.1)

FIGURE 5B: "Late" Aten Name Form
(O'Connor and Cline, eds., *Amenhotep III*, fig. 8.1)

FIGURE 6A: Athribis Block Sketch
(Fairman, *JEA* 46, p. 80)

FIGURE 6B: Fairman's Reconstruction of Cartouches on Athribis Block
(Fairman, *JEA* 46, p. 80)

FIGURE 7: Men and Bek Graffito at Aswan
(Habachi, *MDAIK* 20, p. 86, fig. 11)

FIGURE 8A: Dahshur Graffito
(Allen, *GM* 140, p. 7)

FIGURE 8B: Allen's Transcription of Dahshur Graffito
(Allen, *GM* 140, p. 7)

FIGURE 9: Stela from Panehsy's House, British Museum EA 57399

(Quirke and Spencer, eds., *British Museum Book of Ancient Egypt*, p. 80, fig. 57)

FIGURE 10A: Phonetic Spelling of *Nb-mAat-ra*
From Tiye's Wooden Shrine
(Redford, *History and Chronology of the 18th Dynasty of Egypt*, p. 109)

FIGURE 10B: Seated Maat Goddess
(Redford, *History and Chronology of the 18th Dynasty of Egypt*, p. 104)

FIGURE 10C: *Nb-mAat-ra* with Maat Goddess
(Redford, *History and Chronology of the 18th Dynasty of Egypt*, p. 104)

FIGURE 10D: Phonetically Spelled Hieratic Variations
(Redford, *History and Chronology of the 18th Dynasty of Egypt*, p. 104, n. 73)

FIGURE 11: Inscriptions on Fragments of Granite Bowl
(Giles, *Ikhnaton: Legend and History*, p. 66)

FIGURE 12: Inscriptions on Fragment of Offering Table
(Pendlebury et al., *CoA Part III*, p. 155, fig. 22)

FIGURE 13A: Lintel in Huya's Tomb: Akhenaten and Family
Left Side Panel Inner Doorway North Wall
(Steindorff and Seele, *When Egypt Ruled the East*, p. 80, fig. 21*a*)

FIGURE 13B: Lintel in Huya's Tomb: Amenhotep III and Family
Right Side Panel Inner Doorway North Wall
(Steindorff and Seele, *When Egypt Ruled the East*, p. 81, fig. 21*b*)

FIGURE 14: Banquet Scene from Huya's Tomb, South Wall, First Room
(Arnold, *The Royal Women of Amarna*, p. 113, fig. 110)

FIGURE 15A: Plaster Head (Front)
Berlin 21299
(Bille-DeMot, *The Age of Akhenaten*, p.108, fig. 58)

FIGURE 15B: Plaster Head (Side)
Berlin 21299
(Bille-DeMot, *The Age of Akhenaten*, p.109, fig. 60)

FIGURE 16: Amenhotep III Statue
Brooklyn Museum 48.28
(Smith, *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*, p. 275, fig. 270)

FIGURE 17A: Plaster Head (Front)
Berlin 21356
Bille-De Mot, *The Age of Akhenaten*, p.108, fig. 59)

FIGURE 17B: Plaster Head (Side)
Berlin 21356
Bille-De Mot, *The Age of Akhenaten*, p.109, fig. 61)

FIGURE 18: Amenhotep III
Serpentine Statue
MMA 30.8.74
(Hayes, *The Scepter of Egypt*, Vol. 2, p. 237, fig. 142)

FIGURE 19: UC 004
(Johnson, *JEA* 82, pl. VI, fig. 2)

FIGURE 20: Akhenaten and Nefertiti
Louvre E 15593
(Johnson, *JEA* 82, pl. VII, fig. 1)

FIGURE 21: Durbar in Tomb of Meryre II, East Wall of Main Chamber
(Freed et al., *Pharaohs of the Sun*, p. 89, fig. 60)

FIGURE 22A: Side View of EA 27 Showing Hieratic Docket
(Desroches-Noblecourt, *Tutankhamen*, p. 81, fig. 43)

