HUMS 508

Kate Narev  
220090979  
karev@une.edu.au  
7 Vivian St, Bellevue Hill, NSW, 2023

Coordinator: Associate Professor Matthew Dillon

TITLE OF RESEARCH PAPER:  
Hatshepsut and Thutmose III - Cooperative Co-rulers or Ruthless Rivals?
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ...................................................................................................................... 1

The Family Relationship ................................................................................................. 3

Early Interpretations ........................................................................................................ 3

Did Hatshepsut Usurp her Stepson’s Throne? ............................................................... 4

The Destruction of Hatshepsut’s Monuments ................................................................. 11

Evidence that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III shared a good relationship .................... 16

Images of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III ...................................................................... 23

Images at Djeser Djeseru .............................................................................................. 24

Images in The Red Chapel ............................................................................................. 27

Depictions on Lesser Monuments .................................................................................. 29

Physical Positioning of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III ................................................... 30

Crows worn by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III ............................................................... 33

How the Relationship Functioned ................................................................................ 35

Building Works ............................................................................................................. 35

Foreign affairs ............................................................................................................... 36

Religion ......................................................................................................................... 38

Administration ............................................................................................................. 39

Conclusion ..................................................................................................................... 40

Appendix A – Family Tree ............................................................................................. 42

Appendix B – Pyramidion of an obelisk at Karnak. Amun crowns Hatshepsut .......... 43

Appendix C – Foundation Deposits .............................................................................. 44

Appendix D – Finger rings ............................................................................................. 46

Appendix E – Images of Neferure with pharaonic beard ............................................. 47

Appendix F – Hatshepsut and Thutmose III taking part in the Sed festival .............. 48

Appendix G – Table of Depictions at Djeser Djeseru .................................................. 48

Appendix H – Thutmose III making offerings to Horus at Djeser Djeseru ............... 49

Thutmose III with Amun and Re-Harake at Dheser Dheseru ....................................... 49

Appendix I – Thutmose III, presenting myrrh to Amun ............................................. 50

Appendix J – Thutmose III participating in Opet, Djeser Djeseru ............................... 51

Appendix K – Hatshepsut and Thutmose III accompany the Amun Barque, Red Chapel, South Wall, Block 26 ......................................................................................... 51

Appendix L – Hatshepsut and Thutmose III follow the Amun Barque, Red Chapel, South Wall, Block 169 ......................................................................................... 52

Appendix M – Thutmose III appearing to offer to Hatshepsut as Osiris, detail of block 169 from south wall of Red Chapel ................................................................. 53

Appendix N – Hatshepsut appearing to offer to ‘herself’ as Osiris, Red Chapel, South Wall, Block 135 ........................................................................................................ 54

Appendix O – Dual Stela from Temple of Amun at Karnak .......................................... 55

Appendix P – Stela of Nakht, Sinai ................................................................................ 56

Appendix Q – Inscription of Kheruef .......................................................................... 57

Appendix R - Tomb of Nakht, workers pressing grapes ............................................. 58

Appendix S – Tomb of Menna, workers threshing grain ............................................. 59

Appendix T – Tomb of Rekhmire, foreigners offering tribute ..................................... 59

Appendix U – Modern symbolism .............................................................................. 60

Appendix V - Crowns .................................................................................................. 61

Appendix W – The Egyptian Fleet in Punt ................................................................. 61
SYNOPSIS

The traditional assessment of Hatshepsut’s relationship with Thutmose III, promulgated by early twentieth century writers such as Winlock and Hayes, was that the two were enemies. However, new evidence and a more modern perspective, suggests that this was not the case.

Thutmose III is likely to have supported his step-mother joining him on the throne, as it improved his own legitimacy and avoided dynastic strife. Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that Thutmose III destroyed Hathsepsut’s monuments in a resentful rage, given that the destruction was incomplete, and occurred long after her death. Finally, Hatshepsut included Thutmose III on many of her important monuments, most notable Djeser Djeseru and the Red Chapel. She depicts him as a strong Pharaoh, essentially her equal, which suggests she had some respect for him.

Evidence has led contemporary historians to assume a cooperation between the two kings. Such writers include Tyldesley, Callendar and Ray. It is likely the pharaohs shared the obligations of the office, with Thutmose III leading the army, while Hatshepsut engaged in foreign affairs such as the Journey to Punt. Together they managed administration, building works and religious ceremonies, capably and cooperatively conducting the affairs of the empire in tandem.
Hatshepsut and Thutmose III – Cooperative Co-rulers or Ruthless Rivals?

"Now my heart turns to and fro, in thinking what will the people say. those who shall see my monuments in years to come, and who shall speak of what I have done."¹

Introduction

Early historians took a critical view of Hatshepsut, and assumed that there was animosity between the female king and her co-ruler. This view was based largely on three points. Firstly, there was an assumption that she had unjustly usurped Thutmose’s throne. Secondly, evidence of damnatio memoriae was used to suggest Thutmose’s fury with his stepmother. Thirdly, images of the two rulers together seemed to show Hatshepsut as the more powerful partner, and this was used to create a theory that Thutmose was angry at having been treated as inferior. However, each of these assumptions is flawed.

Rather than being an illegal usurpation, Hatshepsut’s accession may have had more basis in historical precedent that formerly supposed. There had certainly been plenty of coregency arrangements prior to this one, and there had also been powerful female rulers. Further, it is possible that Thutmose III in fact needed his stepmother to join him on the throne. Her links to both Thutmosid and Taosid bloodlines may have been useful in giving Thutmose III legitimacy by association, thereby avoiding dynastic strife.

The nature of the damnatio memoriae also controverts theories that it was an act of anger or revenge. Images of Hatshepsut were not destroyed until twenty years after her death,

which makes the destruction look like a considered decision, rather than an act of passion. Furthermore, the destruction was not complete. Significant aspects of Hatshpsut’s physical legacy were left intact. This would not have been allowed if the true purpose of the erasures was to exact revenge by denying Hatshpsut an afterlife. If the destruction of monuments was not an act of anger, then it cannot be used as evidence that the two rulers had a poor relationship.

Historians have determined that in the majority of images where Hatshpsut and Thutmose III appear together, she seems to be in the superior position. She is depicted in front of him, and tends to wear more important crowns. From this it was extrapolated that Hatshpsut behaved like the superior partner in the coregency, and relegated Thutmose III to a secondary position. It was further concluded that he was angered by this situation, so their relationship could not have been a happy one. However, this conclusion is not supported by the evidence. The majority of the images come from Hatshpsut’s monuments, notably the Red Chapel and her mortuary temple at Djeser Djeseru. As such, they are told from her perspective, and could be expected to place her at the centre of her own story. It is telling that she includes Thutmose at all, and even allows him to share important roles, such as offering to the gods, wearing the red crown, and participating in the presentation of goods brought from Punt. If Hatshpsut truly hated Thutmose III, it is unlikely she would have included him in these significant scenes from her most important monuments.

Thus, the evidence suggesting a poor relationship between the pharaohs is increasingly seen as flawed. Contemporaneously, there is mounting evidence to suggest that the relationship was in fact a happy one, wherein the two parties supported and cooperated with each other. Such evidence includes the fact that Thutmose III lead the army during Hatshpsut’s lifetime, and may have been engaged to marry Hatshpsut’s daughter Neferure. Rather than obliterating Hatshpsut’s memory after her death, Thutmose III allowed her to be buried with full honours, and built his own mortuary temple immediately adjacent to her own. It is also likely that the two rulers shared a heb sed festival. This all suggests a positive, mutually beneficial relationship.
The Family Relationship

Hatshepsut and Thutmose III had a complicated family relationship, and were related in more than one respect.² Hatshepsut was the daughter of the pharaoh Thutmose I and his Great Royal Wife Ahmose. Ahmose herself was probably the daughter of a pharaoh, Amenhotep I. This makes both Ahmose and Hatshepsut descendents of the Taosid bloodline going all the way back to Sekenenre Tao I.

While Hatshepsut was the daughter of Thutmose’s Great Royal Wife, Thutmose I also had a son by a lesser wife, Mutnofret. It was this son, Thutmose II, who inherited his father’s throne. Perhaps in an effort to shore up the royal bloodlines, Thutmose II was married to his half-sister Hatshepsut, making them both siblings and spouses.³ At this point, Hatshepsut served as Great Royal Wife to Thutmose II, and together they had a daughter, whom they named Neferure. Like his father before him, Thutmose did not produce a son with his Great Royal Wife, but did so with a lesser wife, named Isis. That son was Thutmose III, who became heir to the Egyptian throne. This means that Thutmose III was both stepson and nephew to Hatshepsut.

Early Interpretations

In the first half of last century, the history of Hatshepsut was being pieced together by predominantly white, male historians, such as Winlock, Hayes and Steindorff and Seele. The scholars of this generation brought a particularly conservative approach to their interpretation of the archaeological finds, and judged Hatshepsut and her motives with suspicion.⁴ Their work established a story of Hatshepsut’s rise and rule which was full of intrigue, ugly ambition, and hatred-fuelled revenge. Hayes dubbed Hatshepsut ‘the vilest type of usurper’, and Winlock described how violators had vented their spite by smashing her statuary.⁵ Steindorff and Seele assumed that Hatshepsut’s rise must have been against the will of the younger pharaoh, and passionately described how Thutmose III ‘wreaked

---
² See Appendix A.
with full fury his vengeance on the departed ones who in life had thwarted his ambitions. Breasted, too, saw the destruction of monuments as an emotional expression of Thutmose’s suffering.

Such interpretations were not only the result of the historians’ context. They were also based on an incomplete set of sources. When these historians were writing, Djeser Djeser had not been fully restored. Naville had only started publishing his findings in the 1890’s approximately forty years earlier. Hatsheput’s mummy had not been identified, and the Red Chapel was still over half a century from being rebuilt. It was too early for historians to have a complete picture of Hatshepsut’s reign, and the evidence was too new and fragmentary to allow for an objective or summative interpretation. Now, nearly a century since Winlock, Hayes and Steindorff and Seele drew a picture of Hathsepsut as an evil usurper, her legacy is open to new interpretations. These interpretations take place in a post-modern context, with the advantage of a larger collection of primary source material.

