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## Introduction

The profile of the work which has been conducted by the Polish mission at Deir el-Bahari for 50 years is changing. Reconstruction tasks as well as conservation projects are gradually coming to an end while a new priority arises - publication of a monograph devoted to particular parts of the temple and identification of various aspects of the functioning of the complex and its theology. In this context, it is necessary to establish the relationships between the temple of Hatshepsut and other sacral buildings designed and functioning in the same period.

Definition of the ritual space and reconstruction of its landscape is now a subject widely discussed in literature ${ }^{1}$ and researched in different regions of Egypt. ${ }^{2}$ It describes the influence which particular elements of the landscape have on each other and the relationships of these elements with the ritual and cult which integrate them and endow them with religious significance. The analysis of access to ritual practices for different social groups seems to be important for establishing ritual topography. Studies of that issue should be conducted with various perspectives in mind simultaneously. Focussing on particular buildings and mutual influence observed in their micro cosmos, it is necessary to encompass a wider range of the researched area and mark ritual axes connecting particular edifices as well as establish the network of relationships, including economic ones, between Theban sacral buildings.

The locations and alignment of the buildings to cardinal points appear to be essential since they organised space in ancient Egypt and gave it symbolic meaning. The east-west axis belonged to the divine sphere, areas of sunrises and sunsets, cycle of life and death. The north-south axis was the sphere of king's activity, unification of both countries, Egyptian dualism in all its aspects, area of chaos and maat. ${ }^{3}$ The space was additionally described by its own topographic elements, which were also attributed with a symbolic meaning. The desert was associated with Seth, evil, punishment in the netherworld and death; gardens, on the other hand, were elements of life, the place of primordial creation, symbols of regeneration and fertility. ${ }^{4}$ The space inside ritual complexes was connected with the access, or its absence, to light, which was sometimes interpreted as the divine presence.

When Egyptians constructed their first temples, they paid much attention to the locations and orientation aligned with certain astronomical phenomena, as well as the mutual relations between the complexes. Temples were not buildings situated out of context, which is easy to forget, but were incorporated in a network of spatial, ritual, and economic relationships with existing and functioning complexes.

When the sacred landscape of Thebes in the times of Hatshepsut is described, it should be taken into consideration that Thebes started to develop at least as early as the Old Kingdom, ${ }^{5}$ and queen Hatshepsut, erecting new buildings, only added her works to the works of her predecessors. Even if her achievements now appear as complete rebuilding, ancient Egyptians treated constructing "anew" as restoration work, which solidified earlier construction work. ${ }^{6}$

The objective of the series "Sacred Landscape of Thebes During the Reign of Hatshepsut. Royal Construction Projects" is to review religious buildings constructed and used during the reign of Hatshepsut as well as indicate religious and political concepts exploited by the queen or her ideologists in the course of planning new processional routes and building new temples. This investigation will be supplemented with information concerning relationships between particular buildings as a consequence of their topography, mentioned in texts from that period. For this reason, apart from the reconstruction of the ritual landscape, processional routes, relationships between the complexes, orientation of temples and processional axes inside the temples as well as access to sacral buildings have been analysed. The whole analysis will be shown in the context of the queen's political and religious objectives.

[^0]InTRODUCTION

## The scope of research

Chronological. The intention of establishing the relationship between the temples of Hatshepsut and other sacral buildings designed and functioning at that time, i.e. limitation of the study to the reign of one ruler, is critically important for the structure of the work. Only such research provides good conditions for isolation, from enormous amount of information, of religious and political objectives which governed the planning of ritual landscape and their possible modifications. The times of Hatshepsut seem to be ideal for a scientific question defined in such a manner. Her political aims focussed on preserving power have been identified to a great extent, moreover, her reign appears outstanding in the view of those of other rulers. She was the one to increase the importance of Thebes at the beginning of the New Kingdom, her immediate ancestors had not done as much to add splendour to the city as the queen did. Spatial development of Thebes, which had functioned in ritual terms much earlier, definitely cannot be regarded as her own accomplishment, nevertheless, it was Hatshepsut who returned the old rituals to their glory and introduced new ones to the canon of ritual events in this area. ${ }^{7}$
Spatial. Studies represented in this volume have been limited to the area of West Thebes, which cover the grounds surrounded by the Valley of the Kings in the north and west, and by the tombs of the Southern Valleys in the south. The West Bank of the Nile is the natural boundary in the east.
Subject matter. The subject is an attempt at reconstruction of Theban landscape and its particular architectural elements. It is realised by detailed description of historical topography, which, above all, includes presentation of results of research of all temple buildings, but also relationships between ruler's mortuary temples and royal tombs. The existence of the base of supplies, indispensable for the functioning of sacral complexes, was also analysed. Particularly the economic base made it possible for religious institutions to exist as independent entities and was a venue where some parts of the rituals, related mostly to the preparation of offerings, took place.

The main issue raised in this work is the type of relationships which connected particular sacral structures. These relationships show ideological and political aims taken into consideration when the ritual landscape of Thebes was designed.

## Sources

Excavation reports supplemented with source material from the times of Hatshepsut constitute the basis for the study. The available material (excavation reports and literature) is exceptionally heterogeneous. It partially results from the state of preservation of particular buildings and research methods, which have changed over the years of archaeological studies. Nevertheless, it is mostly caused by insufficient or incomplete publications which were left by archaeologists who had worked on the material. Sites where the studies have been in progress since the 19th century must be treated in a different manner from others, since the number of publications and variety of interpretations is enormous for the former.

Different categories of Egyptian texts as well the literature on the subject which concern the discussed questions are the sources which significantly contribute to the study.

Information from excavation reports has been supported with field research and observations. In the case of some structures, they provided unique data. It was possible to identify the temple of Thutmose I, $\underline{H n m t-} n h$, so far known only from texts, which had been only briefly examined archaeologically, but was known and published as a completely different structure, the $H^{-}-3 h t$ temple. Identification of this temple fundamentally changed the perception of Theban topography in the times of Hatshepsut.

## Influence of historical, political, and religious events and processes on the shaping of the ritual topography during the reign of Hatshepsut

The rule of queen Hatshepsut began with the death of her husband, Thutmose II, when, in the face of the juvenility of her stepson - the heir to the throne, Thutmose III, Hatshepsut took over the actual power in her role of a regent. ${ }^{8}$ She commenced the project of rebuilding and expansion of sacral buildings in Egypt

[^1]already at that moment. ${ }^{9}$ However, the major work was to be undertaken after the coronation of Hatshepsut. The discussion of the date of that event has not finished yet, ${ }^{10}$ but most scholars are inclined to date it to year 7 of the reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{11}$

It appears that this is when the construction of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple commenced. ${ }^{12}$ That temple is of great importance for the study of sacral structures in the times of Hatshepsut. First of all, it has been relatively well researched, additionally, it remains one of the best preserved buildings erected in Thebes during the queen's reign. Construction and wall decoration techniques are characteristic for that period, however, their interpretation can be much richer than in the case of other buildings since a large number of ostraca and construction inscriptions has been preserved. Many changes in architectural design have been detected, and they reflect reactions to political and ideological changes.

The greatest difficulty in the study of the times of Hatshepsut is caused by attribution of certain structures, which are not precisely dated and are devoid of characteristic features, to the period of co-regency of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. During the co-regency, Thutmose III erected buildings which must be included in the structure of Theban landscape of the discussed period. Hatshepsut also began work on projects which bear her ideological message, however, she did not manage to finish them and their construction was completed during the sole reign of Thutmose III. These buildings are also elements which characterise the construction and decoration activity initiated by the queen. It should be noted that works of Hatshepsut and the dating to the times of co-regency might remain unnoticed, and only progress in archaeological work helps to establish that a building dated to the sole reign of Thutmose III actually comes from the times of co-regency. ${ }^{13}$

Interpretation of historical topography of the times of Hatshepsut is also strongly influenced by sources which refer to Nefrura, the prematurely deceased daughter of the queen, and officials who lost queen's favour, Sen-en-mut, the steward, in particular.

It appears that Hatshepsut planned to make her daughter, Nefrura, her successor to the throne of pharaohs. ${ }^{14}$ These plans were undermined, probably by the death of the girl. This event is also difficult to precisely locate in chronology. The last mention of the princess comes from year 11 of the reign of Thutmose III, ${ }^{15}$ this is also the moment when Hatshepsut changed her attitude to her co-regent, who became the sole heir.

Sen-en-mut was one of the most important people at the court of Hatshepsut. He fulfilled functions which attest his exceptional position at the court, he was in charge of enormous fortune of the state and temples, ${ }^{16}$ as well as supervised construction work i.a. in the temple of Mut at Karnak, at Luxor, and the temple of the queen at Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{17}$ Moreover, he was the only official who had been granted with the right to place his images in all temples of gods. ${ }^{18} \mathrm{He}$ lost queen's favour relatively early for unknown reasons and his representations were removed from temples and his tombs as well as other artefacts. ${ }^{19}$ The last historically confirmed mention of the official comes from year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{20}$

The reign of Hatshepsut was a consequence of the processes which transpired at the beginning of the 18th dynasty and formation of new ideological currents, which had a great influence on religion and politics of that period. Her political choices were essential for the functioning of the state and the shift of efforts

[^2]Introduction
from the fight for stabilization of the country, which took place during the reign of Thutmose I, to shaping of prosperity and increase in importance of religious centres in Egypt.