FIGURE 22B: Hieratic Restoration of EA 27 Docket
(Fritz, *SAK* 18, p. 212)

FIGURE 22C: Hieroglyphic Transcription of EA 27 Docket
(Fritz, *SAK* 18, p. 212)

APPENDIX

Historiography of the Coregency Debate[231]

FOR

1899 Petrie, *A History of Egypt*, Vol. II, p. 207ff. [at least 4 years]
1904 Lady Amherst of Hackney, *A Sketch of Egyptian History from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, p. 139.
1923 Carter, *The Tomb of Tutankhamen*, p. 2ff.
1933 Pendlebury, *City of Akhenaten*, Vol. 2, pp. 102, 104, 108. [11 years]
1936 Pendlebury, *JEA* 22, p. 198.
1938 Borchardt, *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*, pp. 23-29. [3-5 years]
1940 Engelbach, *ASAE* 4, pp. 134ff. [9 years]
1942 Steindorff and Seele, *When Egypt Ruled the East*, pp. 201 and 275. [12 years]
1951 Fairman, *City of Akhenaten* Part *III*, pp. 152-57. [9 years]
Hayes, *JNES* 10, pp. 36-7.
Wilson, *The Burden of Egypt*, p. 213.
1952 Giles, *Aegyptus* 32, pp. 293-310. [11 years]
1957 Aldred, *JEA* 43, pp. 114-17.
1958 van der Meer, *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 15, pp. 74-96. [9 years]
1959 Aldred, *JEA* 45, pp. 19-33.
Aldred, *JNES* 18, pp. 116-20.
Giles, "The Amarna Period: A Study of Internal Politics and External Relations of the Late Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt." (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London)
1960 Fairman, *JEA* 14, p. 14.
1962 Kitchen, *Suppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs*.
1963 Desroches-Noblecourt, *Tutankhamen*, pp. 103-136.
1965 Kitchen, *CdE* 80, pp. 310-22.
1967 Kitchen, *Protagonisti de la Storia universale*, Milan.
Gilbert, *CdE* 84, p. 323.
1968 Aldred, *Akhenaten, Pharaoh of Egypt—A New Study*.
1970 Giles, *Ikhnaton: Legend and History*.
1973 Aldred, *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*, pp. 50-1.
1976 Wente and Van Siclen, "A Chronology of the New Kingdom," in *Studies in Honor of George Hughes*, p. 230 [2 years]
Hari, *CdE* 51, pp. 252-60.
1977 Osing, *GM* 26, p. 53.
1980 Bentley, *JEA* 66.
1988 Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*.
1990 Johnson, "Images of Amenhotep III in Thebes; Styles and Intentions," in *The Art of Amenhotep III: Art Historical Analysis.*
1991 Martin Valentin, F., *BAEE* 3, "indicios de una corregencia."
1995 Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte et la Vallee du Nil, tome* 3, pp. 402-07.
1996 Johnson, *JEA* 82
1997 Giles, *The Amarna Age: Western Asia*.
1998 Johnson, in *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on His Reign*.
1999 Reeves, in *Pharaohs of the Sun*. [2 years]
Johnson, in *Pharaohs of the Sun.* [12 years]

[231] By no means comprehensive.

AGAINST

1954 Helck, *MIO* 2, pp. 189-207.
1956 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, p. 68, n. 3.
1957 Gardiner, *JEA* 43, pp.13.
1958 Redford, *JEA* 45, pp. 34-37.
Smith, W.S., *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*, p. 184ff.
Roeder, *ZAS* 83, p. 45.
1959 Von Beckerath, *OLZ* 54, p. 7.
1961 Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 213.
1962 Hayes, "Internal Affairs from Tuthmosis I to the Death of Amenophis III, Part I" in *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 2, p. 12, n. 7.
1964 Hornung, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie u. Geschichte des Neun Reiches*, pp. 71 ff.
Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters with Special Reference to the Hypothetical Coregency of Amenophis III and Akhenaten*.
Helck, *OLZ* 59, pp. 459ff.
1967 Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*.
1970 Murnane, *Serapis* 2, pp. 17-21.
1975 Harris, J., *SAK* 2, pp. 98-101.
1977 Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, [maybe 2 years]
1990 Eaton-Krauss M., *BiOr* 47, pp. 541-59
1994 Von Beckerath, *Chronolgie des aegyptischen Neun Reiches*, p.45.
1998 Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*.
1999 Redford, *Pharaohs of the Sun.*
Hornung, *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldred, Cyril

1957a "The End of the El-Amarna Period." *JEA* 43: 30-41.