**Did Hatshepsut Usurp her Stepson’s Throne?**

One of the primary reasons that early historians concluded there was a poor relationship between Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, was that she had usurped his throne. It was felt that this usurpation must have left Thutmose III angry and bitter. However, it is not at all clear that Hatshepsut’s rise to power was a usurpation, or that Thutmose III responded to it angrily. In fact, the opposite may be true.

When Thutmose II died, in Year 14 of his reign, it was his son, Thutmose III, who took his place as King. This was in accordance with Egyptian tradition that the throne should be occupied by a male. However, Thutmose III was still a young boy at this time.

---


referred to in one inscription as ‘a hawk in the nest’. So, while he occupied the official position of Pharaoh, he required assistance to govern. Hatshepsut filled this void, acting as regent for her young stepson. The biography of the official Ineni describes the situation, explaining that

[Thutmose II] went to heaven and joined the gods. His son stood in his place as King of the Two Lands, and he began to rule on the throne of him who had begotten him, [while] his sister, the God’s Wife Hatshepsut, managed the affairs of this land. The Two Lands were governed according to her plans, and work was done for her.

This inscription reveals that while Thutmose clearly held the title of Pharaoh, or ‘King of the Two Lands’, Hatshepsut was present from the beginning, taking an active role in affairs of state. She is given credit for managing the affairs of the land; it is said that the work is done for her. Initially, Hatshepsut behaved as a conventional regent, and acknowledged Thutmose III as the true pharaoh. Such regents were not uncommon in Egyptian history. Given that Thutmose III was so young, it was clear that a regent would be required to rule on his behalf. His own mother was not of royal blood, so was not an appropriate choice to do so. Hatshepsut, on the other hand, was of royal blood. She was also so central to the royal family, through her relationships to Thutmose I, Thutmose II and Thutmose III, that many in the Theban court may have seen her adoption of the regency as a natural step.

This regency, though, broke with tradition in some important respects. Ordinarily, regencies occurred where the older king invited the younger king to join him on the throne.

13 Tyldesley, ‘A royal feud?’, p.3.
15 Wilson, ‘The Queen who would be King’, p. 2.
16 Barbara Mertz ‘The Woman Who was King’ in *Temples, Tombs and Hieroglyphs*, ed. Barbara Mertz, London, 2010, p.166
The purpose here was to give the heir some experience ruling while his father was still alive to guide and advise him. These arrangements had the advantage of legitimising the ascension of the younger king, and they usually ended with the natural death of the older party to the corule. In the case of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, however, it is the younger party who is king first.\(^{18}\) He was too young to invite Hatshepsut to share the throne, so it seems likely that she made the decision herself.\(^{19}\) Also, while other coregencies were created to address the problem of finding an heir, that could not have factored into the thoughts of the young Thutmose III.\(^{20}\) So while the event of a coregency was not a New Kingdom novelty, the nature of this particular coregency did differ from the others, and therefore may have provoked some consternation among Thutmose’s court.

Even if Hatshepsut had been accepted as a regent for a child too young to rule, it must have been assumed that she would vacate the position once the child attained maturity, as other queens had done before her. This, however, did not occur. Rather, she began to engage in activities usually reserved for a sitting king. She showed herself offering directly to gods, and she commissioned a pair of obelisks for erection at Karnak.\(^{21}\) A graffito from Aswan commemorates the expedition which extracted the obelisks, and refers to Hatshepsut as ‘the king’s daughter and king’s sister, the god’s wife and great king’s wife’. Here Hatshepsut is portrayed as a woman in the traditional double-plumed crown of a god’s wife, and yet she is conducting business which usually only a pharaoh would conduct.\(^{22}\) Hatshepsut’s position gradually transformed; from her initial recognition of Thutmose’s right to rule, to her adoption of kingly rites, until eventually she herself was crowned as pharaoh, sitting alongside Thutmose III.\(^{23}\)


\(^{20}\) Ibid.


\(^{23}\) Murnane, ‘Coregencies’, p. 32.
The date of Hatshepsut’s coronation is disputed.\(^{24}\) Historians have generally agreed that it must have occurred some time between Year 2 and Year 7.\(^ {25}\) However, Professor Kanawati has proposed a much shorter timeframe. Kanawati cites a pot from the tomb of Ramose and Hatnofer, which is dated 2 Peret of Year 7, and refers to Hatshepsut as God’s Wife.\(^ {26}\) This is the last known reference to Hatshepsut as God’s Wife. She appears to have been crowned very shortly thereafter. An ostracon from the forecourt of Senenmut’s tomb, dated 4 Peret of Year 7, refers to Hatshepsut at King of Upper and Lower Egypt, as does a seal from the tomb of Ramose and Hatnofer, also from Year 7.\(^ {27}\) Certainly by the seventh year of her regency she adopts the fivefold titulary of a king, and appears in images wielding pharaonic symbols such as the crook and flail and the false beard.\(^ {28}\) Given that Hatshepsut had been exercising the powers of a pharaoh for some time before her coronation, perhaps the precise date is not altogether important. Dorman encapsulates this interpretation by casting the coronation as the time at which ‘her de jure iconography caught up with her de facto authority’.\(^ {29}\)

There is evidence to indicate that Hatshepsut’s ascent to the position of coruler may not have been offensive to Thutmose III. Some of this evidence is found in the history of Egyptian rulers, and some is more specific to the case of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. Looking firstly to the history of the Egyptian kingship, the evidence is relevant to the issue of Hatshepsut’s gender. It has been suggested in the past that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III could not have had a positive relationship because being a female, she had no right to claim the throne.\(^ {30}\) However, history shows there was some precedence for female rulers.

---

\(^{25}\) Murnane, ‘Coregencies’, p. 33.
\(^{29}\) Dorman is quoted in Sankiewicz, ‘The Co-regency’, p. 132.
\(^{30}\) Steindorff and Seele, *When Egypt Ruled the East*, p. 46.
During the reign of the pharaoh Binothris in the 2nd Dynasty, an edict declared that Egyptian women might legitimately rule.\textsuperscript{31} Two women had achieved this apex of power prior to Hatshepsut. They were Nitokris of Dynasty 7 and Sebekneferu of Dynasty 12.\textsuperscript{32} Indeed the latter of these, Sebekneferu, was lauded for taking the throne and saving her dynastic line from obscurity.\textsuperscript{33} However, it must be acknowledged that female kingship was far from being the norm. These two examples are isolated among two or three hundred male kings of the two lands, showing that while a female may take the throne legally, such an event was a marked break from tradition.\textsuperscript{34} The impact this may have had on the relationship between Thutmose III and Hatshepsut is therefore uncertain. The legality of her rule is not affected by her gender, but the fact that it was very much out of the ordinary could have resulted in ill feeling from her stepson.

A break with tradition of this nature had serious consequences in Ancient Egypt, beyond being merely unusual. Egyptians believed in \textit{ma’at}, or divine order. Disorder might lead to chaos in both the physical and spiritual worlds, with serious earthly consequences such as drought or famine.\textsuperscript{35} To have a female on the throne would be such a severe anomaly that it might be interpreted as an affront to \textit{ma’at}. This in turn might threaten the very security of the land. So while Hatshepsut’s gender may not have been a challenge to legality, it had the potential to challenge essential Egyptian beliefs, and thereby create a fear of chaos, or \textit{isfet}. As the initial legitimate pharaoh, it was Thutmose’s kingly obligation to maintain \textit{ma’at}.\textsuperscript{36} Hatshepsut’s gender, therefore, may have reflected poorly on him, if he was seen to have failed to secure order by allowing a female to share his throne.

In addition to the precedent of female pharaohs, there are further reasons to question assertions that Hatshepsut’s enthronement was an unwelcome usurpation. Firstly, it is possible that Hatshepsut, rather than taking the throne away from Thutmose III, in fact

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid.}, p.89.
\textsuperscript{33} Tyldesley, ‘A royal feud?’, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{34} Robins, \textit{Women}, pp. 37 and 51.
\textsuperscript{35} P Bradley, \textit{Ancient Egypt: Reconstructing the Past}, Cambridge, 1999, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Ibid.}. 
took the throne to protect him from dynastic strife. As has been explained, Hatshepsut was the granddaughter of Pharaoh Amenhotep of the Taosid line, and she was also daughter of Pharaoh Thutmose, first of the Thutmosid line. Her mother and grandmother were both great royal wives, so Hatshepsut’s blood was purely royal. Her forebears are purported to have stretched in an unbroken line to Seqenenre Tao, the great 17th Dynasty king who is credited with beginning the expulsion of the Hyksos. Thutmose III, on the other hand, although the son of a pharaoh, had much less royalty in his veins. Both his mother and grandmother were lesser wives, and in contrast to Hatshepsut he had no Taosid blood.

Thutmose’s lack of royal blood may have left him vulnerable to dynastic strife, in the form of challenges from the Taosid line. That faction of nobility could well have wanted Hatshepsut on the throne, continuing the glorious legacy of her Taosid ancestors. If this is the case, Thutmose III was at risk of losing his throne through civil strife. Hatshepsut’s accession actually worked in Thutmose’s favour. Rather than removing him, as the Taosid faction may have wanted, she ruled beside him, thereby strengthening his rule by association with her own. Viewed in this light, Hatshepsut’s accession was a protection for Thutmose III, and would have provoked feelings of gratitude and respect rather than animosity.

Not only did Thutmose III perhaps need Hatshepsut to prevent dynastic factionalism, but he may also have needed her for more practical reasons. It is clear from Ineni’s inscription that Hatshepsut was the effective ruler after the death of Thutmose II. One perspective acknowledges that Thutmose III may have been grateful for the leadership of his aunt. She protected his land while he grew up, and allowed him to train for greatness. Her skill in managing affairs benefitted the country, and meant that Thutmose did not suffer under the

---

37 See Appendix A.
39 Ibid, p 51.
41 Catharine Roehrig (ed), Hatshepsut: From Queen to Pharaoh, New Haven, 2005, p.2.
pressure of having to rule alone while he was young. Hatshepsut also brought great wealth to Egypt, most notably through the trading voyage to Punt.\textsuperscript{44} It is conceivable that Thutmose III was grateful for Hatshepsut’s achievements and happy to receive the reflected honour as Hatshepsut’s coruler.