The times of Hatshepsut were a period of dynamic development of Egyptian religion and emergence of new conditions which would leave their mark for the period of the New Kingdom. This is the time that delivered the oldest examples of the Book of Amduat, which was incorporated into the decoration programme of royal tombs, ${ }^{21}$ when solar theology flourished, ${ }^{22}$ divine oracles began to be exploited for political purposes, ${ }^{23}$ legends of miraculous events associated with rituals were created with the same objective in mind. ${ }^{24}$ The issue of personal piety became important during the reign of the queen, ${ }^{25}$ which is also reflected by the emergence of numerous processional festivals. ${ }^{26}$ On the other hand, the spheres of sacrum and profanum were clearly separated, which is expressed by i.a. the use of pylons in the architecture of the temple at Karnak. Architecture of temples is also transformed, buildings of the type represented by the small temple at Medinet Habu emerged, ${ }^{27}$ small structures framed with porticoes and bark stations were also built outside the grounds of proper temples. ${ }^{28}$

## Historical sources for the studies of Theban temples on the West Bank during the reign of Hatshepsut

There are fairly few sources for reconstruction of ritual topography in the times of Hatshepsut, which mention sacral structures in West Thebes.

The buildings themselves bear a high number of construction inscriptions which not only state the Egyptian names of the temples, but above all, the purpose of their construction and the names of the gods who these buildings were devoted to. ${ }^{29}$

Lists of temples preserved in decoration of royal and private structures constitute the most important group of sources. They help to reconstruct the probable number of structures and additionally, to a lower degree, their mutual relations.

The royal list of temples has been preserved on the wall of the quartzite chapel called the Chapelle Rouge. The first register of the south wall of the chapel depicts the procession of personifications of temples led by the personification of the temple of Amun at Karnak. It is followed by the personification of the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari and then personifications of other temples, first from the West Bank, then from the East one. ${ }^{30}$ It must be mentioned that the list is very incomplete - at least eight blocks are missing and eight have been preserved. ${ }^{31}$ The Chapelle Rouge was erected relatively late, in the course of the rebuilding of Karnak commissioned by the queen. It was dismantled already in the times of Thutmose III, and its remains served Amenhotep III's builders for filling the 3rd Pylon at Karnak. ${ }^{32}$ The chapel was most probably built in the Palace of Maat, which would imply that it should be dated to the period after year 17 of the reign of Thutmose III, as it is indicated by the dedicatory inscription preserved on the outer north wall of the Palace of Maat. ${ }^{33}$ Accepting this terminus post quem as highly likely, it should be assumed that ritual practices were performed in the temples recorded on that list after year 17 of Thutmose III's reign. Unfortunately, it is the only date connected with the lists of temples of that time.

Sacral buildings were also mentioned in representations of processional feasts. In the case of the West Bank, significant representations of the Beautiful Feast of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ can be found in the decoration of temples on both banks (the Upper Courtyard in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w^{34}$ and the outer north wall of the Chapelle Rouge at

[^3]Karnak ${ }^{35}$ ). Even though these images are by no means complete, they are invaluable for the reconstruction of the ritual landscape as they illustrate ritual relationships between temples visited by the processional bark of Amun.

Other lists of temples have been preserved on private artefacts and only their approximate chronology could be established. The list of temples shown on the wall of the transverse western hall in the tomb of Ineni is the oldest among them. ${ }^{36}$ That official was responsible i.a. for deliveries of incense from the temple of Karnak to other Theban temples and was portrayed in a scene of inspection of the treasury of Amun at Karnak. That list is also incomplete. Ineni was an active official for a long time, he began his work in the times of Amenhotep I and retired during the reign of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{37}$ For this reason, it seems that the list from his tomb reflects the ritual landscape in the times preceding the reign of Hatshepsut or, at the latest, at the beginning of her rule.

Another list of sacral buildings comes from the tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39). ${ }^{38}$ It is the only list mentioned here that has been preserved complete, with minor damage, which does not prevent the text from being properly read. The list is similar to the list of Ineni, it depicts Pui-em-Ra supervising the distribution of incense to different temples. The number of temples is the item where they differ: Ineni's record mentions only nine while Pui-em-Ra's list - 15. Pui-em-Ra was one generation younger than Ineni, he began his work as an official during the reign of Hatshepsut, and his career flourished under Thutmose III. ${ }^{39}$ Therefore, it could be supposed that the list of temples from his tomb represents the state of affairs at the end of the reign of Hatshepsut.

It seems that each list of temples served its own purpose and none of them records the buildings in geographical order.

A lot of information concerning the ritual landscape is provided by biographies of officials as well as their titles preserved in tombs and on statues. The biography of Djehuty written on the Northampton stela carved in the façade of the tomb of the official seems the most important in this group of sources. ${ }^{40}$ The stela is in a fairly good state of preservation, apart from erasures made already in the times of Hatshepsut. Djehuty was in charge of i.a. supervision of decoration and finishing works in sacral buildings. His career flourished in the early reign of Hatshepsut, then he lost queen's favour and his names and representations were destroyed. ${ }^{41}$

Another official, the memory of whom was not supposed to survive, was Sen-en-mut. Although he had two tombs hewn for himself, no biography of the official has been preserved. Nevertheless, many artefacts bear his numerous titles connected with construction and management of sacral buildings, ${ }^{42}$ as well as foundations of some structures record his name. ${ }^{43}$

Another type of sources which should be taken into consideration in the study of Theban topography in the times of Hatshepsut are the so-called name stones, stones with polished surfaces and carved cartouches of the queen or, very rarely, Thutmose III. Apart from the royal names, an official's name was also inscribed, possibly of a founder of the temple. Name stones were situated face down in a layer of pure sand on the bottom of a foundation pit. Such practices have not been attested for any other rulers than Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. ${ }^{44}$

The dipinti and graffiti left by the builders and decorators on the walls and foundations of the structures are very helpful for interpretation of particular temples and the reconstruction of their building processes. They provide daily dates, and sometimes names of months and bands which worked on the construction of the walls in the case of building dipinti, as well as daily dates and names of decorators, ${ }^{45}$ i.a. scribes, outline drawing artists and craftsmen in the case of dipinti and graffiti on the walls. ${ }^{46}$

[^4]Many ostraca, some of which bear the year date, come from Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{47}$ These ostraca contain notes from the construction site, which mention the names of workers and jobs that they were responsible for, as well as the place of their work and administrative structure at times. The type of information which they bear and their state of preservation result in ostraca being more useful for the reconstruction of work system than for the reconstruction of the ritual landscape.

## Terms used in the book

The description of the structures and rituals connected with them required the use of terms, whose application should be explained.

The first of them is the term of sacred landscape, used in the title. This term covers such representation of topography which portrays its ritual relationships, on the same basis as historical topography illustrates topography in historical relationships. Therefore, this book represents relationships of particular topographic locations in the context of rituals and their interdependencies.

Ancient Egyptian sacral buildings bear a variety of names in the scientific literature. These names often differ from the ones used by ancient Egyptians. The temples of the west bank of Thebes are first of all described as temples of millions of years (hwt h.hw m rnpwt), ${ }^{48}$ as well as 'funerary/mortuary temples' ${ }^{49}$ and 'memorial temples'. ${ }^{50}$ The first name was used by Egyptians themselves, however, the semantic range of this notion, despite comprehensive studies, has not been completely established. The two other terms were coined in modern times to indicate the functions of these structures, nevertheless, from the perspective of the present state of knowledge, the names might be misleading. The term of the temple of the royal cult is used in this work to emphasise the most essential function of the complexes. This name, however, does not reflect the function of the structures either, especially if it is difficult to distinguish temples of the royal cult ${ }^{51}$ from temples of gods. ${ }^{52}$

[^5]
# Construction works in the times of Hatshepsut as represented by the construction of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ 

A lot of buildings were constructed during the reign of Hatshepsut, and the work was perfectly organised, which can be ascertained from written sources as well as from observation of the effects of this process. The queen's temple erected in the valley of Deir el-Bahari is the most complete source of information on the subject of construction in this period. It was an impressive undertaking with a variety of architectural concepts. It has been most thoroughly examined from this perspective, and apart from the phases of construction, the phases of re-construction can also be indicative. It is also important that the information resulting from examination of the architecture is supplemented with a rich collection of ostraca bearing texts concerning the building of the temple, found within the edifice itself. All this combined provides insight into the details of construction and work organization. It is also essential for a discussion on architectural alterations and the chronology of particular elements of both the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and other temples designed by the builders who served Hatshepsut.