1957b "Year 12 at el-Amarna." *JEA* 43: 114-117.

1959a "The Beginning of the El-Amarna Period." *JEA* 45: 19-33.

1959b "The Gayer Anderson Jubilee Relief of Amenophis IV." *JEA* 45: 104.

1959c "Two Theban Notables during the Later Reign of Amenophis III." *JNES* 18: 113-20.

1967 "The Second Jubilee of Amenhotep II." *ZÄS* 94:3-4.

1972 *Akhenaten: Pharaoh of Egypt—A New Study*. London: Sphere Books Ltd.

1973 *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*. New York: The Brooklyn Museum in association with Viking Press.

1975 "Egypt: The Amarna Period and the End of the Eighteenth Dynasty." In *CAH*, 3rd ed., edited by I.E.S. Edwards et al., vol. 2, part 2A. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1980 *Egyptian Art in the Days of the Pharaohs 3100-320 BC*. New York: Oxford University Press.

1988 *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*. New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc.

Allen, James P.

1994 "Further Evidence for the Coregency of Amenhotep III and IV?" *GM* 140: 7-8.

Arnold, Dorothea with contributions by James P. Allen and L. Green

1996 *The Royal Women of Amarna: Images of Beauty from Ancient Egypt.* New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, distributed by Harry N. Abrams.

Bentley, Julia

1980 "Amenophis III and Akhenaten: Co-regency Proved?" *JEA* 66: 164-65.

Berman, Lawrence Michael, ed.

1990 *The Art of Amenhotep III: Art Historical Analysis*. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art.

Bianche, Robert S.

1995 "Ancient Egyptian Reliefs, Statuary, and Monumental Paintings." In *CANE*, Vol. 4, edited by Jack Sasson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Bille-De Mot, Elénore

1966 *The Age of Akhenaten*. Translated by Jack Lindsay. London: Evelyn, Adams, and Mackay.

Borchardt, Ludwig
1938 "Amenophis IV. Mitkönig in den letzen Jahren Amenophis III.? In *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten: Seinen Wissenschaftlichen Freunden und Bekannten zu Seinem 70. Geburtstage am 5. Oktober 1933*. Leipzig: Privatdruck.

Campbell, E. F.
1964 *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters, with Special Reference to the Hypothetical Coregency of Amenophis III and Akhenaten*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cryer, Frederick H.
1995 "Chronology: Issues and Problems." In *CANE*, Vol. 2, edited by Jack Sasson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Davies, Norman de Garis
1941 *The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose*. Mond Excavations at Thebes 1. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Delia, Robert D.
1980 Review of *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* by William Murnane. *Sarapis: The American Journal of Egyptology* 5, no. 2: 51-4.

Desroches-Noblecourt, Christiane
1965 *Tutankhamen: Life and Death of a Pharaoh*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Eaton-Krauss, M.
1988 "Tutankhamen at Karnak." *MDAIK* 44: 1-11.
1990 "Akhenaten versus Akhenaten." *BiOr* 47: 541-59.

Epigraphic Survey
1980 *The Tomb of Kheruef: Theban Tomb 192*. Oriental Institute Publications 102. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Fairman, H. W.
1960 "A Block of Amenophis IV from Athribis." *JEA* 46: 80-2.

Forbes, Dennis C.
1991 "A Malkata-Amarna Coregency? Summing up the Pros and Cons." *KMT* 2, no. 2 (summer): 64-65, and 71.
1998 *Tombs, Treasures, Mummies: Seven Great Discoveries of Egyptian Archaeology*. Sebastopol: KMT Communications, Inc.