Although evidence is scant, some support for this argument can be found in the dating of the reigns. Hatshepsut and Thutmose III share dates for their reign, both beginning with Year 1 from the same point in time. Thutmose III was the legitimate ruler first, and Hatshepsut was not crowned until two to seven years later. This created an assumption that Hatshepsut had backdated her rule to make it appear as though she had always been on the throne with Thutmose III.\textsuperscript{45} A more recent theory has arisen, however, to suggest that the opposite is true. Petty asserts that Hatshepsut dated her rule from the death of her father. Hatshepsut justified her rule by claiming that her father had chosen her as his successor. This justification is depicted in the coronation scenes at Djeser Djeseru, where Thutmose I is shown presenting Hatshepsut to the court and declaring:

\begin{quote}
This is my daughter, Khnemet-Amun Hatshepsut who liveth, I have appointed her... she is my successor upon my throne, she it assuredly is who shall sit upon this wonderful seat.\textsuperscript{46}
\end{quote}

Hatshepsut repeats her assertion that she was Thutmose’s successor with inscriptions on the southern pylon at Karnak and on her obelisks.\textsuperscript{47} Having made that point so definitively, Hatshepsut had little choice but to date her reign from the death of her father.\textsuperscript{48} This ignored the rule of Thutmose II entirely, but fitted with the propaganda Hatshepsut needed to justify her rule. If this is the case, then, logically, it must have been Thutmose III who altered his dates, in order to match with Hatshepsut’s.\textsuperscript{49} That would suggest no animosity between the two monarchs. Indeed, if Thutmose III altered the dates of his reign to be in

\textsuperscript{45} Murnane, ‘Coregencies’, p. 34.  
\textsuperscript{46} Inscription from Djeser Djeseru, quoted in Bradley, \textit{Ancient Egypt}, p. 291.  
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Ibid.}  
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Ibid.}
line with Hatshepsut’s, it implies that he accepted her rule. More research needs to be done in this area, to clarify the coronation dates of the two corulers. In the meantime, however, there is reason to believe that Thutmose III accepted Hatshepsut’s reign alongside his own, and did not bear her ill will.

With the entirety of this evidence in mind, the question of usurpation is not yet concluded. Certainly, Hatshepsut, as a woman, had legal right to rule, even if this did offend ma’at. Thutmose III may have resented his stepmother’s rule, as traditional historians suggested. And yet there is evidence to support the notion that they were close and cooperative. This comes from the facts that she may have saved him from dynastic strife, he was possibly grateful for her good leadership, and he may even have dated his own reign to align with her own. These issues raise sufficient questions to ensure that, in the absence of further evidence, Hatshepsut is not definitively labelled as a usurper.

The Destruction of Hatshepsut’s Monuments

After Hatshepsut’s death, her monuments were deliberately damaged or destroyed. Her image was carefully chiselled out where she appeared on her monuments, for example at her mortuary temple at Deir el Bahri. Initially her image was replaced with piles of offerings, but later these were changed to be images of Thutmose II and Thutmose III.50 Hundreds of statues of Hatshepsut were smashed and thrown into a pit at Deir el Bahri, while other fragments were strewn around the area.51 Additionally, Hatshepsut’s Red Chapel was dismantled brick by brick, and her obelisks at Karnak were hidden behind walls so they could not be seen.52

This type of destruction is a very severe punishment to be inflicted on a dead pharaoh.53 Egyptians believed that the dead lived on through their images on earth. If their name was kept alive through inscriptions and depictions, then the dead would be guaranteed an afterlife. Erasure of the names and images, then, would mean their memory would

51 Mertz, ‘The Woman who was King’ p. 180.
52 Bradley, Ancient Egypt, p. 322.
disappear from earth, and they would be denied an afterlife. It was the equivalent of being cursed by an endless death.\textsuperscript{54} This was horrific punishment indeed. Therefore the destruction of Hatshepsut’s monuments has been interpreted as punishment of Hatshepsut, and Thutmose III has been held responsible.\textsuperscript{55} Brown, for example, makes the accusation that “Thutmose III did as thorough a job smiting the iconography of King Hatshepsut as he had whacking the Canaanies at Megiddo.” This has supported theories that Thutmose III must have hated Hatshepsut, but such theories must now be examined in more detail.

If the images had been destroyed with the purpose of denying Hatshepsut an afterlife, the destruction would have been very thorough. The perpetrator ought to have ensured that every last image of Hatshepsut was destroyed. Yet, in this case, a complete obliteration was not attempted.\textsuperscript{56} The destruction, far from being deliberate and thorough, seems haphazard, almost casual.\textsuperscript{57} Firstly, only inscriptions relating to Hatshepsut as King have been obscured.\textsuperscript{58} Where Hatshepsut appears as a queen, her name and figure have been left untouched.\textsuperscript{59} This indicates that the purpose behind the damnatio memoriae relates only to Hatshepsut’s role as a pharaoh. It is not an attempt to eradicate her name entirely. Secondly, there are various nooks and recesses, hidden from the casual observer, where Hatshepsut’s throne name and cartouche survive untouched.\textsuperscript{60} On the pyramidion of a granite obelisk at Karnak, for example, Amun crowns Hatshepsut with the khepresh crown, and this image is undamaged.\textsuperscript{61} Again, this suggests a different purpose behind the erasures. It indicates that the erasures had a public purpose, but were not intended to deny Hatshepsut an afterlife. It appears that the obliteration of Hatshepsut’s images was undertaken to make a public statement about her role as King, possibly to eradicate that awkward challenge to \textit{ma’at} from history. The erasures were not part of a thorough

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{54} Tyldesley, ‘A royal feud?’, p. 2.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Dorman, ‘Wicked Stepmother?’, p. 1.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Tyldesley, \textit{Daughters of Isis}, p. 229.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Tyldesley, \textit{Hatchepsut}, p. 225.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Roehrig, \textit{Hatchepsut}, p. 267.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Donald Redford ‘The Reign of Hatchepsut’ in \textit{History and Chronology of XVIII Dynasty Egypt}, ed. Donald Redford, Toronto, 1976, p. 87.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Appendix B
\end{itemize}
damnatio memoriae with hatred at its heart. As such, they cannot be used as evidence to suggest that Thutmose III felt hatred towards Hatshepsut.

There are other important aspects of Hatshepsut’s physical legacy which were left untouched. Perhaps the most significant is her extraordinary mortuary temple at Deir el Bahri. Known as Djeser Djeseru, or Holy of Holies, the temple is acknowledged as one of the great architectural masterpieces of ancient times.\(^62\) It was built as a place of worship where Egyptians could pray to the departed Pharaoh Hatshepsut. It includes chapels to Hathor and Anubis and a sanctuary to Amun. Temple statuary depicting Hatshepsut was thrown into a pit near Djeser Djeseru, and her images were chipped from the walls, but the temple itself was left standing.\(^63\) If the destruction of the images was an attempt to deny Hatshepsut an afterlife, it is hard to explain why the temple survived. Winlock provides a reason for the anomaly, explaining that a structure dedicated to the gods cannot be lightly abandoned. He posits that the entire temple may well have been destroyed had it not contained a sanctuary to the state god Amun.\(^64\) This being the case, the failure to completely destroy Hatshepsut’s mortuary temple is not clear evidence of either hatred or sympathy for the dead pharaoh.

Perhaps more significant, then, is the evidence of Hatshepsut’s burial. She was buried in a tomb she had prepared for herself in the Valley of the Kings, with the honours and ceremony usually associated with the burial of a pharaoh.\(^65\) Hatshepsut was mummified, and rituals carried out to ensure her body and soul survived to enjoy a successful afterlife.\(^66\) As long as her body survived, she was ensured eternal life, and at no point was her body desecrated.\(^67\) This is very strong evidence to suggest that, in spite of the damnatio memoriae, there was no sincere effort to prevent Hatshepsut from living in eternity. It necessitates a rethinking of traditional interpretations, which used destruction of the
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monuments as evidence that Hatshepsut was an object of hatred. There must have been other reasons, based perhaps in politics or religion for the images to have been destroyed.

One oft-mooted explanation for the destruction of Hatshepsut’s images lies in Thutmose’s putative need to assure the succession of his son, Amenhotep II. Since Hatshepsut represented both Taosid and Thutmosid lines, descendants of the Taosid line may have hoped to take the throne. Thutmose III, as a Thutmosid family member, was motivated to erase any record of Taosid rule, and to emphasise Thutmosid legitimacy instead. By removing Hatshepsut from the record, he created a new reality, wherein Thutmosid kings ruled in an unbroken line from Thutmose I, down to his great-grandson, Amenhotep I. This would characterise the damnatio memoriae as an act of political expediency, rather than vengeance or emotion. In support of this theory, there is evidence that Thutmose rarely put his own name over that of Hatshepsut. Rather, her replaced her name with those of Thutmose I or Thutmose II. This indicates that the emphasis, for Thutmose III, was not on seeking personal revenge or retribution, but on solidifying dynastic security for his son.

The flaw with this train of argument, however, is the fact that no real contender for the throne has been revealed, other than Amenhotep I. The destruction would seem an excessive step to take in shoring up Amenhotep’s claim to the throne, if there were no challengers to the throne at the time. Future excavations may settle the question if they reveal a challenge to the succession. The question may remain unsettled, however, since it is clear that opposition to Amenhotep, if it existed, was not successful. In such a case we would not expect the material evidence to highlight the unsuccessful candidate. Those in power had little motivation to advertise challenges to their legitimacy, and the challengers themselves, having been unsuccessful, would have had little opportunity to erect monuments to their failure.
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Further evidence that Thutmose III acted out of political expediency, rather than hatred, is the timing of the damnatio memoriae. Nims has ascertained that the revision of Hatshepsut’s monuments did not occur until twenty years after her death, and this conclusion is generally supported.\(^{72}\) Twenty years is surely too long to wait if the destruction was motivated by hatred of Hatshepsut or resentment of her rule. Rather, it reflects a changed attitude towards her portrayal in public.\(^{73}\) Furthermore, the destruction was incomplete. It was undertaken during a short period of time, and seems to have stopped once Amenhotep was securely on the throne.\(^{74}\) This further supports the theory that the destruction was undertaken for the purpose of securing Amenhotep’s succession, rather than out of personal vengeance.