## Work system for temple construction

It seems that the system of work for the construction of the temple at Deir el-Bahari can be precisely reconstructed on the basis of the preserved ostraca. It is clear that a large group of people worked at the same time. An ostracon found in a pit between the processional alley of Hatshepsut and the processional alley of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra lists 228 people working on one day. ${ }^{1}$ The workers employed for the construction works came from all over Egypt, but there were also some foreigners among them, mostly Nubians. One ostracon mentions a Nubian stonemason, a man called Te-re-ka-ia, ${ }^{2}$ another refers to workers from Esna, el-Kab, el-Matanah, and Asfun, ${ }^{3}$ while on a certain day people from Armant, Nefru-si, Qaw el-Kebir ${ }^{4}$ did the work, and workers from Abydos, Hierakonpolis and Asyut ${ }^{5}$ appear on yet another day. The workers sent by higher state officials ${ }^{6}$ constituted a numerous and important group. It seems the services of local workers, hired by other employers, were also used, e.g. the people who worked on the construction of the tomb of Sen-en-mut also appear on the lists of those engaged at Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{7}$

The workers were registered according to their place of origin, names of the nomes, ${ }^{8}$ or names of the officials who had sent them. ${ }^{9}$ That group consisted of a higher class of skilled labour, termed as $j s t$ or $r m t$ $j s t,{ }^{10}$ often abbreviated to rmt..$^{11}$ According to ostracon 10621 verso 3 from Berlin, $j s t$ is a group of workers of Egyptian origin, as opposed to the foreigners employed by Rekh-mi-Ra for the construction of the temple of Thutmose III. ${ }^{12}$ The skilled labour included those who cut the stones, ${ }^{13}$ others who carried the soil,,${ }^{14}$ and obviously there was a group of stonemasons. ${ }^{15}$ Ordinary workers were managed by supervisors. ${ }^{16}$

[^6]Work gangs were also engaged for the building of the temple of Hatshepsut, which is known from one of the ostraca concerning the construction of the tomb of Sen-en-mut, TT 353, which reports that a work gang (jst) from $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ worked in the city as well. ${ }^{17}$ A lower group was constituted by servants $s d m w^{18}$ and $s \underline{d} m-{ }^{`} \check{s} w,{ }^{19}$ who are described by Mounir Megally as those who were employed for the simplest tasks. This does not seem to be a fixed rule since ostracon 69 concerning the works on the tomb of Sen-en-mut, published by William C. Hayes, reports: "note from the obligatory work performed by servants ( $s$ dmw) who came with the priest on that day", and then lists skilled workers, i.a. stonemasons. ${ }^{20}$

All activities in the temple were clearly divided between two groups, normally counting the same number of people, which worked simultaneously. Written sources report that one worked in the left and the other in the right corner, ${ }^{21}$ and were described in other texts as the right group and the left one. ${ }^{22}$ Such a division of labour is also attested by texts from Deir el-Medineh and other ostraca. ${ }^{23}$ Both groups did the same work, ${ }^{24}$ were managed by corresponding officials ${ }^{25}$ and received the same pay for their services. ${ }^{26}$ In the case of the tomb of Sen-en-mut, one ostracon says that the workers were divided between two people, Ipu-er and Ma-ru-ben-re-khy $\left(M^{\prime}-r w-b n-r-h y\right){ }^{27}$ It seems to be in accordance with what has been concluded from the examination of unfinished tombs: e.g. in tomb TT 229 from the 18th dynasty only one half of the structure was carved while the other had not even been started. The same applies to decoration of various types of buildings. ${ }^{28}$ This division appears to correspond with what is known about dualism in the Egyptian state. ${ }^{29}$

The Egyptian system of work was marked by a high level bureaucracy. Construction works were supported by a big group of scribes ${ }^{30}$ who, each and every day, conscientiously recorded the number of workers present, ${ }^{31}$ but also those who did not appear at the worksite, ${ }^{32}$ the amount of delivered building materials, ${ }^{33}$ the amount of completed work ${ }^{34}$ and the type and measure of the remuneration. ${ }^{35}$ It was also undoubtedly a duty of the scribes to find people for work and to take personal responsibility for them. ${ }^{36}$ Most probably, the daily work report was associated with the tasks assigned to particular workers. Reports for the whole week of works were compiled on the basis of these daily accounts. ${ }^{37}$ The activities of each day were normally written down in a logical order, according to the type of undertaken work. ${ }^{38}$

The work was paid for with goods, above all, the most necessary commodities, such as bread ${ }^{39}$ or sandals. ${ }^{40}$ The workers were sometimes flogged as a punishment for poor performance. ${ }^{41}$

[^7]Animals were also hired for work. One ostracon bears a report of hiring a donkey for the purposes of construction. ${ }^{42}$

Even though an impressive amount of stone was delivered to the worksite, merely a few blocks were used for the construction every day. ${ }^{43}$ The processing of stone required the work of specialised stonemasons, who were limited in number. It is known that three stonemasons were assigned to the task of processing an external door jamb. ${ }^{44}$

It appears that the end of the year and epagomenal days were not an occasion for the workers to have free time from work. Texts indicate that it was a time when people worked on private building projects ${ }^{45}$ and the system of work for the temple was probably the same. One of the name stones from Deir el-Bahari bears the date of the fourth epagomenal day, ${ }^{46}$ which suggests that the workers came to work on that day.

A large part of the building materials was delivered from private foundations provided by state officials. ${ }^{47}$

Masonry works in one area of the temple were carried out simultaneously with finishing works, polishing of the walls and their preparation for relief decoration in other parts. ${ }^{48}$

Hieratic ostraca provide information that various types of finishing works were performed at the same time - the accounts of one day mention stonemasons, plasterers, as well as scribes of outlines. ${ }^{49}$ The phenomenon of inviting different types of skilled workers at the same time can also be seen if unfinished Theban tombs are examined - tasks associated with carving different chambers, sculpted decoration, and painted decoration were underway all at once. ${ }^{50}$

[^8]
## Construction techniques

The way on which large complexes, such as the $\underline{D} s r$ - $d s r w$ temple, were constructed evolved over generations of Egyptian builders and was a result of the development of stone masonry. These techniques were employed for all stone buildings in the times of Hatshepsut, although they differed in details depending on the materials used as well as the region and local traditions associated with it.

## Materials

Even though queen Hatshepsut states in dedicatory inscriptions that the temple was constructed from "good white stone from Anu", ${ }^{1}$ i.e. of Tura limestone, there is nothing which would corroborate this statement. The studies of Rosemarie and Dietrich D. Klemm, ${ }^{2}$ Susanne Bickel, ${ }^{3}$ as well as Thierry DePutter and Christina Karlshausen ${ }^{4}$ confirm that the builders who worked for Hatshepsut quarried the stone material from the quarry of limestone located nearby, ${ }^{5}$ where the layer of good quality stone was approximately 10 m thick (Fig. 1). ${ }^{6}$ The temple itself was carved in bedrock within the Esna Formation, which, unfortunately, was of poor quality. ${ }^{7}$

The quarry at Qurna has not been published in the form of a monograph yet, but has merely been mentioned by relatively few scholars. ${ }^{8}$ It is located in a wadi to the north of the Valley of the Kings. Very few artefacts remain today at this great work site. ${ }^{9}$ Some tools have been found there, the galleries shaped by the sourcing of stone display traces of various stages of the quarrying process (Figs 1, 3) and a relatively high number of hieratic inscriptions with notes of the daily progress of works (Fig. 5). ${ }^{10}$

One could suppose that blocks were hauled from the quarry to $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ by land, and not transported by water. It does not seem to have been necessary to ship them by water. The quarry was not located far from the construction site, but rather far from a watercourse, and the blocks were not very large. This suggestion is confirmed by the fact that the canal next to the temple probably did not exist during the construction period and the landing place located near the $H^{\iota}-3 h t^{11}$ temple would have to be used. Land transportation is also implied by the text recorded on an ostracon found in a pit between the processional alley of Hatshepsut and the processional alley of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra, which refers to the work conducted in the temple of Hatshepsut and mentions hauling of stones. ${ }^{12}$

Another type of material was also employed for the construction of the temple of Hatshepsut. Two gates on the Upper Terrace were built of blocks of red granite (quarried in Aswan), ${ }^{13}$ which is also stated in the dedicatory inscription on one of the gates. ${ }^{14}$

Practically the whole temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari was built of limestone, although sandstone was used in a few places. This material was exploited for a part of the foundation of the southern portion of the Lower and Middle Terraces, architraves of the Northern Colonnade, three tympana (the north wall of niche A in the Statue Room, the east wall of the niche in the Lower Anubis Shrine and the south wall of the Sanctuary of the Lower Anubis Shrine), as well as gargoyles and steps of the Lower Ramp stairs. ${ }^{15}$ The use of this type of stone was probably not accidental and performed an important function as sandstone is
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Fig. 1. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, view of the quarry (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
a more flexible material than limestone and may have been utilised intentionally in those places where the wall had to resist more massive pressure. The provenance of the sandstone is not clear since no analysis has been undertaken so far. Somers Clarke suggested that it could have possibly come from the temple of Mentuhotep II, ${ }^{16}$ located nearby, nevertheless, as argued by Zygmunt Wysocki, it is highly unlikely. ${ }^{17}$

The statues which were eventually placed in the temple were carved in various types of stone: they included statues made of red granite ${ }^{18}$ and granodiorite, ${ }^{19}$ but also of sandstone, ${ }^{20}$ or limestone, ${ }^{21}$ there were even some carved in indurated limestone. ${ }^{22}$
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Fig. 2. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, block in the process of extraction (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
These mostly large statues as well as the aforementioned sizable granite and sandstone blocks had to be transported from the quarry by water and then cover the remaining part of the distance from the quay to the construction site by land.