Forbes, Dennis C., editorial director
1991 *Amarna Letters: Essays on Ancient Egypt c. 1390-1310 BC. Vol. 1*. San Francisco: KMT Communications.

1992 *Amarna Letters: Essays on Ancient Egypt c. 1390-1310 BC. Vol. 2.* San Francisco: KMT Communications.
1994 *Amarna Letters: Essays on Ancient Egypt c. 1390-1310 BC. Vol. 3.* San Francisco: KMT Communications.

Freed, Rita E., Yvonne J. Markowitz, and Sue H. D'Auria
1999 *Pharaohs of the Sun: Akhenaten, Nefertiti, Tutankhamen*. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston in association with Bulfinch Press/Little, Brown and Company.

Fritz, Walter
1991 "Bemerkungen zum Datierungsvermerk auf der Amarnatafel Kn 27." *SAK* 18: 207-14.

Gabolde, Marc
1998 *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*. Collection de l'Institut d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Antiquité Université Lumière-Lyon 2. Vol. 3. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.

Gardiner, Alan
1945 "Regnal Years and Civil Calendar in Pharaonic Egypt." *JEA* 31: 11-28.
1957a "The So-called Tomb of Queen Tiye." *JEA* 43: 10-25.
1957b *Egyptian Grammar, Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs.* 3rd edition. London: Oxford University Press.
1964 *Egypt of the Pharaohs: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Giles, F. J.
1970 *Ikhnaton: Legend and History*. London: Hutchinson and Company, Ltd.
1997 *The Amarna Age: Western Asia*. The Australian Centre for Egyptological Studies 5. Warminster: Aris and Phillips Ltd.

Goring, Elizabeth, Nicholas Reeves, and John Ruffle, eds.
1997 *Chief of Seers: Egyptian Studies in Memory of Cyril Aldred.* Studies in Egyptology. New York: Kegan Paul International.

Griffith, F. L.
1926 "Stela in Honour of Amenophis III and Taya, from Tell el-Amarnah." *JEA* 12: 1-2.

Gunn, B.
1923 "Notes on the Aten and His Names." *JEA* 9: 168-76.

Habachi, Labib
1965 "The Graffito of Bek and Men at Aswan." *MDAIK* 20: 85-92
1971 "The Jubilees of Rameses II and Amenhotep III with Reference to Certain Aspects of their Celebration." *ZÄS* 97: 64-72.

Hari, Robert
1976 "Un nouvel élément de la Corégence Aménophis III – Akhenaton." *CdÉ* 51, no. 101 (January): 252-60.

Harris, James E. and Edward F. Wente, eds.
1980 *An X-Ray Atlas of the Royal Mummies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harris, John R.
1975 "Contributions to the History of the Eighteenth Dynasty." *SAK* 2: 95-101.

Hayes, William C.
1951a "Inscriptions from the Palace of Amenhotep III." *JNES* 10, no. 1: 35-56.
1951b "Inscriptions from the Palace of Amenhotep III." *JNES* 10, no. 2: 82-104.
1951c "Inscriptions from the Palace of Amenhotep III." *JNES* 10, no. 3: 156-83.
1951d "Inscriptions from the Palace of Amenhotep III." *JNES* 10, no. 4: 231-42.
1962 "Egypt: Internal Affairs from Tuthmosis I to the Death of Amenophis III." Part 1. *CAH* revised edition of Vol. 2. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1976 "Chronology I. Egypt–to the End of the Twentieth Dynasty." In *CAH*, 3rd edition. Vol. 1 Part 1, edited by I. E. S. Edwards et al. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1990 *The Scepter of Egypt: A Background for the Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Vol. 2 The Hyksos Period and the New Kingdom (1675-1080 BC).* 4th printing (revised). New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, distributed by Harry N. Abrams, Inc.