Another motive for the destruction exists in the Egyptians’ belief in *ma’at*. The existence of a female pharaoh has been discussed above as a challenge to *ma’at*, since a female on the throne was a disruption to the natural order of things.\(^{75}\) Hatshepsut may even have included *ma’at* in her throne name, Maatkare, in order to combat such ideas.\(^{76}\) It has been noted that Hatshepsut’s gender may have given Thutmose III a reason to resent Hatshepsut’s corule. Even if Thutmose III did not resent Hatshepsut at the time of their joint rule, the issue of a female ruler may have arisen much later, to motivate the erasure of images.\(^{77}\) Removing her from the King lists and the monuments may well have been an attempt to re-establish or maintain *ma’at*.\(^{78}\) It may have been necessary to avoid decline and retribution associated with a failure of *ma’at*.\(^{79}\) While the reign may have been amicable, and Hatshepsut’s contribution valuable, *ma’at* may have demanded that it be obliterated from national memory.
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The female king might also have been erased from the record in order to discourage other females from seeking the crown. There are various explanations as to why Hatshepsut may have been tolerated on throne, such as her ability, her bloodlines, and her strong support among the political and religious elite. But these explanations attach to Hatshepsut personally, and do not extend to women in general. Although Hatshepsut may have been accepted, the tradition of a male on the throne remained valuable to New Kingdom Egyptians, and it is possible that they were unwilling to see this tradition eroded beyond Hatshepsut’s unusual rule. Altering the record to omit a female ruler could have been a strategy to ensure that the single exception did not give rise to further exceptions, which would then have eroded an important tradition. If this is the case, then the damnatio memoriae does not reflect on the relationship between Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, but is the expression of a more general concern.

Evidence that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III shared a good relationship

Much of the foregoing discussion has been based in conjecture; drawing the best possible conclusions from scant evidence. Much of it relates to Thutmose’s state of mind when he ordered the destruction of Hatshepsut’s monuments, and of course the state of mind of this ancient King will always be a matter of conjecture. There is, however, other evidence to suggest that the relationship between Thutmose III and his stepmother was strong and mutually supportive.

According to tradition, when Hatshepsut began construction of her mortuary temple, Djeser Djeseru, she buried foundation deposits to ensure the construction was blessed. These objects have now been excavated and they include various small items with Thutmose’s name on them.80 For example, scarabs from the site show cartouches bearing the throne name of Thutmose III.81 These foundation deposits were laid when Thutmose
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III was still a very young boy.\textsuperscript{82} They suggest that Hatshepsut had no ill feeling towards Thutmose III, and recognised him even when creating a monument to herself. Although tiny, these scarabs provide weighty evidence that the relationship was a positive one.

Further foundation deposits were unearthed at the temple at Hierakonpolis, and these date from later in the reign. The Petrie Museum holds foundation plaques which reveal the names of both Hatshepsut and Thutmose III together.\textsuperscript{83} This suggests that the two royals founded the temple together when they were co-regents. Although this evidence is fragmentary, and minimal, when added to the other finds, they combine to suggest a strong relationship.

There are other small but important finds from this era which support the theory of a cohesive joint rule. Appendix D shows two examples of finger rings which bear the cartouches of both Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. They are held in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum in New York. The rings are evidence of a contemporary perception that, just as the two cartouches lie harmoniously together, the two kings ruled harmoniously together. Even more persuasive is the fact that Thutmose III gave such a ring to one of his foreign wives.\textsuperscript{84} This indicates that Thutmose himself endorsed the representation of the two kings together, and found it an appropriate motif for a significant gift. Furthermore, an alabaster jar, inscribed with Hatshepsut’s cartouches, was found among Thutmose’s grave goods.\textsuperscript{85} Unfortunately, archaeologists are not completely sure that the jar formed part of Thutmose’s grave collection, even though it was stored with other grave goods.\textsuperscript{86} If the jar was indeed, buried with Thutmose III, it would suggest that even long after Hatshepsut’s death, and long after the damnatio memoriae, Thutmose III felt close enough to his stepmother to honour her in his own tomb.
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The length of the joint rule, fifteen years, is indicative of the nature of the rulers’ relationship. Each of the parties was a pharaoh, and thereby certainly powerful enough to have had the other killed if he or she had desired. If Hatshepsut had borne ill feeling towards Thutmose III, she could have had him disposed of at any time. Initially, after all, he was only a child. Thutmose III was too young, at the beginning, to think of murdering Hatshepsut. And yet, even when he attained maturity, he let her live. The fact that both rulers appear on monuments together also shows that neither party sought to exile the other from Egypt. This leads to the conclusion that he accepted the coregency, and worked willingly with his stepmother, and equally, she was happy to share the throne with him.

Unwilling to accept that the two rulers were on good terms, some historians have sought to find other reasons why Thutmose III might have accepted the corule so passively. There have been allegations that Hatshepsut was so powerful and well-supported that Thutmose III was not able to stand up to her. Hatshepsut certainly had the support of the powerful Amun cult. She had enjoyed a long relationship with the priests of Amun since childhood, serving as God’s Wife of Amun when she was married to Thutmose II and continuing to offer Amun praise and material wealth. For example, Hatshepsut dedicated a chapel to Amun in her impressive mortuary temple. She credited him with guiding the trading expedition to Punt, and thereafter offered him the benefits of this mission. The command to travel to Punt came ‘from the great throne, an oracle of the god himself’, writes Hatshepsut in her mortuary temple. She claims Amun instructed her to ‘establish for him a Punt in his house’. Hatshepsut also proclaimed herself the daughter of Amun in the Birth Colonnade at Djeser Djeseru. There, inscriptions describe the moment when Amun impregnated Hatshepsut’s mother, Ahmose:

91 Joyce Tyldesley, *Daughters of Isis*, p. 225.
93 Ibid.
She waked at the fragrance of the god, which she smelled in the presence of his Majesty. He went to her immediately… When he came before her she rejoiced at the sight of his beauty, his love passed into her limbs…

Such inscriptions consistently emphasise the very close relationship between Hatshepsut and the Amun cult; a cult so powerful that perhaps Thutmose III had no choice but to bend to their will.

In addition to the priests of the Amun cult, Hatshepsut had powerful political allies, many of whom had served her father, Thutmose I. They included Ineni and Ahmose-Pennekheb. Most influential of all was Hapusoneb. High priest of Amun, Hapusoneb was also given the title ‘chief of the prophets of south and north’. Breasted reports that under Hatshepsut

[the] formation of a priesthood of the whole land into a coherent organisation with a single individual at its head appears for the first time. This new and great organisation, was thus through Hapusoneb, enlisted on the side of Hatshepsut.

Yet any suggestion that Hatshepsut and her supporters intimidated Thutmose III into submission must be seriously questioned. In his Annals at Karnak, Thutmose III reveals himself as a true warrior king; brave and successful. Although these reports are autobiographical, and subject to the exaggeration of propaganda, there is a core truth to Thutmose’s military success. He was hardly the type of character to be intimidated. Furthermore, Thutmose III was not an opponent of Hatshepsut’s advisers. On the contrary, there is evidence that he worked with them quite cooperatively. Thutmose III retained the vizier Amunwosre, who had previously been vizier under Hatshepsut. Thutmose III is also shown on a stela at Karnak, granting property to Hatshepsut’s chief steward,
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Senenmut. He was also not alienated by the Amun cult. In Hathsepsut’s own mortuary temple, Thutmose III is shown wearing the double crown while he is embraced by the god Amun. Therefore, while it is true that Hatshepsut was powerful and well-supported, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that Thutmose III was cowed into cooperation. The more likely explanation is far more simple. That is, that the two kings ruled happily together.

Thutmose III would be unlikely to have resented Hatshepsut if the older regent treated him with respect. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that she did treat him respectfully. Hatshepsut may have exceeded the tradition role of a regent by claiming kingly powers, yet we have seen that she had reasons to do so. Importantly, she never took the next step and tried to establish a solo reign. On the contrary, Hatshepsut allowed Thutmose III to train with the army, and ultimately, from Year 20, to lead it. Thutmose’s forays into Nubia, and possibly Gaza, took place before Hatshepsut’s death. This is a clear indication of the trust Hatshepsut put in Thutmose III. If she had feared him, or mistrusted him, she would hardly have put the weaponry of the empire within his reach.

Additionally, evidence suggests that a marriage was planned, and perhaps even occurred, between Thutmose III and Hatshepsut’s daughter Neferure. The queenship is a position that must be filled in New Kingdom Egypt. Just as Horus had a wife, so must a pharaoh have a wife. There is no explicit evidence of Thutmose III having had a wife. If he did, however, Neferure was the obvious candidate. She was the daughter of a pharaoh (Thumose II) and she inherited two dynastic bloodlines from her mother. A stela from Sinai in regnal year 11 refers to Neferure as God’s Wife, a title reserved for the wife of a pharaoh. This suggests that Hatshepsut married her daughter to Thutmose III. Such a marriage implies political allegiance, as well as trust, between Hatshepsut and Thutmose
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III. It might also suggested that Hatshepsut was helping Thutmose III to shore up his bloodlines. If Neferure could provide Thutmose III with a child, it would add her Taosid blood to his Thutmosid blood. It would also improve his progeny’s royal credentials, since he himself was the spawn of a lesser wife.

Elsewhere, Neferure is portrayed as a young child wearing the uraeus on her forehead, and the pharaonic beard below her chin. These images endow the young princess with kingly attributes. This is unusual indeed, and has been interpreted as an indication that Hatshepsut intended her daughter to follow her onto the throne. Contrary to an expedient marriage, any such plans exceed the imputed role for Neferure as God’s Wife, and take on a more threatening character. Thutmose III would surely have favoured his son’s accession over another female who was not his own child. If Hatshepsut really was intending Neferure to rule, it may well have damaged her relationship with Thutmose III. In any case, such suppositions are moot, since Neferure predeceased both Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.