## Module

The layout of the temple was designed according to a module, which measured 1.5 royal cubits during the time of Hatshepsut. This was established by Waldemar Połoczanin, ${ }^{23}$ and his results were later confirmed by Jean-François Carlotti. ${ }^{24}$ This feature seems to be characteristic for the buildings of the queen. Such a grid was superimposed on the whole original plan of the complex at Deir el-Bahari, starting from the northsouth axis of the temple, and from the granite gates of the Upper Terrace on the east-west axis. Both the architectural elements and the general composition of the decoration were consistent with that proportion grid.

## Preparation of the surface

The first task which the builders of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ had to complete was the levelling of the surface for the future temple. The intended construction site has a sloping surface and the difference needed to be evened out.

Equally important preparation works were conducted on the grounds of the Valley Temple, which had been planned to be situated in the area of an earlier saff tomb. The tomb had a large courtyard, which had to be buried and thus the surface was levelled for the future structure. ${ }^{25}$

[^11]Fig. 3. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, marks left by extraction of a block (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 4. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, outlines after each day of work (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 5. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, outlines after each day of work (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

It is likely that in order to make transportation of building materials possible, one of the first assignments was a basic preparation of the processional alley, which was associated i.a. with hewing a pass through hill 104. ${ }^{26}$

It has been established that the subsequent works were organised in such a manner that several gangs worked simultaneously. The rooms were cut in the rock gradually and the debris taken to the areas which needed to be filled. It is widely supposed that at the same time the builders worked on the construction of the retaining wall, which also constituted the west wall of the Middle Portico, whose function was to support the whole fill and prevent it from sliding. ${ }^{27}$

It is worth noting that the area which was occupied for the construction of the temple was not empty when the work was undertaken during the reign of Hatshepsut. First of all, the mortuary complex of Mentuhotep II covered, most probably, the whole area in question, and the foundation of its enclosure wall was discovered below Hatshepsut walls. Amenhotep $\mathrm{I}^{28}$ had built his temple in the portion partly covered by the Lower Courtyard and partly by the Middle Courtyard. Bricks stamped with his name were found within the so-called quarry of Sen-en-mut ${ }^{29}$ and inserted in the sinusoidal wall which enclosed the area of houses of priests from the north. ${ }^{30}$

[^12]Fig. 6. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, foundations: Upper Courtyard, south wall (based on Stefanowicz, An Analysis of the South Wall of the Upper Court, 49, Fig. 6; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


## Foundations

All the walls of the Upper Courtyard were erected on a platform carved in bedrock, ${ }^{31}$ however, the rock under the Upper Courtyard and the rooms located to the south of it sloped down considerably. Thus it was necessary to form a type of artificial platform in the southern part to create a uniformly flat surface of the Upper Terrace. ${ }^{32}$ After such preparation, the plan was marked by roughly carving the lines which would be the outlines of the foundation (Fig. 6). ${ }^{33}$ In the places where it was necessary to raise the surface level and where a high foundation was planned, the work was divided into several stages: a few layers of blocks were laid, then the spaces were filled with sand, gravel, fragments of undecorated blocks, broken pottery and debris sourced from the rooms carved in rock, and next, most frequently, all that was combined with mortar. ${ }^{34}$ The height of the foundation depended on the ground surface and ranged from a single layer in the northern portion of the Upper Terrace to more than ten layers in its southern part. ${ }^{35}$

The foundations were laid up to the level of the slabs of the floor ${ }^{36}$ and were constructed mainly from limestone blocks. They were built of sandstone blocks only in the southern part of the Lower Terrace and below the retaining wall of the Middle Terrace. ${ }^{37}$ While the foundations for walls were made of roughly worked blocks, the ones under planned doors were laid from blocks which fitted each other. ${ }^{38}$

## Walls

The upper surface of the foundation was roughly smoothed and next outlines were made to mark the walls as well as the spaces for doors. ${ }^{39}$

The system of building walls was basically the same as for the construction of the foundations: two parallel walls were erected on the foundation blocks and the space between them was filled with sand, gravel, limestone flakes, and sometimes mortar. The walls were constructed from horizontally laid courses of blocks. It sometimes happened that the height of a course changed, which, according to Janusz Karkowski, resulted from a new delivery of blocks from the quarry. ${ }^{40}$ The layers of blocks were not high, the walls were
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Fig. 7. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: dovetail cramp: a) wooden original, b) stone socket (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
built of blocks which reached a height of between 30.0 to 50.0 cm , precisely polished on the face and joints, and only roughly cut on the back. ${ }^{41}$

The blocks were joined in two ways. The ones which were laid inside the wall were simply stationed next to each other and the space between them was mostly filled with mortar. ${ }^{42}$ In the places where it was necessary for structural reasons, where the joints needed to be reinforced, which occurred mainly in the case of corner blocks, the so-called "dovetails" were employed. ${ }^{43}$ These were pieces of wood of a characteristic shape, fitted into recesses carved in two blocks (Fig. 7). ${ }^{44}$ Outlines which marked the placement of the subsequently inserted blocks can be found on the upper surface of the blocks that were laid lower. ${ }^{45}$

Some blocks in the walls featured the cartouche $M_{3}{ }^{〔} t-k 3-R^{`}$ (Fig. 8) carved on the side hidden from view, the same as the blocks in the walls of the Chapelle Rouge. ${ }^{46}$ It is unclear why Hatshepsut had her throne name carved in such a place, perhaps it was yet another attempt to legitimise her power, hidden from the eyes of visitors. Unfortunately, in the case of the temple at Deir el-Bahari, it is not known which walls the blocks came from. There are only three blocks with cartouches on the unpolished inner side and scholars are not aware of the exact provenance of any. ${ }^{47}$

The architects of the temple designed the walls in such a way that they would perform definite functions. Thus there was no uniform pattern for all the walls and they were modified depending on need. The thickest walls surrounded the Upper Courtyard ${ }^{48}$ and some rooms adjacent to it. These walls were slanted,
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Fig. 8. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: block with Hatshepsut's cartouche carved in the part concealed under the wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
tapering upwards (Figs 6, 9). Wysocki believes that this could be accounted for by structural reasons: the walls needed to resist the pressure of the materials which filled the space between them. Nevertheless, he noticed that the same form was used for the walls of the temple of Mentuhotep II, located nearby, which were made solely with stone blocks without filling the space with debris. ${ }^{49}$ This is a system of construction widely known in the Middle Kingdom. ${ }^{50}$ The walls erected next to the rock and retaining walls were built of a single row of blocks. ${ }^{51}$ Thicker walls were erected mostly when a niche was planned in the wall. ${ }^{52}$ The niches were formed gradually, along with the construction of the wall and the floor was not made of special blocks but created from the layer of the wall blocks which featured the niche outline. ${ }^{53}$

Wherever there was no specific reason, resources were not spent thoughtlessly and the builders erected thinner walls which were not slanted but vertical. This was the case in the side rooms, such was also the shape of the walls built in the rooms hewn in the rock.
${ }^{49}$ The only analogy to the slanted wall filled with rock debris is the enclosure wall of the Upper Temple of the pyramid of Senwosret I at el-Lisht (Arnold Di., The Pyramid of Senwosret I, 59, Fig. 10).
${ }^{50}$ Wysocki, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, 213; Wysocki, The Raising of the Structure, 242.
${ }^{51}$ Wysocki, The Raising of the Structure, 242.
${ }^{52}$ Karkowski, The Solar Complex, 39, n. 15.
${ }^{53}$ Karkowski, The Solar Complex, 40.


Fig. 9. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, wall shapes: inclined walls erected only in some parts of the temple (based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).


Fig. 10. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: patches and plaster fillings (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
It sometimes happened that a stone inserted in the wall proved to be of inferior quality and was chipped in the course of surface smoothing or because of the impact of a chisel. If there was a slight defect, the gap was filled with mortar, however, the damaged stone sometimes suffered major damage or it was discovered that it was too soft and could not be carved. In such a case, the gap was carved out and filled with a replacement - a new, specially-shaped irregular block, the so-called patch (Fig. 10).