Helck, Wolfgang
1957 *Urkunden der 18. Dynasite. Heft 20: Historische Inschriften Amenophis' III*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
1981 "Probleme der Königsfolge in der Übergangszeit von 18. zu 19. Dyn." *MDAIK* 37: 207-11.
1982 "Mitregentschaft." *LÄ* Vol. 4, edited by Wolfgang Helck and Wolfhart Westendorf. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Hornung, Erik
1964 *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches*. Ägyptologische Abhandlung. Vol. 11. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
1992 "The Rediscovery of Akhenaten and his Place in Religion." *JARCE* 29: 43-49.
1999a *History of Ancient Egypt: An Introduction.* Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
1999b *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*. Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Johnson, W. Raymond

1993 "The Deified Amenhotep III as the Living Re-Horakhty: Stylistic and Iconographic Considerations." In *Sesto Congresso Internazionale Di Egittologica.* Atti Vol. 2. IV Congresso Internzionale di Egittologia. Torino, Italy: Società Italiana por il Gas p.A.

1994 "Honorific Figures of Amenhotep III in the Luxor Temple Colonnade Hall." In *For His Ka: Essays Offered in Memory of Klaus Baer*. Edited by David Silverman. SAOC, no. 55. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1996a "Amenhotep III and Amarna: Some New Considerations." *JEA* 82: 65-82.

1996b "The Revolutionary Role of the Sun in the Reliefs and Statuary of Amenhotep III." *The Oriental Institute News and Notes*, no. 151 (fall): 1-6.

Kitchen, K. A.

1962 *Suppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs: A Study in Relative Chronologies*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

1965 "Chronique: On the Chronology and History of the New Kingdom." *CdÉ* 40, no. 79 (January): 310-322.

1967 Review of *The Chronology of the Amarna Letter, with Special Reference to the Hypothetical Coregency of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten* by E. F. Campbell. *JEA* 53: 178-82.

1968 "Further Notes on New Kingdom History and Chronology." *CdÉ* 43, no. 85 (January): 313-24.

1971 Review of *Akhenaten, Pharaoh of Egypt—A New Study* by Cyril Aldred. *JEA* 57: 217-19.

1975 Review of *The Road to Kadesh* by William Murnane. *JEA* 75: 276-77.

1977-78 Review of *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes: January 12, 1977,* edited by Janet Johnson and Edward Wente. *Serapis: The American Journal of Egyptology* 4: 65-80.

1989 "Supplementary Notes on the Basics of Egyptian Chronology." In *High, Middle or Low? (Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg, 20th-22nd August 1987),* edited by P. Åström, part 3, 152-9. Göteborg: Paul Åström.

Kozloff, Arielle P. and Betsy M. Bryan with Lawrence M. Berman

1992 *Egypt's Dazzling Sun: Amenhotep III and His World*. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art.

Leprohon, Ronald S.

1995 "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt." In *CANE*, vol. 1, edited by Jack Sasson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Meltzer, Edmund

1988 "Ancient Egypt through Three Windows." *JAOS* 108, no. 2: 285-90.

Moran, W. L., trans.
1992 *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Murnane, William J.
1970 "The Hypothetical Coregency between Amenophis III and Akhenaten: Two Observations." *Serapis: A Student Forum on the Ancient World* 2: 17-21.
1976 "On the Accession Date of Akhenaten." In *Studies in Honor of George Hughes: January 12, 1977*, edited by Janet Johnson and Edward Wente. SAOC 39. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
1977 *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*. SAOC 40. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
1979 "The Bark of Amun on the Third Pylon at Karnak." *JARCE* 16: 11-27.
1985 *The Road to Kadesh: A Historical Interpretation of the Battle Reliefs of King Seti I at Karnak*. 2nd revised edition. SAOC 42. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of The University of Chicago.
1988 Review of *Akhenaten: The Heretic King* by Donald Redford. *JNES* 47, no. 1: 47-48.
1995 *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*. Writings from the Ancient World Society of Biblical Literature, vol. 5, edited by Edmund S. Meltzer. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Nims, Charles
1976 Review of *Akhenaten and Nefertiti* by Cyril Aldred. *JNES* 35: 279-80.