A good relationship between the kings is suggested by the evidence relating to jubilee ceremonies. On the pillars of the middle colonnade at Djeser Djeseru, Hatshepsut depicts her sed festival, or royal jubilee. One of the most important festivals relating to kingship, the sed festival renews the king’s right to rule, and strengthens his (or her) kingly powers. Uniquely, in Hatshepsut’s scenes, Thutmose III is also depicted. Here we find two kings, both taking part in the same sed festival. They are both shown making offerings of milk and water, with Hatshepsut to the north, and Thutmose III to the south. Although Thutmose III takes a lesser role in these scenes, his very presence is indicative of a strong relationship between the two. Tyldesley is satisfied that the two did share the festival. This would suggest a strong relationship, where each was happy to publicly celebrate a shared rule with the other. However, Roehrig disputes that the event occurred.
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She argues that the evidence does not support a firm conclusion. Rather, she suggests the depictions are aspirational, showing what Hatshepsut hoped might happen.\textsuperscript{111} Even so, if this is what Hatshepsut desired, then she was desirous of harmony between herself and her stepson. Either way, the images suggest a strong relationship.

The greatest physical monument to Hatshepsut’s reign is her mortuary temple at Deir el Bahri, Djeser Djeseru. Hatshepsut built this edifice beside the mortuary temple of Mentuhotep, and designed it so that the two would be compatible.\textsuperscript{112} The temples acted as way-stations for the barques of the gods during the Beautiful Feast of the Valley.\textsuperscript{113} Following Hatshepsut’s death, Thutmose III erected his own temple at Deir el Bahri, directly adjacent to Djeser Djeseru, and with a complementary architectural design.\textsuperscript{114} This was unusual, given that Thutmose already had a temple, not far away, in Qurna.\textsuperscript{115} Additionally, the site chosen by Thutmose III at Deir el Bahri was a narrow rocky slope, and exceptionally inconvenient for the erection of a major temple.\textsuperscript{116} Once completed, Thutmose’s temple, known as Djeser Akhet, also became part of the procession associated with the Beautiful Feast of the Valley.\textsuperscript{117}

It has been suggested that Thutmose III built here in order to overshadow Hatshepsut’s temple, and shame her by comparison, using the propaganda of architecture to dominate her memory.\textsuperscript{118} However, this interpretation seems deliberately and unnecessarily adversative. Thutmose III had the option to destroy Hatshepsut’s temple, and even reuse the stones, but he did not. He could have rerouted the Beautiful Feast procession to avoid Deir el Bahri, but he did not. Rather, by building right near Djeser Djeseru, he ensured that the procession continued to include Hatshepsut’s monument. The festival of the Beautiful Feast of the Valley is centred upon reverence for deceased relatives. If
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Thutmose III had felt true hatred for his stepmother, he would not have gone out of his way to build a temple which ensured her continued memory through an annual festival. Equally, Thutmose III could have made his temple very different, thereby emphasising the difference between himself and Hatshepsut, but he did not. Rather, he used a consistency of architecture to link the two. If Thutmose III were indeed trying to distance himself from Hatshepsut, he would not have erected his monument directly beside hers. The monuments stand together as a visual representation of the good relationship between the pharaohs.

Taken together, this evidence supports the conclusion that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III had a strong relationship. She included him in the foundation deposits of her great temple, and in depictions of her sed festival. She trusted him to rule the army while they were coregents, and he did so without threat to Hatshepsut. The two kings shared important officials, and Thutmose III may even have been engaged or married to Hatshepsut’s daughter. These factors exist across disparate fields of political, social and military concern, consistently indicating a strong and mutually supportive relationship.

**Images of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III**

Throughout the coregency, Hatshepsut and Thutmose III appeared together in a plethora of images, decorating the walls of a range of monumental buildings, including those Hatshepsut herself had commissioned. Her inclusion of the younger pharaoh on her own monuments is a physical expression of her acceptance of him. In order to understand the implications of the available images, it is necessary to consider them each in turn. Additionally, they must be considered as a group, in order to determine trends in the way the pharaohs are arranged in relation to each other, as well as trends in the different crowns they wear. When all these aspects are considered, it becomes evident that Hatshepsut was honouring Thutmose III by including him on her monuments. The images do not support the conclusion that the pair had a poor relationship.
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Images at Djeser Djeseru

Perhaps the most significant images of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III together are those which occur on the walls of her mortuary temple at Deir el Bahri. This building was Hatshepsut’s most significant monument. Its primary purpose was to provide a place where Hatshepsut could be worshipped after her death. The essential nature of Djeser Djeseru is thus as a monument to Hatshepsut, and she uses the walls to represent the highlights of her life as she would like them to be remembered. As such, one would expect to find that her images are the predominant ones. It is natural for a ruler building a monument to himself to include himself as the central motif throughout that monument. This is particularly true in Ancient Egypt, where such monuments are used as communication devices; telling the story of the monarch’s life and reign. Examples include Thutmose’s own Annals in the Amun temple at Karnak, and the scenes of the Battle of Kadesh preserved by Ramesses II. These representations are propagandist in nature, serving to glorify deeds of the kings who created them. The tradition of this kind of self-promotion can be traced as far back as Narmer in the early Dynastic period. Hatshepsut was adhering to tradition in her self-aggrandisement at Djeser Djeseru, and if Thutmose III were not included at all, this could be understood in the context of the building.

However, Thutmose III does appear on the walls at Djeser Djeseru. His very inclusion in this context is telling. While Hatshepsut may have been justified in excluding Thutmose III from her funerary monument, in order to focus attention on herself, she did not do so. Rather, she depicts him in numerous locations throughout all three terraces of the temple. In fact Thutmose III appears a total of 102 times. That Hatshepsut included Thutmose III in these images, when the nature of the building provided sufficient reason to exclude him, is very weighty evidence that she respected him. Furthermore, Hatshepsut portrays Thutmose III as an important participant in events. He is not relegated to
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subservient or unimportant roles, but is depicted conducting a range of kingly affairs, such as making offerings to the gods, and participating in the Opet festival.\textsuperscript{126} It is not necessary that Hatshepsut portray Thutmose III as her equal at Djeser Djeseru in order to suggest that the two had a good relationship. It is sufficient that she included him at all, and portrayed him with respect.

There are some key scenes of Thutmose III at Djeser Djeseru. Many of the depictions occur in the Sanctuary of Amun, on the Upper Terrace.\textsuperscript{127} Since this is the main set of rooms at the temple, Hatshepsut could be interpreted to be honouring Thutmose III by depicting him there. In the sanctuary, the two rulers are seen kneeling together, making wine and milk offerings to Amun.\textsuperscript{128} This is an image of two kings participating in an important ritual together, implying a strong relationship. Elsewhere, Thutmose III is seen making offerings to gods including Horus and Re-Harakte.\textsuperscript{129} He is also depicted being embraced by Amun.\textsuperscript{130} These images represent Hatshepsut’s choice to depict Thutmose III conducting respected and important pharaonic roles.

One of the centrepieces of Hatshepsut’s reign, as she chose to have it depicted at Djeser Djeseru, was the trading expedition to Punt. This expedition, which took place in Year 9, is detailed in a series of reliefs in the southern portico of the second terrace of the temple. The amount of space devoted to describing this expedition at the temple is an indication of its importance in Hatshepsut’s narrative. She was determined to have the mission commemorated in detail. It might be expected that she guard all the credit for the journey for herself. And yet Hatshepsut displays Thutmose III participating in scenes at the conclusion of the mission, as the spoils are returned to Egypt and presented to Amun. In one scene, the figures of Hatshepsut, her chief adviser Senenmut, and the expedition’s captain, Nehesy, have been chiselled out. The figure of Thutmose III remains, wearing the khepresh crown and offering two jars of myrrh to Amun.\textsuperscript{131} The inclusion of Thutmose III
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in this vital scene, which celebrates a successful trading mission and honours the state god with the spoils, is a clear indication of Hatshepsut’s good relationship with the younger king. Hatshepsut must have felt close to her coruler in order to honour him in this way.

Another important series at Djeser Djeseru represents the Opet Festival.\textsuperscript{132} This annual event, lasting over a week, saw the statues of Amun, his wife and his son removed from the sanctuary at Karnak and borne on barques with great fanfare to Luxor.\textsuperscript{133} The Opet Festival was one of the preeminent events of the Egyptian calendar; a time when the general population enjoyed the generosity of the monarch, who provided them with time away from the their work, sponsored feasts, and allowed them a glimpse of the cult statues, which were normally hidden away in the temple’s inner sanctum.\textsuperscript{134} The Festival thereby created goodwill toward the monarch who provided its delights. Just as Hatshepsut allowed Thutmose III to share in the glory of the successful trip to Punt, she also allowed him to be present in scenes of the Opet festival. A fragment of a relief from the upper terrace of Djeser Djeseru shows Thutmose III taking part in Opet festivities.\textsuperscript{135} Hatshepsut, Thutmose II and Thutmose III are all present as the principal barque, and other barques, are transported during the festival.\textsuperscript{136} This is evidence that Hatshepsut felt no ill feeling towards Thutmose III, as she was generous in sharing the credit for the Festival with him.

There are a small number of scenes at Deir el Bahri where Thutmose III is clearly portrayed in a role lesser than Hatshepsut’s. Firstly, in the shrine of Hathor at Djeser Djeseru, he is shown worshipping Hatshepsut, in the guise of the cow goddess Hathor.\textsuperscript{137} It would be tempting to interpret this is an image of Thutmose III in subordination to the female king, since he is worshipping her. However, this conclusion would be rash. In this instance, Thutmose III should be interpreted as worshipping Hathor, not Hatshepsut. The purpose of the scene is not to subordinate Thutmose III to Hatshepsut, but rather to
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emphasise the connection between Hatshepsut and Hathor.138 Thutmose’s role, by participating in a scene where Hatshepsut is given godly connotations, is to legitimise Hatshepsut’s own position as King. Images throughout Djeser Djeseru emphasise Hatshepsut’s divine links, most notably the divine birth and coronation scenes. Taken together, her purpose of legitimising her rule becomes clear. In this context, the Hathor scene is simply part of a programme of legitimisation, rather than a symbol of Thutmose’s inferiority.