Some parts of the temple ${ }^{54}$ seem to feature Osiride statues as integral parts of the architecture of the walls. The statues were built together with the walls, in consecutive courses of the blocks (Fig. 11). It is likely that the blocks were initially roughly shaped and the final form were modelled after the whole wall had been constructed together with the statue. ${ }^{55}$

## Doors

The doors limited access to subsequent rooms of the temple in the open parts to a gradually decreasing number of authorised people. If the name of a door was recorded, it always comes with the term $s b 3$, which is translated as "that which blazes the [trail]". ${ }^{56}$ They also indicated the direction in which people should move in the temple, by always opening to the inside in the case of the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. This is how it was possible to establish that the originally planned door between the Courtyard of Solar Cult Complex and the Northern Room of Amun was intended to lead from the Northern Room of Amun to the Courtyard of the Solar Cult Complex. ${ }^{57}$ Only some niches opened to the outside and this possibly sug-
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Fig. 11. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, Osiride statues: Upper Portico, north wing, Osiride statue XXV (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 12. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, remains of the bolt of the door: entrance to the Room with the Window, east jamb (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
gests the direction taken in cult practices. In some cases, there are marks left by blocking the door with a type of bolt (Fig. 12). ${ }^{58}$

While the foundations below the walls were constructed from two parallel walls with a filler between them, the foundations below doors - as mentioned above - were filled completely with stone blocks. ${ }^{59}$

Most gates in the temple of Hatshepsut were made of limestone. They were built together with the walls into which they were fitted. A characteristic feature of the gates was the fact that courses of blocks were laid independently on the two sides and differed in height. They only became equal at the level of the lintel (Fig. 13). ${ }^{60}$

Architects commissioned by Hatshepsut decided to erect merely two monumental gates, built of Aswan granite. These led to the Upper Courtyard and from the Upper Courtyard to the Sanctuary. They were constructed from red granite monoliths, the jambs from two vertical blocks, and the lintel from one, laid horizontally.

The doors to different rooms consist of one or two leaves, which seems to be associated with cultic rather than practical reasons, as regardless of the width of the gap in the wall, sometimes a double-leaf door was installed while in other cases it was a sin-gle-leaf one. It should be noted that each single-leaf door opened to the right, i.e. in a way which is practical for right-handed people. However, the largest gates always consisted of two leaves, it is also true for most niches in the temple (apart from the niches in both Shrines of Anubis which had single-leaf doors as well as niches in the Vestibule of the Complex of the Royal Cult which had no doors) (Fig. 14). Doors were instaled in door sockets, circular perforations drilled in the floor and ceiling. ${ }^{61}$ They were made of wood and plated with precious metals. ${ }^{62}$ Moreover, they were also probably sealed. Although no marks of seals have been found at Deir el-Bahari, they are known from the contemporary temple at Amara-West. ${ }^{63}$ It might additionally imply the proceedings of the daily ritual, one element of which is the breaking of the seal. ${ }^{64}$
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Fig. 13. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, door: door to the Southern Room of Amun from inside (based on Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXXX; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

## Floors

The blocks of the floor in the temple of Hatshepsut were made of limestone. They were thinner than other blocks used for the construction and were laid on a layer of sand. ${ }^{65}$ If the shape of a particular room was in line with the original design, the floor blocks were laid before the walls were erected (Fig. 6). ${ }^{66}$

## Columns, pillars

The installation of columns and pillars required a high level of precision. In order to indicate the exact placement of a column, special outlines were drawn or incised on the lower part of the wall or the floor, and were later usually removed. ${ }^{67}$
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Fig. 14. Deir el-Bahari, Temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, distribution of door sockets (based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).


Sixteen-sided columns, as well as pillars were built jointly with the floor. The base of a column was at the same time a floor slab, especially shaped in the upper part (Fig. 15). It was sometimes not just one block, but two or more, combined by means of a "dovetail". ${ }^{68}$ Then, the drums of the column were placed on top of the base and over one another in such a manner that the drums tapered upwards. Thus a column with a diameter of 80 cm at the base measured only 70 cm at the top. ${ }^{69}$ This means the columns were not monolithic forms, which was typical of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, ${ }^{70}$ but were constructed from several courses of appropriately shaped blocks. The sizes of columns differed from room to room. ${ }^{71}$

The pillars were built in a similar manner to the columns. They were constructed from blocks laid one over another. The pillars tapered upwards, just like the columns. ${ }^{72}$
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Fig. 15. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, column bases: a) Hathor Shrine; b) Lower Anubis Shrine; c) Northern Colonnade; d) Southern Lower Portico (Obelisks Portico); e) Southern Middle Portico (Punt Portico); f) Southern Middle Portico (Punt Portico); g) Southern Lower Portico (Obelisks Portico) (based on Połoczanin, The Upper Portico, 80-83; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

The Osiride statues from the Upper Portico constituted an element of carved decoration, which was directly connected with the architecture of the pillars. These statues were constructed in the same way as the Osiride statues fitted in the walls, they were built of segments including both the pillar and part of the statue, ${ }^{73}$ shaped roughly before installation, and then the statue alone received its finishing touches. ${ }^{74}$

## Architraves

The element which rested directly on the columns or pillars was an architrave (Fig. 16). Architraves were the largest blocks, their length ranging from approx. 230.0 cm to 285.0 cm , and the cross section was approx. $70.0 \times 65.0 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{75}$ The width of the blocks differed from room to room, and even in the same room not all architraves reached the same width. In the case of the Upper Portico, the characteristic trait of the

[^19]Fig. 16. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: columns, architraves and ceiling (based on Wysocki, The Upper Court Colonnade, 62; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

architraves is the fact that they are reduced in width as viewed from the north to the south. ${ }^{76}$ The middle architraves featured rectangular cuboid shape (Fig. 17a), and when two lines of architraves were combined, the corner blocks were shaped in such a manner that the column or pillar upheld the biggest possible surface of the block (Fig. 17b). ${ }^{77}$ Another feature characterised the blocks which were directly combined with the wall: they projected from the wall, constituting an integral part (Fig. 17c). This property is present in all architraves in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$.

## Ceilings and ceiling slabs

Two types of rooms were designed for the temple of Hatshepsut, and as a consequence, they were topped with two types of ceilings. The first instance applied to rooms (both closed and open: porticoes and courtyards) so wide that the ceiling slabs had to be supported with columns or pillars. In such cases, the builders constructed a flat roof (Fig. 16).

The ceiling slabs in such cases displayed lengths and widths required by the distances between the pillars or columns and the walls, which means they changed in a similar manner as architraves. The slabs were approx. 70 cm thick. ${ }^{78}$

There was also another type of closed room, long and narrow, where there was no need or possibility to install columns. If the width and function of such a room corresponded with a flat roof, it was usually constructed. However, there are some rooms which technically could have been topped with a flat roof, but a different solution was selected, and a barrel vault was built.

The barrel vaults in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ did not represent the classic type, but rather imitated it. Two types of vaults are attested: ${ }^{79}$ one of them was a corbelled vault (Fig. 18a), ${ }^{80}$ the other a relieving vault. ${ }^{81}$ Both

[^20]
a.


Fig. 17. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, method of joining architraves: a) architraves in one row; b) joint of two perpendicular rows of architraves; c) end of a row of architraves with an architrave inserted in the wall (drawing J. Iwaszczuk).
of these types of ceiling were formed by carving the already installed blocks into a barrel shape. The relieving vault was used in smaller rooms, and the ceiling blocks were hewn into the shape of an arch. On the other hand, in the case of rooms such as the Bark Hall or the royal offering chapels, where a larger space had to be covered, the structure required a different construction due to the larger and heavier blocks. For this reason, a corbelled vault was employed. In such circumstances, there was a possibility that the blocks would collapse into the room and destroy one another. Therefore they needed to be weighed down on the sides. Thus, to prevent the ceiling slabs from collapsing into the Bark Hall fitted into the rock, it was necessary to build a relieving structure, which divided the weight equally on the sides and at the same time exerted pressure on the slabs along the width of the walls situated below (Fig. 18b). ${ }^{82}$

It is possible that the so-called barrels, whose models are found in foundation deposits, were used to aid the process of shaping. Andrzej Ćwiek believes that they might have been used to verify the shape of the chiselled vault. ${ }^{83}$

It should be added, however, that the shape of each room depended, above all, on its ritual function and not on the architectural or aesthetic needs. The best example for that is the chapel of the cult of Hatshepsut (and most probably also the chapel of the cult of Thutmose $I^{84}$ ), which is the largest room in the temple, yet due to its function of an offering chapel, ${ }^{85}$ its walls support a corbelled vault of barrel shape. The ceilings of sanctuaries (Bark Hall in the Main Sanctuary of Amun or the Shrines of Hathor and of Anubis) also featured this shape. ${ }^{86}$

## Stairs

The stairs on the grounds of the temple of Hatshepsut are of two types: low, with a few steps, and a type of wide ramp which served for walking from the level of a lower terrace to the higher terrace.