O'Connor, David and Eric H. Cline, eds.
1998 *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on His Reign*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

O'Connor, David and David Silverman, eds.
1995 *Ancient Egyptian Kingship*. Probleme der Ägyptologie, vol. 9, edited by Wolfgang Helck. New York: E. J. Brill.

Pendlebury, J.D.S. with chapters by J. Cerny, H. W. Fairman, et al.
1951 *The City of Akhenaten Part III: the Central City and the Official Quarters. Vol 1: Text.* London: Oxford University Press.

Quirke, Stephen and Jeffrey Spencer, eds.
1992 *The British Museum Book of Ancient Egypt*. New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc.

Ray, J. D.
1975 "The Parentage of Tutankhamun." *Antiquity* 49: 45-7.

1985 Review of *Akhenaten, the Heretic King* by Donald Redford. *GM* 86: 81-93.

Redford, Donald B.
1959 "Some Observations on Amarna Chronology." *JEA* 45: 34-37.
1966 "On the Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty." *JNES* 25, no. 3: 113-24.
1967 *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*. Near and Middle Eastern Series vol. 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
1976a "The Sun-Disc in Akhenaten's Program: Its Worship and Antecedents, I." *JARCE* 13: 47-61.
1976b Review of *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* by William Murnane. *JEA* 69: 181-3.
1980 "The Sun-Disc in Akhenaten's Program: Its Worship and Antecedents, II." *JARCE* 17: 21-38.
1987 *Akhenaten: The Heretic King*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Reeves, C. Nicholas
1980 "Tuthmosis IV as 'Great-Grandfather' of Tutankhamun." *GM* 56: 65-9.

Robins, Gay
1981 "The Value of the Estimated Ages of the Royal Mummies at Death as Historical Evidence." *GM* 45: 63-8.
1997 *Art of Ancient Egypt.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Samson, Julia with an introduction by Prof. H. S. Smith
1978 *Amarna: City of Akhenaten and Nefertiti*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, Ltd.

Schlögl, Hermann Alexander
1993 *Echnaton--Tutanchamun: Daten, Fakten, Literatur*. 4th edition. Weisbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Schulman, Alan R.
1969-70 Review of *Akhenaten Pharaoh of Egypt—A New Study* by Cyril Aldred. *JARCE* 8: 101-2.

Smith, W. Stevenson
1981 *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*. 2nd edition revised with additions by William Kelly Simpson. New York: Penguin Books.

Steindorff, George and Keith C. Seele.
1957 *When Egypt Ruled the East*. Revised by Seele, 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Strudwick, Nigel and Helen Strudwick
1999 *Thebes in Egypt: A Guide to Tombs and Temples of Ancient Luxor*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Uphill, Eric
1963 "The Sed Festivals of Akhenaten." *JNES* 22*:* 123-7.
1971 Review of *Ikhnaton, Legend and History* by F. J. Giles. *JEA* 57: 219-222.

Vandersleyen, C.
1988 "Les deux jeunesses d'Amenhotep III." *BSFE* 111: 9-30.

Van Siclen, Charles C. III
1973 "The Accession Date of Amenhotep III and the Jubilee." *JNES* 32, no. 4: 290-300.

Wegner, Josef W.
1996 "The Nature and Chronology of the Senwosret III-Amenemhat III Regnal Succession: Some Considerations Based on New Evidence from the Mortuary Temple of Senwosret III at Abydos." *JNES* 55, no.4: 249-79.

Wente, Edward
1969 Review of *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies* by Donald Redford. *JNES* 28: 273-80.

Wente, Edward F. and Charles C. Van Siclen III.
1976 "A Chronology of the New Kingdom." In *Studies in Honor of George Hughes: January 12, 1977* edited by E. F. Wente and J. H. Johnson. SAOC 39. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Wilkinson, Richard H.
1996 *Reading Egyptian Art: A Hieroglyphic Guide to Ancient Egyptian Painting and Sculpture*. New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc.

Wilson, John A.
1968 *The Culture of Ancient Egypt*. 11th Impression. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.