**Images in The Red Chapel**

More complete Opet scenes are present in the Red Chapel, or Chappelle Rouge, at Karnak. This is unsurprising, as the chapel itself was built as a barque station for use during the Festival.139 On block 26 of the South Wall, Hatshepsut and Thutmose III are seen together accompanying the barque of Amun.140 A nearby scene, on block 169, shows both kings together again, escorting the barque on its journey.141 These images link Thutmose III with both Hatshepsut and the Opet festival, on a monument which she commissioned. This indicates that Hatshepsut was comfortable representing them as colleagues in the kingship, and was content to share the regal limelight with him.

The images throughout the Red Chapel suggest a duality, with the two kings functioning equally.142 Looking at the two Opet images as an example, the kings appear almost identical to each other. They both wear the same triangular kilt, and the same headdresses. They adopt the same physical stance, striding forward in both scenes, and their figures are the same size. In the barque scene they both hold a was sceptre, a symbol of kingly power. In the offering scene, the only small difference is that Thutmose III holds offering jars in both hands, while Hatshepsut offers one jar and one bundle of reeds, representing Upper and Lower Egypt. This small difference should not be interpreted to set Hatshepsut apart from Thutmose III, as throughout the Chapel both kings are shown making various

140 Robins, *Women*, p. 45. See Appendix K.
141 See Appendix L.
142 Davies, ‘Hatshepsut’s Use of Tuthmosis III’, p. 64.
offerings of milk, incense, food and other items. There is no reason to imbue these offerings with a hierarchy; they appear to be interchangeable. Therefore the Red Chapel scenes indicate an equality inherent in the relationship between Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.

On the far left of Block 169 from the South wall of the Red Chapel, an image depicts Thutmose III appearing to offer to Hatshepsut as Osiris. Thutmose III wears the blue khepresh crown, and is seen offering in front of Hatshepsut as she stands in front of one of her way stations. Hatshepsut is depicted as Osiris; she is mumiform, with arms crossed, and wearing the double crown. She is identified by the cartouche above her head. However, Thutmose III is not offering to Hatshepsut, as such. The inscription below the offering reads ‘jr.t snTr n Jmn-Ra’, meaning ‘offering incense to Amun Ra’. The adjacent block from the same wall at the Red Chapel depicts Hatshepsut offering to her own image as Osiris. The two kings are thus both engaged equally in offering to gods, in similar scenes. Hatshepsut is not offering to herself, and so Thutmose III should not be interpreted as offering to her either. In both cases, the kings are following the usual programme, and offering to the great gods Amun and Osiris. Once again, the image suggests their equality, not any subordination of one to the other.

The history of the Red Chapel itself is extremely pertinent to this discussion. Hatshepsut initiated the building of the chapel while she was alive, however, she died before it was complete. At this point, if Thutmose III had felt true hatred toward Hatshepsut, he might have immediately halted building works. But he did not. Rather, Thutmose III continued decorating the shrine. This indicates that for a time at least, Thutmose III felt close enough to his stepmother to continue working on a shrine which honoured the two of them

143 See Appendix M.
145 This is block 135. See Appendix N.
together. At some point, however, Thutmose III had a change of heart. He ceased work on the chapel and dismantled it.\(^{149}\) The stones were initially stored, and then used in other structures.\(^{150}\) Stones from the Red Chapel were discovered in the foundations of the Temple of Ptah, and as filler in the Third Pylon at the Amun temple, which was erected by Amenhotep III.\(^{151}\) Just like the delay in the execution of the damnatio memoriae, this timeline of events suggests that Thutmose III did not act out of anger as soon as Hatshepsut died. Instead, he made a measured decision some time later. His motivation for dismantling the temple is unclear, but cannot be assumed to have been hatred or anger.

**Depictions on Lesser Monuments**

A stela from the Temple of Amun at Karnak commemorates the dedication of a monument to Amun there.\(^{152}\) The stela shows Hatshepsut leading Thutmose III to make offerings to the god Amun. Her positioning gives her superiority over Thutmose III, as she is closer to the god, is more active in making the offerings, and is also in front of Thutmose. Yet, Thutmose III is seen in a more important crown than Hatshepsut, and their figures are equal in proportions. So the image does not exclusively portray Hatshepsut as superior. In addition to analysing the figures and their actions, it should be noted that this stela was erected by the monarchs together, in the important Temple of Amun, during their joint rule.\(^{153}\) This indicates that they were working cohesively together. It is also evidence that Hatshepsut did not exclude Thutmose III from her close relationship with the Amun cult, but actually worked with him to glorify the state god. The dedication of a monument to Amun is evidence of the two kings fulfilling the traditional religious role of the pharaoh, not separately, but together.

There are various monuments outside of Egypt which make reference to the joint pharaohs. In Sinai, the Stela of Nakht shows both Hatshepsut and Thutmose III offering to the local gods.\(^{154}\) Hatshepsut is shown on the right, wearing the blue war crown, and offering bread

---


\(^{150}\) Larché, ‘Red Chapel Restoration’, p. 56.
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to Anhur-Show. Thutmose III is depicted on the left, facing Hatshepsut and in identical proportions. He wears the red crown of Lower Egypt, and presents an offering of wine to Hathor. This stela is dated from Year 20 of the reign, and with the exception of the different crowns, depicts the two kings as equals.\footnote{Murnane, ‘Coregencies’, p. 39.} Even the positioning of the kings is almost equal, since they are facing each other, rather than one leading the other.

The depiction on the Inscription of Kheruef, found near a turquoise mine in Sinai, is similar, with the two kings depicted as equals, although in different crowns and kilts.\footnote{Roehrig, \textit{Hatshepsut}, p. 99. See Appendix Q.} Unusually, in this image, the kings have their backs to one another as they present their offerings to the gods. This stance does little to imply one king is superior to the other. Since the monuments of Nakht and Kheruef were erected by officials, and not by the kings themselves, they may be representative of the way Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were perceived by third parties. The implication is that observers considered Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were equal partners in the kingship.

Also beyond the borders of Egypt is the Temple of Buhen, in Nubia. This temple was built and decorated jointly by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.\footnote{Dorman, ‘Hatshepsut’, p. 5.} The building of temples was an important expression of any pharaoh’s religious role. The fact that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III cooperated to build this one is an indication of their partnership. The decoration of the temple is further evidence. Hatshepsut and Thutmose III alternate in the scenes, each having equal turn to present offerings and participate in rituals.\footnote{Dorman, ‘Hatshepsut’, p. 5.} Here is further evidence of the cooperative nature of the corule.

**Physical Positioning of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III**

The scenes on the stela of Nakht, the inscription of Kheruef, and the Temple of Buhen, are, however, rare in their depiction of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III as equals. The majority of scenes place Hatshepsut’s figure in front of her stepson’s.\footnote{Sankiewicz, ‘The Co-regency’, p. 141.} So, while the two figures are are usually the same size, wear the same regalia, and engage in the same activities, she
appears first. The scenes from the Red Chapel are a perfect example of this tradition. Thutmose III is consistently depicted as following Hatshepsut, while she leads. This occurs in 62% of the scenes they share, and in the remainder the kings are usually shown facing each other. Hatshepsut is never shown subordinated to Thutmose III. This placement has been interpreted as an indication of Hatshepsut’s superiority. Yet such a conclusion does not necessarily mean their relationship was strained. Firstly, these monuments were erected by Hatshepsut, and as such it is understandable that she would depict herself in the primary position. Secondly, even if there was an understanding that Hatshepsut was the senior ruler, this may not have created poor relations between the two. It is conceivable that Thutmose III accepted Hatshepsut’s seniority based on her age alone. Furthermore, if she helped him to maintain his rule, as has been suggested, he may have been grateful for her to assume the role of senior ruler and guide.

Not all historians, however, accept the notion that these images portray Hathsepsut as the senior ruler. It has been suggested that depicting the two rulers one in front of the other was a stylistic attempt to portray them as being side by side. The artists have gone to great lengths to ensure that all other elements of the depictions are identical, so Davies suggests that equality was the clear message. She argues that the positioning of the pair should not be allowed to negate those consistent features of equality. Yet, the positioning of Hatshepsut in front is too consistent to ignore. If there were no relative importance implied, one would expect to find a roughly equal mix of scenes where Hatshepsut leads, and scenes where Thutmose III leads. This is not the case. The few scenes where Thutmose III leads Hatshepsut are all from very early in the corule, probably while Hatshepsut remained regent. By the time she has attained the position of pharaoh, the images almost exclusively show her in the lead. The exceptions have the two pharaohs
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facing one another. The imagery is too consistent to assume that it has no deeper meaning. The portrayal of Hatshepsut as the leading partner is almost certainly deliberate.

The theory that the portrayal of the two pharaohs indicated they were side by side does correlate to some extent with New Kingdom artistic techniques. There are few examples from New Kingdom art which show there was a method of portraying people side by side. The tomb of Nakht is one example, where slaves are shown stomping grapes, side by side.\(^{167}\) Similarly, in the tomb of Menna, field workers thresh wheat alongside one another.\(^{168}\) In both cases, however, the individuals involved are nameless slaves engaged in manual labour. Where they are shown side by side, the figures further from the gaze are partially obscured. This may not have been acceptable in the case of higher class citizens, and it was certainly not the norm. In most cases, crowds are depicted in lines, where the figures do not overlap. An excellent example is found in the busy tribute scenes from the 18\(^{th}\) dynasty tomb of the vizier Rekhmire.\(^{169}\) If the overlaying technique were applied in the case of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, one of them would have been obscured. Instead, a choice has been made to represent both figures completely. Although this necessitated one being behind the other, this may have been more respectful to Thutmose III than having his figure obscured behind Hatshepsut’s.