The low stairs were normally constructed from a single block and a type of small balustrade was shaped in it. This kind of stairs led i.a. from the Bark Hall to the Statue Room, from the Hypostyle Hall to the Vestibule of the Lower Anubis Shrine, from the Second Hypostyle Hall to the Vestibule of the Shrine of Hathor, or to the Porticoes of the Lower and Middle Terraces.

[^21]

Fig. 18. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, ceilings: a) ceiling of the Chapel of Hatshepsut (based on Połoczanin, Moduł architektoniczny w kompozycji górnego tarasu, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk); b) relieving structure over the Bark Hall (based on Wysocki, The Discoveries, Research and the Results, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

The construction of a ramp was an undertaking of a higher magnitude. It seems to have been such an important and heavy architectural element that the structure required a foundation. In some cases, foundation deposits were placed under the foundations. ${ }^{87}$

## Skylights and the window

Only one room was designed to have a window. It does not seem, however, that its basic role was to let the light in but it rather was intended to provide a connection between the Room with the Window and the Upper Courtyard. ${ }^{88}$ This is due to the fact that it is difficult to let the light in from a covered arcade, which was

[^22]Fig. 19. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, balustrade: a) regular balustrade; b) balustrade of the ramp which leads to the Upper Terrace (based on Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes (1932), 21, Fig. 21; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

constituted by the colonnade of the Upper Courtyard. It would also be confirmed by the presence of stairs situated in the Room with the Window.

On the other hand, the openings which definitely served for illumination of the rooms were skylights. Only two rooms were equipped with this type of natural "lamps": the Main Sanctuary of Amun and the Northern Room of Amun.

The skylights were formed along the whole thickness of the wall, the blocks inside the wall were precisely polished. The builders additionally emphasised the openings in the decoration of the wall by framing them with geometric friezes. ${ }^{89}$ This is the way that the skylights in the Main Sanctuary of Amun look. The skylights in the Northern Room of Amun were not particularly emphasised, they create an impression of secondary ones and they pierce the kheker frieze. ${ }^{90}$

The skylights were not an architecturally necessary element and their presence should be explained with a ritual function. Scholars understand the role of the skylights in the Main Sanctuary of Amun as they directed the light to the statue in the niche of the Statue Room approx. 36 days before and after the winter solstice, ${ }^{91}$ however, the ritual role of the skylights in the Northern Room of Amun has yet to be accounted for.

## Architectural details: cornices, balustrades, torus mouldings, gargoyles

The cornice ${ }^{92}$ was, as it appears, a purely decorative element, and it was a block adjacent to the ceiling blocks. Therefore it had to be narrow enough to let them rest on the same wall or architrave. An arch-shaped form in the lower part was a characteristic feature of the cornices. The cornice was usually made of a separate block which rested on a torus moulding, although e.g. in the Northern Middle Portico (Birth Portico) it also included a part of the torus moulding. The upper limit of the balustrade was marked on the upper surface of the cornices, either with a carved line, or sometimes an incision of the whole surface or a raised surface for the balustrade. Cornices were incised with vertical grooves resembling the shape of palm leaves, painted red, green, and blue, with a white separating stripe. ${ }^{93}$

Two types of balustrades were used in the temple at Deir el-Bahari. First of all, there were balustrades in the walking area. They were constructed from blocks which were rounded at the top and were planted next to the cornice. Such balustrades were built as protection from falls along porticoes and ramps, and their miniature copies were placed on the Solar Altar or smaller stairs. These balustrades were either decorated, like the one on the ramp leading to the Upper Terrace (Fig. 19b), ${ }^{94}$ or undecorated (Fig. 19a), as it was in all other cases.

The balustrades without decoration were always built at the top of a wall above the cornice (Fig. 16).

\footnotetext{
${ }^{89}$ See, e.g. Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes (1932), 13, Fig. 10; Winlock, Excavations, 216.
${ }^{90}$ See: Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I, 19-24, Pl. I [upper right].
${ }^{91}$ Furlong, Midwinter Solstice Alignment, 2; Barwik, Sanctuary of the Hatshepsut Temple, 7, Fig. 12 and studies by Ćwiek, in preparation.
${ }^{92}$ Dąbrowski, The cornices in the Queen Hatshepsut Temple, 57-61.
${ }^{93}$ Dąbrowski, The cornices in the Queen Hatshepsut Temple, 57-61.
${ }^{94}$ Winlock (Excavations, 106-107, 172-173, 219, Fig. 14) and Ian Shaw (Balustrades, Stairs and Altars, 112-114) suggest an ideological interpretation of the decoration, according to which, the images on the ramp would symbolise the gods of the North and the South (Wadjet and Horus); they, however, do not allow for the fact that the erased fragment of the lower part could be a relic of the hieroglyph $k_{3}$, with Horus seated on it, which formed a cryptographic record of the name $M_{3}{ }^{`} t-k 3-R^{`}$. That was already indicated by Franciszek Pawlicki (Hatshepsut Temple Conservation and Preservation Project 1996/1997, 52-53) and although Marta Sankiewicz (Cryptogram Ureus Frieze, 211, n. 77)
}

Fig. 20. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, torus moulding: a) fragment of a block topped with torus moulding; b) torus moulding en face; c) torus moulding, view of a corner block from above (drawing J. Iwaszczuk).


The basic function of such balustrade, apart from the decorative one, which seems secondary, was to support the cornice.

Torus mouldings were an ornamental motif which framed the decoration of the walls around the sides and the top. It was a type of cordon which lined the wall, with a decoration which resembled a tied bunch of reed (Fig. 20a-c). They were normally placed on the outside of the building, on the outer architraves, however, they can also be found in the Chapel of Hatshepsut. Torus mouldings were employed to line the false door, as well as the niches in the west wall of the Upper Courtyard.

The final architectural detail which appears in the temple is the gargoyle. The temple grounds accommodate at least two objects of this type, however, the system of water removal has not been reconstructed so far. The two gargoyles identified with certainty are situated in the balustrade on both sides of the Upper Portico. They are sandstone sculpted elements built into the wall, representations of a lion's head, with an aperture in the mouth, which should convey water out. It is possible that other gargoyles were located in the cornice over the Solar Cult Courtyard since a regular carved shape, associated with gargoyles by Karkowski, has been preserved at a distance of 3.2 m from the northern corner. ${ }^{95}$

## Architectural errors

The notion that a building can be perfect only in theory can also be seen in the case of the temple of Hatshepsut. Some structural errors appeared and the builders repaired or masked them in a more or less accurate manner. Even though they luckily were fairly rare, some of them determined further architectural work within a particular area.

The most serious error seems to be the construction of the Northern Colonnade, without taking the tomb of queen Meritamon, ${ }^{96}$ located directly below, into consideration. It seems that this area was intended to hold five chapels instead of the four which were eventually built. However, the brick ceiling of the funerary chamber would not resist such a heavy load and, consequently, as suggested by Wysocki, not only the work on the eastern chapel was abandoned, but also on the whole Northern Colonnade. ${ }^{97}$

Some errors were harmless to such a degree that the builders did not regard it necessary to repair them. In theory, all foundations should be situated along the line of planned walls, however, there were some errors which the workmen corrected only when they erected the walls. Such a situation developed in the process of construction of the north wall of the Upper Courtyard, whose foundation is slightly shifted towards south at the western end. It seems that the defect was left as it was due to its little influence on the structure (Fig. 21). ${ }^{98}$ The south wall of the Upper Courtyard appears to display the same trait. ${ }^{99}$

The south wall of the Upper Courtyard can be an example of an early noticed and skilfully masked error. A part of the artificial platform probably slightly collapsed in the course of the levelling works. Thus
believed that there was not enough space to accommodate the hieroglyph $k_{3}$, it seems there is no reason to contradict the presence of the cryptographic record of the queen's name in that place since a fragment of the hood of a cobra was found by Ćwiek in season 2005-2006.
${ }^{95}$ Karkowski, The Solar Complex, 124-125.
${ }^{96}$ Wysocki, The results of research, 338-342, Figs 4-5.
${ }^{97}$ Wysocki, The results of research, 338-342, Figs 4-5; Wysocki, The Raising of the Structure, 251, see below, pp. 77-78.
${ }^{98}$ Karkowski, The Solar Complex, 38 and n. 11.
${ }^{99}$ Stefanowicz, An Analysis of the South Wall of the Upper Court, 45, Fig. 2 [b].


Fig. 21. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, architectural errors: foundation of the north wall of the Upper Courtyard (based on Karkowski, The Solar Complex, Pl. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
a difference in the levels between the lower portion of the eastern and western parts of that wall emerged, and the eastern part ended up 6 cm lower that the western one. The error was detected at the level of the jamb of the door to the Royal Cult Complex, where the builders started to implement adjustments. Next, in order to conceal the height difference, the dado in the eastern part of the south wall was carved higher and the column bases installed in this area of the courtyard were also higher. The effect of this collapse can be also observed inside niches of the Vestibule of the Complex of the Royal Cult. ${ }^{100}$

[^23]
## Decoration techniques

It should be assumed that decoration was made when the construction of a given part of the temple had been completed and the roof had been installed if it had been planned in that place. The installation of the roof is a task which requires a high degree of precision considering the size of blocks that had to be lifted and fitted on top of the building. Any sway of a ceiling block, frequently weighing more than a ton, could have caused damage to the wall surfaces, the top layers of blocks being the easiest to break. It seems that in such circumstances the decoration process was postponed until the room had been closed.