There are other elements of Thutmose’s position which reflect his subordination to Hatshepsut. Thutmose III is usually turned towards the left. In Egyptian art, the person who is oriented rightward is perceived as dominant.\(^ {170}\) Additionally, Thutmose III is most often portrayed on the northern and eastern walls of the monuments, while Hatshepsut is depicted on the south and west, which are the more important orientations.\(^ {171}\) Finally, the placement of Hatshepsut in front of Thutmose III not only affects his physical relationship to her, but also his comparative relationship to the gods. By virtue of being in front, Hatshepsut is closer to the gods whom the two kings approach.\(^ {172}\) Each of these spatial
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elements is a subtle reminder of the kings’ relative importance. The messages implied by the images may seem obscure to the modern viewer, but the Egyptians of the New Kingdom were well versed in the meanings embedded in images. Just as the double yellow arches or the black swoosh have a universal meaning in today’s world, the positioning of the two pharaohs could have been easily interpreted by the contemporary viewer.\textsuperscript{173}

**Crowns worn by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III**

New Kingdom Egyptian pharaohs are depicted in a range of different crowns, each with their own symbolism.\textsuperscript{174} The white crown symbolises Upper Egypt, while the red crown symbolises Lower Egypt. Since Thebes, the administrative and religious centre of the New Kingdom, was located in Upper Egypt, that crown carries more import than its white counterpart. The most significant crown is the double crown, a combination of the white and red crowns. The double crown evokes the unification of Upper and Lower Egypt. As such, it reinforces the power of the Pharaoh who wears it to rule over the entire land.

Other crowns include the simple blue khepresh crown, which is commonly interpreted as a military symbol, and the Atef crown, which adds an ostrich feather to either side of the white crown, and is associated with the god Osiris.\textsuperscript{175} The blue and gold striped nemes headdress, made famous by the funeral mask of Tutankhamun, is not technically a crown, but is a symbol of pharaonic power nonetheless.

In a comprehensive quantitative analysis of the crowns worn by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, Davies finds that Hatshepsut’s superiority is reinforced by the headwear she is depicted wearing.\textsuperscript{176} The most important crown, the double crown, is worn by Thutmose III only twice. By comparison, Hatshepsut is depicted in that crown four times at Djeser Djeseru alone.\textsuperscript{177} Similarly, at Djeser Djeseru, Hatshepsut wears the white crown nine times, while Thutmose III wears it only three times.\textsuperscript{178} He is found in the less important

\textsuperscript{173} See Appendix U.
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\textsuperscript{176} Davies, ‘Hatshepsut’s Use of Tuthmosis III’, pp. 57-ff
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid, pp. 57-58.
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red crown three times more often than Hatshepsut.\textsuperscript{179} The most common crowns for Hatshepsut to be depicted in are the atef, white and red crowns, but Thutmose III is most often seen in the inferior nemes and blue crowns.\textsuperscript{180} When such statistics are compared in isolation from the context of the images, they suggest a policy of depicting Hatshepsut as the more important pharaoh. Since these images come almost exclusively from Hatshepsut’s own monuments, it is to be expected that she would cast herself as the more important king.

However, a quantitative analysis may not be the appropriate method to adopt in this case. The contemporary viewer was surely not keeping a tally of the crowns and their respective wearers. Yet the viewer was subject to the inherent meaning in the images, and even if that viewer wasn’t tracking the exact occurrences, he or she was more than likely subject to the general impression they gave. From this perspective, the figures indicate that the contemporary viewer would have subtly received the message that Hatshepsut was more important than Thutmose III. Conversely, perhaps the viewer received a different message. Perhaps even the occasional appearance of Thutmose III in important crowns, and on the monuments of Hatshepsut herself, was sufficient to give an impression that he was regarded as important.

In some respects, this question is unimportant, and the real issue is what Hatshepsut may have intended by the depictions. This is also a question of interpretation. One interpretation is that Hatshepsut deliberately portrayed Thutmose III, on balance, in less important crowns than her own. She may have done this to spite him, or to reflect her true feeling that he was inferior to herself. However, an opposite interpretation is also possible. The fact that Hatshepsut portrayed Thutmose III on her own important monuments at all, and even sometimes in the double crown, or the white crown of Upper Egypt, indicates her acceptance of him. The same quandary arises in assessing Thutmose’s response to the portrayals. Without further evidence, imputing Thutmose’s reaction would require an irresponsible level of hypothesis. It is not possible to determine whether he was pleased to
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be included, or insulted by the differences, relying only on the current available sources. Unfortunately, this issue must remain unresolved.

It is worth recalling briefly here the evidence left by Nakht and Kheruef, in Sinai. These inscriptions are far from Thebes, and were erected by officials, not by the monarchs themselves. In each of these images, Hatshepsut wears the blue war crown, and Thutmose III wears the more important red crown of Lower Egypt. These two sources alone are insufficient evidence on which to base firm conclusions, yet it is interesting that non-royal monuments subtly promote Thutmose’s superiority, while the monuments sanctioned by Hatshepsut naturally cast her as more important. There may be a difference between the way in which Hatshepsut wanted to be perceived, and the way in which she was in fact perceived.

**How the Relationship Functioned**

The available evidence supports a conclusion that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III shared a good relationship. Beyond that, however, there has been little analysis. Few historians have commented on the way in which the two rulers shared power, or how they divided the obligations of the office. New Kingdom Pharaohs were expected to fulfil certain traditional roles. With the crown came the responsibility to be a builder, to perpetuate the state religion, to engage in foreign affairs, and to competently administer the kingdom. It is now possible to assess how Hatshepsut and Thutmose III divided those roles between them. Any such division is indicative of the how the relationship functioned in a practical sense.

**Building Works**

Djeser Djeseru, the mortuary temple Hatshepsut built at Dier el Bahri, was a unique and impressive expression of her role as a builder pharaoh. The nature of this building demanded that it be built in her name only. A mortuary temple was not to be shared by more than one pharaoh. The same can be said of Hatshepsut’s tombs.¹⁸¹ Hatshepsut did,
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¹⁸¹ Hatshepsut began a tomb in the Valley of the Queens before deciding to build herself a tomb in the Valley of the Kings among other pharaohs. Peter Der Manuelian and Christian Loeben, ‘New Light on the
however, engage in other building works, which she claimed exclusively for herself. These include the obelisks and the 8th Pylon in the Amun complex at Karnak.\textsuperscript{182} She also built (or restored) a number of temples, including the temple to Pakhet known as Speos Artemidos, at Beni Hassan.\textsuperscript{183} The history of the Red Chapel suggests that Hatshepsut began it as her own construction, although Thutmose III did continue work on it after her death.\textsuperscript{184} The only construction which appears to have been a joint building project is the Temple of Buhen in Nubia.\textsuperscript{185} In general, Hatshepsut fulfilled her role as a builder independently from her stepson. This may be because these constructions were always intended to create her legacy. Hatshepsut’s intention was to leave her mark on Egypt, and preserve her name forever. With this in mind, it is not surprising that Hatshepsut acted independently in her building works, but it does indicate that this element of kingship was not shared between the two rulers.

**Foreign affairs**

Mid 20th century historians asserted that Thutmose III took responsibility for military campaigns during the joint rule.\textsuperscript{186} He is known to have led at least two military expeditions during the joint rule.\textsuperscript{187} The assumption was that Hatshepsut focused on internal matters, while Thutmose III led the army.\textsuperscript{188} This interpretation was based in part on gender bias, in a pre-Thatcher world, when gentlemen historians could not easily perceive of a female commanding an army. The misconception was perpetuated by a lack of contrary evidence. However, since the time of Winlock and Wilson, further evidence has come to light.
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One of Hatshepsut’s officials, Tiy, left a graffito on the island of Sehel, near Aswan. It reads:

The hereditary prince and governor, treasurer of the king of Lower Egypt, the sole friend, chief treasurer, the one concerned with the booty, Tiy. He says: ‘I followed the good god, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt [Maat-ka-re] may she live! I saw when he overthrew the Nubian bowman, their chiefs being brought to him as living captives. I saw when he destroyed Nubia, I being in his majesty’s following…’\(^{189}\)

This inscription suggests not only that Hatshepsut planned military incursions, but that she may even have been present in battle. Another battle planned by Hatshepsut is attested to on the stela of the scribe Djehuty at Dra abu el-Naga. It reads ‘I saw the collection of booty of this mighty ruler [Hatshepsut], from the vile Kush who are deemed cowards. The female sovereign, given, life, prosperity and health forever.’\(^{190}\)

Fragmentary inscriptions from Deir el Bahri and Karnak provide further support for Hatshepsut’s military exploits. At the mortuary temple, Hatshepsut is depicted as a sphinx, trampling her enemies. This, however, is not conclusive, since sphinx imagery is a pervasive element of pharaonic propaganda and may not actually represent reality. More persuasive are the fragments of text which state ‘her arrow is amongst the Northerners’, and ‘she has destroyed the southern lands, as was done by her father…’\(^{191}\) These statements suggest that Hatshepsut engaged in two different wars, one in the north, and one in the south. Their reliability is tarnished slightly by their context. Hatshepsut’s representations at Deir el Bahri are autobiographical, and serve the purpose of glorifying her rule. As such, they may be subject to exaggeration, or even invention. Yet these inscriptions are compelling in their specificity. The latter inscription is supported by another fragment from the temple at Karnak, which refers to ‘the land of Nubia being in submission’ to Hatshepsut.\(^{192}\) When interpreted in the context of the other evidence they add to an impression that Hatshepsut did indeed engage in military campaigns. Historians

\(^{190}\) Stela of Djehuty, *ibid*.
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now accept that Hatshepsut was responsible for at least four military expeditions during her rule.\footnote{193}

Thus the evidence now indicates that both Hatshepsut and Thutmose III engaged in military affairs during the period of the joint rule. This has important implications for their relationship. It shows that they were sharing one of the most important responsibilities of the office, which is evidence of cooperation. It also shows that each was capable of commanding an army, and had soldiers at his or her disposal. This implies an element of trust, since Hatshepsut did not fear Thutmose III might use his army against her, and Thutmose III had the same faith in her. The sharing of military responsibilities is a key indication of how this relationship operated.

An important element of ancient Egyptian foreign affairs is trade. Hatshepsut uses a whole portico on the middle terrace of Djeser Djeseru to depict her trading expedition to Punt. Images of the fleet indicate the enormous scope of the mission.\footnote{194} This paper has already discussed the inclusion of Thutmose III in the concluding scenes of the Punt Colonnade, noting that such inclusion is evidence of Hatshepsut honouring Thutmose III. In the context of how the relationship functioned, the images support the conclusion that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III worked alongside each other. When the Punt expedition returned to Egypt, both Kings participated in the ceremonies. Although Hatshepsut takes credit for the mission at Djeser Djeseru, the images show that both kings functioned together in carrying out the associated offerings and presentations. This indicates that functionally, they were cooperative, sharing the duties of the office.

**Religion**

The evidence already discussed in this paper suggests that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III shared religious duties while they ruled together. The stela they erected together to jointly dedicate a chapel at the Amun Temple in Karnak is compelling evidence of their cooperation.\footnote{195} Similarly, they built the Temple of Buhen together, and seem to have
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cooperated in building the Red Chapel for use in the religious festival of Opet. These are all instances of the two kings fulfilling their religious obligations cooperatively. Further evidence comes from the many inscriptions of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III offering to the gods together, found on the walls of Djeser Djeseru and the Red Chapel.\textsuperscript{196} It appears that in practice, the relationship was characterised by a shared participation in religious rites.

**Administration**

When considering how the two pharaohs shared the duties of administering the empire, the evidence is scant and conclusions involve a degree of conjecture. Firstly, the shared dates for the reign may suggest a degree of cooperation. The two kings must have agreed at some point to adopt the same dates for their rule, although it is not clear which of them acceded to the dates of the other.\textsuperscript{197} However it happened, it created a concept that they ruled in concert, and may be taken to imply that matters of administration were shared. More conclusive is the evidence that both Hatshepsut and Thutmose III maintained relationships with the same advisers. Amunwosre, for example, served as vizier both before and after Hatshepsut’s death, indicating that the functional administration of the Empire enjoyed some continuity.\textsuperscript{198} This may be a sign that administrative duties were shared, since both rulers had links to the same officials. Finally, there is the suggestion that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III shared a sed jubilee.\textsuperscript{199} This has not been universally accepted, but if the two rulers did share a jubilee celebration, it would indicate they shared administrative duties. The sed jubilee is a celebration of the strength of the pharaoh, and an endorsement of his (or in this case, her) ability to rule. A shared sed festival would indicate shared rulership, and this would suggest that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III saw themselves as equal partners in the administrative functions of their office.

\textsuperscript{196} See, for example, Appendix F.
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Conclusion

It has become clear that early interpretations of Hatshepsut and her relationship with Thutmose III were coloured by the conservative context of the contemporary writers, and affected by the limited number of sources available. Their conclusion that the two kings had a poor relationship was based on three grounds: that Hatshepsut had no right to the throne; that Thutmose destroyed her monuments in fury; and that images showed Hatshepsut as the superior king, which must have provoked Thutmose III to jealous anger. Each of these assumptions has been assessed, and each has been found wanting.

Hatshepsut had the legal right to rule, based in a second dynasty edict allowing female pharaohs. Her gender, however, may have been an offence to *ma’at* and there is the possibility that this provoked ill feeling in Thutmose III. Yet evidence suggests that the two kings ruled cooperatively. They included each other on their monuments, and worked together on building at least one temple. They shared administrators, and dated their reigns together. It is also possible that Thutmose III was grateful to Hatshepsut for joining him on the throne, as she ruled wisely and strengthened his dynastic claim through association with her Taosid and Thutmosid bloodlines.

The damnatio memoriae was also misinterpreted by early historians, and should not be used as evidence of Thutmose’s hatred towards Hatshepsut. It is now clear that Hatshepsut’s images were not erased until twenty years after her death, and this would appear to be too late to be an emotion-fuelled act of violent retribution. The incomplete nature of the erasures, which left many images of Hatshepsut intact, indicates that it was undertaken for a purpose other than denying her an afterlife. This means that the purpose of the erasures was not hatred, and so should not impact on any decision regarding the nature of the corulers’ relationship. It is more likely that the erasures were undertaken in order to change the historical record, to remove the presence of a female pharaoh, which was a serious challenge to *ma’at*.

It has been assumed that the images of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III portray her in the superior position and that this may have provoked Thutmose III towards jealousy. It is
true that Hatshepsut is most often portrayed in front of Thutmose III, and on the whole she wears superior crowns. However, these images are taken almost exclusively from Hatshepsut’s own monuments. As such, it is an honour that Thutmose III is included at all, since Hatshepsut might have been justified in excluding him in this context. Similarly, although he wears the important crowns less often than she does, it is telling that she allows him to be depicted in them at all, on her own monuments. The persistent equality in their size and royal regalia is a sign of the equality between the two. Even if the images are taken to represent Thutmose III as inferior, there is no evidence that he responded to this with anger. Indeed, it is possible that Thutmose III was grateful for his step-mother’s guidance.

Finally, there is substantial evidence that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III ruled cooperatively together, and felt no ill will towards one another. Neither sought to rule alone by murdering or exiling the other. Hatshepsut trusted Thutmose III to rule the army, and he did not turn this power against her. Thutmose III appears to have honoured Hatshepsut by building his mortuary beside hers, and he may even have been betrothed to Hatshepsut’s daughter. Further, they seem to have cooperated in the performing essential functions of their position, including building together, fulfilling military and religious functions, and administering the empire.

Evidence uncovered since the first half of last century, and the development of post-modern historical interpretations, have allowed for a departure from the earliest interpretations of Hatshepsut. She can now be appreciated for her extraordinary achievements and her strong rule. There is no longer sufficient support for the argument that she was an evil step-mother who usurped her step-son’s throne and relegated him to an inferior position. When their relationship is reconsidered in this light it becomes evident that Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were cooperative rulers.
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Appendix C – Foundation Deposits

Foundation deposit objects with the names of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III
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Scarab Inscribed with the Throne Name of Thutmose III

Period: New Kingdom
Dynasty: Dynasty 18, early
Reign: Joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III
Date: ca. 1479–1458 B.C.
Geography: From Egypt, Upper Egypt, Thebes, Deir el-Bahri, Temple of Hatshepsut, Foundation Deposit 7 (G), MMA 1926–1927
Medium: Steatite (glazed)
Dimensions: L: 1.7 cm (11/16 in); w: 1.3 cm (1/2 in); h: 0.7 cm (1/4 in)
Credit Line: Rogers Fund, 1927
Accession Number: 27.3.316

Not on view

http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/559875
Appendix D – Finger rings

Scrab Finger Ring with the Names of Thutmose III and Hatshepsut

Period: New Kingdom
Dynasty: Dynasty 18
Reign: Joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III
Date: ca. 1479–1458 B.C.
Geography: From Egypt, Upper Egypt, Thebes, Wadi Gabbarat al-Qurn, Wadi D. Tomb of the 3 Foreign Wives of Thutmose III
Medium: Gold, lapis lazuli
Dimensions: Diam. 2.5 cm (1 in.); l. of scarab 1.5 cm (9/16 in.)
Credit Line: Purchase, Elisha S. Harkness Gift, 1926
Accession Number: 26.7.764

Not on view

Finger Ring Inscribed with the Cartouches of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III

Period: New Kingdom
Dynasty: Dynasty 18
Reign: Joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III
Date: ca. 1479–1458 B.C.
Geography: From Egypt, Upper Egypt, Thebes
Medium: Green jasper, gold
Dimensions: Diam. 2.3 cm (7/8 in.); l. of plaque 1.5 cm (9/16 in.)
Credit Line: Gift of Mrs. Frederick F. Thompson, 1916
Accession Number: 15.6.22

On view in Gallery 118

http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/547602

http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/545428
Appendix E – Images of Neferure with pharaonic beard


Block statue of Senenmut and Neferure, held at Neues Museum, Berlin – the appendix.net
Appendix F – Hatshepsut and Thutmose III taking part in the Sed festival

Appendix G – Table of Depictions at Djeser Djeseru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hatshepsut</th>
<th>Thutmose III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Terrace – Southern Lower Portico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Terrace – Northern Lower Portico</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Terrace – Hathor Shrine</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Terrace – Southern Middle Portico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Terrace – Pillars of the Southern Portico</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Terrace – Northern Middle Portico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Terrace – Pillars of the Northern Portico</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Terrace – Lower Anubis Shrine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Upper Portico</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Upper Courtyard</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Complex of the Royal Mortuary Cult</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Southern Chamber of Amun</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Main Sanctuary of Amun</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Northern Chamber of Amun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Complex of the Sun Cult</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Terrace – Upper Anubis Shrine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H – Thutmose III making offerings to Horus at Djeser Djeseru

http://www.kenseamedia.com/july/delb.htm

Thutmose III with Amun and Re-Harakte at Dheser Dheseru

Appendix I – Thutmose III, presenting myrrh to Amun

http://www.maat-ka-ra.de/english/bauwerke/djeser/dj_portico_2_hall_punt.htm
Appendix J – Thutmose III participating in Opet, Djeser Djeseru


Appendix K – Hatshepsut and Thutmose III accompany the Amun Barque, Red Chapel, South Wall, Block 26

Appendix L – Hatshepsut and Thutmose III follow the Amun Barque, Red Chapel, South Wall, Block 169


Detail:

www.proteus.brown.edu
Appendix M – Thutmose III appearing to offer to Hatshepsut as Osiris, detail of block 169 from south wall of Red Chapel

Appendix N – Hatshepsut appearing to offer to ‘herself’ as Osiris, Red Chapel, South Wall, Block 135

Appendix O – Dual Stela from Temple of Amun at Karnak

http://mv.vatican.va/3_EN/pages/x-Schede/MEZs/MEZs_Sala01_02_004.html
Appendix P – Stela of Nakht, Sinai

Sketch:

Remains:

Both images: http://www.sennefer.at/Tempel/Sinai/Nakht.htm
Appendix Q – Inscription of Kheruef

Appendix R - Tomb of Nakht, workers pressing grapes

http://www.alamy.com/
Appendix S – Tomb of Menna, workers threshing grain


Appendix T – Tomb of Rekhmire, foreigners offering tribute

Appendix U – Modern symbolism

www.e8hoops.com

logos.wikia.com
Appendix V - Crowns

DESHRET  HEDJET  PSCHENT

KHEPRESH


Appendix W – The Egyptian Fleet in Punt
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