On the other hand, it is known that architectural alterations were also made after the decoration had been finished, which is demonstrated by the example of the west wall of the Upper Courtyard, where the gate was replaced and a part of the decoration deleted in the process. ${ }^{1}$

The stone underwent a preparatory shaping already at the quarry, and then, possibly at the construction site, was fitted in with the blocks laid on its both sides in the wall. The face and the back of the block, which was inserted into the wall, were left unworked (Fig. 22). The preliminary work was done with chisels, whose models have been found in the foundation deposits, ${ }^{2}$ and wooden mallets, found in the temple (Fig. 23). ${ }^{3}$ The surface of the block face was smoothed as the last, after the blocks had been fitted into walls, to protect them from damage in the course of installation and polish the surface more accurately. ${ }^{4}$ The walls were initially roughly evened with copper or bronze chisels and wooden mallets. ${ }^{5}$ The stone-worker was seated for his convenience in one spot and he hit the chisel reaching as far as he could. He then moved a little further. This can be traced by the marks left where the wall surface was not decorated (Fig. 24).

[^24]

Fig. 22. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, block from the lower part of the wall, retaining wall over the Hathor Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 23. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, tools for preliminary smoothing and polishing of walls: mallet, storeroom of the Mission at the temple of Thutmose III, Deir el-Bahari (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 24. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, polishing of the walls: marks left by polishing of the walls, Upper Courtyard, north wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 25. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques: contours and carving of reliefs; marks left by carving of reliefs in an unfinished wall, Complex of the Solar Cult, Courtyard, Niche B, west wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 27. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, application: bowls with pigments: season 1999/2000, excavations in the Northern Room of Amun (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

The walls after preliminary preparation were polished, which was effected by abrasion of the stone surface with ground stones or sand. ${ }^{6}$ The places where the stone was chipped were filled with mortar (Fig. 25).

A painter approached the wall after such preparation and first painted grid lines ${ }^{7}$ which he then followed with decoration lines (Fig. 25). ${ }^{8}$ Sculptors carved the shape of the relief along these lines. The images were sometimes first tested on limestone flakes ${ }^{9}$ or directly on the walls. ${ }^{10}$ It concerns also the preparation of inscriptions on statues: e.g. the ostracon stored in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna bears the text of the inscription carved on the statue of Hatshepsut's wet nurse, Sit-Ra, discovered at Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{11}$

The next step involved covering the walls with whitewash, which created an undercoat for certain colours. It should be remembered that not all colours required whitewash as some were applied directly on the stone (Fig. 26).

The final task was application of paints from little bowls. Fragments of broken vessels were used for that purpose. Containers of such type with various pigments have been unearthed in the temple of Hatshepsut (Fig. 27). ${ }^{12}$

## Errors of the decorators

Not all decoration elements were made by the master artist himself, a part of the easier work was left for his assistants. At least this is what could be believed when faced with errors of a sculptor, which were later

[^25]

Fig. 28. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, correction of carvers' errors: Upper Courtyard, east wall, northern part (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
corrected. It appears, however, that the decoration in such places was not of enough importance to polish the surface and conceal the lack of skill shown by a careless apprentice - the supervisors were satisfied when such errors were covered with paint (Fig. 28).

# Earlier temples <br> which functioned in the times of Hatshepsut 

Temple of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari - Mn-swt

| Name: | Mn-swt ${ }^{1}$ (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 221) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dedicatory incription: | none |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location: ${ }^{2}$ | h | no data |  |  | La | 2543.96 ' N |  | Lo | $3237.39^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ |  |
| Orientation: | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}\right.$ | no data |  | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data | $\delta\left({ }^{\circ}\right.$ | no data |  | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | no data |
| Dimensions: ${ }^{3}$ | H | no data |  |  | W | 32 m |  | L | 64 m |  |
| Material: | limestone |  |  |  | Quarry: |  | no data |  |  |  |
| Type of the temple according to written sources: |  |  | no data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | ```1896 - Wilhelm Spiegelberg 1897 - Georges Daressy 1898 - Wilhelm Spiegelberg, Percy E. Newberry 1911 - Georg Möller 1911 - Wilhelm Spiegelberg 1916 - Howard Carter 1971, 1980 - Charles C. Van Siclen``` |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular hight of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

The temple discovered by Wilhelm Spiegelberg in the northern part of the necropolis, 500 m to the west of the temple of Seti I at Qurna, ${ }^{5}$ is now identified beyond doubt as the $M n$-swt temple. The identification is based on the inscriptions of its name, ${ }^{6}$ found in the building. The fragments discovered by Spiegelberg in the southern part of the temple, signed with the name of Amenhotep I, ${ }^{7}$ were reconstructed by Herbert Eustis Winlock as elements of the door lintel which led to the chapel devoted to the cult of the ruler. ${ }^{8}$ They indicate that the temple was erected in the times of Amenhotep I. It must be emphasised, however, that the cult of the ruler, attested on private possessions, ${ }^{9}$ was connected with the cult of his mother, Ahmose Nefertari, from a relatively early period. ${ }^{10}$ It should be noted that the temple is not referred to as the temple of

[^26]

Fig. 29. Qurna, Temple of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari, Mn-swt, plan (based on Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 197; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

millions of years in any sources, ${ }^{11}$ and no fragments of false door or any other type of artefacts which could be attributed to a traditional chapel of royal cult have been discovered.

The blocks of the reconstructed lintel bear evident traces of Amarna-related erasures, ${ }^{12}$ post-Amarna restorations, ${ }^{13}$ as well as Ramesside re-carvings. ${ }^{14}$ The silhouette of Seth was also erased, probably in the Late Period, ${ }^{15}$ which indicates that the cult of the ruler was observed there longer than it is attested in written sources. ${ }^{16}$

The temple was located along the north-south axis. ${ }^{17}$ On the basis of stone elements found in situ, Charles C. Van Siclen stated that the enclosure was entered through a pylon. ${ }^{18}$ Nevertheless, his interpretation raises doubts since brick elements have not been preserved and the stone remains do not provide
of Meniset, 192-193). For this reason, the suggestion that Mn-swt should really be regarded as the mortuary temple of Ahmose Nefertari (Stadelmann, Tempel und Tempelnamen, 172, n. 11) seems to be incorrect.
${ }^{11}$ Schmitz, Amenophis I., 106.
${ }^{12}$ Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge, Pl. VI [11].
${ }^{13}$ Lintel block, Louvre, Paris B 58 (http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=car_not_frame\&idNotice=23714\& langue $=\mathrm{fr}$, accessed November 22, 2016).
${ }^{14}$ Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge, Pl. VI [12]; Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 186.
${ }^{15}$ Lintel block, Louvre, Paris B 58: Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge, Pl. III [3]; Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 186; on the subject of the chronology of erasures of Seth, see: Ćwiek, Fate of Seth, 59, n. 61 and references there.
${ }^{16}$ The list of temples from the tomb of Imi-seba (TT 65), reign of Ramesses IX. On the subject of the edifice, see: LD III, Pl. 236 [a]. On the subject of the history of the building, see: Thiem, Anmerkungen zur Identifikation des Tempels ḥwt-Jmn-htp-n-p3-k3mw, 79-80.
${ }^{17}$ Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 184.
${ }^{18}$ Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 184.


Fig. 30. Qurna, Temple of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari, Mn-swt: representation of Amenhotep I in $h b b-s d$ pavillion (based on Winlock, A Restoration of the Reliefs, Pl. IV; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
conclusive evidence. However, Van Siclen's hypothesis should be carefully considered due to the fact that so far the 4th Pylon at Karnak built by Thutmose I has been the first pylon with established chronology. ${ }^{19}$ According to Van Siclen, the whole complex was surrounded with a brick enclosure. ${ }^{20}$

The remains of architecture are sparse, the plan of the temple was reconstructed by Van Siclen ${ }^{21}$ mostly theoretically (Fig. 29). It could be supposed that Mn-swt was 64 m long and 32 m wide. The entrance in the south led to the hypostyle hall which contained 24 sixteen-sided columns, which were arranged in four rows, six columns in each. Merely eight column bases could be seen in the times of work conducted by Howard Carter. ${ }^{22}$ The bases were made of limestone and installed in the limestone floor. The hall was 14 m long and 10 m wide. From there, it was possible to pass on to a courtyard surrounded with a portico, which led to the main chamber of the temple. Nothing survived of that part, Van Siclen marks a large depression in the area of the supposed courtyard. ${ }^{23}$ The central building was a fairly small structure framed with a portico. A hall with four columns led to another one with two columns. The latter featured a door which led to two long side rooms located on its both sides. This section of the temple has been preserved best, part of the foundation and bases of some columns have survived: two bases of columns from the portico which framed the main building and two columns inside of it. ${ }^{24} \mathrm{~A}$ better state of preservation of this part of the building results from the fact that it was made of stone. ${ }^{25}$ As shown on the plan made by Clarence S. Fischer, ${ }^{26}$ the inner part of the central portion of the structure contained more preserved material than Carter and Van Siclen detected, Fischer also documented pavement in the whole area of the sanctuary. His plan shows that another room with a door which led to the two side rooms was situated behind the room with two columns.

Further discussion ${ }^{27}$ seems to be affected by the possible location of the scenes from the lintel reconstructed by Winlock. Van Siclen, ${ }^{28}$ who was the last to study the remains of the Mn-swt temple, did not treat Winlock's reconstruction seriously and exploited reconstruction drawing made by Kurt Sethe, ${ }^{29}$ adding

[^27]two fragments published by Philippe Derchain. ${ }^{30}$ The difference is so notable that Sethe believed that some of the photographs were mirror images of the original objects and the scale published by Spiegelberg is the same for all blocks, while Winlock indicated that firstly, there were various scales in the publication, secondly, the blocks were not mirror images. As a consequence of Winlock's findings, two scenes of corresponding sizes were reconstructed instead of one. The length of the scenes reconstructed in this manner is 3.65 m and thus it exceeds the sizes of entrances to the side rooms. ${ }^{31}$ Moreover, the widths of the blocks, which reach 40 cm for one of the lintels and 25 cm for the other, ${ }^{32}$ indicate that they come from two different architectural elements, which makes Winlock's theory more likely. Such fairly thin blocks might have been laid in a brick wall. Analogical lintel scenes are known from the Middle Kingdom, ${ }^{33}$ as well as the times of Amenhotep I. ${ }^{34}$ In all cases in which their location in the temple can be established, they are not decoration of a door inside the building but a part of the gate which leads to the area of the temenos. ${ }^{35}$ The reconstruction made by Sethe, cited by Van Siclen, seems to be little likely - it is impossible for this scene to form a lintel as it is composed of several blocks which would not be held in place over an entrance. Therefore, it must have been a scene situated over a lintel analogically to the structure of the gate of Amenhotep I at Karnak. ${ }^{36}$ In addition to that, the two widths of blocks would rather make it impossible to place them in one structure and for this reason, the reconstruction of two scenes on both sides of the gate in a brick wall is more likely. Winlock remarks that the northern part of the temple, i.e. the proper temple edifice, lacks space for such a large lintel scene. ${ }^{37}$ Van Siclen further adds that the blocks were found in the southern section of the temple. According to him, this indicates the possibility that the scene was situated in the brick wall on the axis, in the entrance to the hypostyle hall. ${ }^{38}$

The scenes reconstructed by Winlock have so far been regarded as evidence for the existence of the royal cult in Mn-swt, and the temple itself as the mortuary temple of Amenhotep I and/or Ahmose Nefertari. ${ }^{39}$ Nevertheless, scenes of that kind are mostly found in temples of gods and did not constitute a part of decoration programme of chapels of the royal cult before the times of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{40}$ Therefore, nothing implies particularly that Mn-swt functioned as the mortuary temple of a king, typical features of such a building are absent in it (i.e. offering chapel with a false door), however, the cult of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari was definitely practiced there. The preserved architectural remains also indicate that there was no space for a offering chapel in its southern section. ${ }^{41}$

The construction work in Mn-swt was continued by subsequent rulers. An architrave with the name $D h w t j-m s h^{\prime} n f r w$ discovered by Spiegelberg ${ }^{42}$ indicates that the structure was rebuilt already under Thutmose I and one of the porticoes is the work of that ruler. It should also be added that the shape of the columns implies expansion of the building during the reign of Thutmose I or Hatshepsut, ${ }^{43}$ even though her names have not been attested in the temple.

Van Siclen believes that the form of the temple which he reconstructed results mainly form the rebuilding in the Ramesside Period. ${ }^{44}$
${ }^{30}$ Derchain, Débris du temple-reposoir, 18, Figs 1-2.
${ }^{31}$ Winlock, A Restoration of the Reliefs, 14-15; Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 185.
${ }^{32}$ Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge, 2, n. 3.
${ }^{33}$ Amenemhat I, el-Lisht: Simpson, Studies, 60-61, Pl. VIII; Senwosret III, Medamud: Cottevieille-Giraudet, Rapport sur le fouilles de Medamoud (1931), Pl. 1; Amenemhat III, Bubastis: Farid, Preliminary Report, 94, Pl. X; Sebekhetep II, Medamud: Cottevieille-Giraudet, Rapport sur le fouilles de Medamoud (1931), Pl. 5. I am grateful to Dr Felix Arnold for sharing a list of lintels with this particular type of decoration.
${ }^{34}$ Karnak: Chevrier, Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1947-1948), Pl. XXVI; Letellier, Larché, La cour à portique de Thoutmosis IV, 262; Gebel Zeit: Louvre, Paris B 58 (http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=car_not_frame\&idNotice=23714\&langue=fr, accessed November 22, 2016).
${ }^{35}$ Cottevieille-Giraudet, Rapport sur le fouilles de Medamoud (1931), Pls 1, 5; Letellier, Larché, La cour à portique de Thoutmosis IV, 262.
${ }^{36}$ Letellier, Larché, La cour à portique de Thoutmosis IV, 262-263.
${ }^{37}$ Winlock, A Restoration of the Reliefs, 15.
${ }^{38}$ Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 186.
${ }^{39}$ Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge, 1-5; Winlock, A Restoration of the Reliefs, 11-15, Pls III-IV; see above, n. 10; see also: Romer, Royal Tombs, 202; Polz, Der Beginn des Neuen Reiches, 104-105.
${ }^{40}$ Karkowski, Pharaoh in the Heb-Sed Robe, Figs 10-12. See above, nn. 32-33.
${ }^{41}$ Cf. plans: Carter, Note, Pl. XXIII; Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 196, Fig. 2; Polz, Der Beginn des Neuen Reiches, Fig. 25.
${ }^{42}$ Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge, 4; Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, Fig. 6 [2].
${ }^{43}$ Sixteen-sided columns, particularly limestone ones, are typical of the architecture from the times of Hatshepsut (cf. chap. Construction techniques, pp. 23-24), although they appeared also in Karnak during the reign of Thutmose I (Larché, Nouvelles observations, 446, Pl. XLIV).
${ }^{44}$ Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 186.

Sources from the times of Hatshepsut which record the name of the Mn-swt temple include the list of temples from the tomb of Ineni, ${ }^{45}$ as well the list of temples from the tomb of Pui-em-Ra. ${ }^{46}$ It also appears on more recent lists of temples from later periods. ${ }^{47}$ It is an important evidence that despite the death of the ruler, the temple still fulfilled a significant role in the cult. It should be noted that according to the list of Ineni, Mn-swt received a bigger amount of incense than most temples on the East Bank or the temple of Mentuhotep II. ${ }^{48}$ Pen-iaty is known to have supervised the construction work in the times of Thutmose II, which is attested by the title of the official jmj-r k3t $n(t) D \operatorname{Ds}-k 3-R^{c} m 3^{c} h r w$, inscribed on a rock at Shatt elRigal together with the titles jmj-r k3t $n(t)$ ' $3-h p r-k 3-R$ ' as well as $j m j-r k 3 t n(t)$ ' $3-h p r-n-R{ }^{\prime}{ }^{49}$ Mn-swt was undoubtedly involved in cult in the times of Hatshepsut, which is confirmed by one of the titles of Sen-enmut: jmj-r 'hwt $n(t) J m n m M n-s w t^{50}$ and Sen-Amun, who fulfilled the function of a $w^{\prime} b$ priest and overseer of a granary(?) i.a. of the cult of Amenhotep I. ${ }^{51}$

[^28]Temple of Mentuhotep II $-3 h-s w t$

| Name: | $3 h-s w t^{1}, 3 h-s t^{2}$ (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 221) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dedicatory incription: | none |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location: | h | 125 m a.s.l. (terrace) |  |  | La | $25^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}$ |  | Lo | $32^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ |  |
| Orientation: ${ }^{3}$ | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $118^{1 / 4}$ |  | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | 0 | $\delta\left({ }^{\circ}\right.$ | -25.5 |  | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | $90^{1 / 4}$ |
| Dimensions: | H | 11 m |  |  | W | 120 m (in the time of Hatshepsut) |  | L | 310 m (without the processional alley) |  |
| Material: ${ }^{4}$ | 1. limestone; 2. sandstone |  |  |  | Quarry: |  | 1. Gebelein(?); <br> 2. Qubet el-Hawa(?) |  |  |  |
| Type of the temple according to written sources: |  |  | no data for the reign of Hatshepsut |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | 1859 - Frederik Lord Dufferin 1903-1907 - Edouard Naville 1920-1925, 1930-1931 - Herbert Eustis Winlock 1966-1971 - Dieter Arnold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

The temple of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra was built in the valley of Deir el-Bahari. This location is accounted for with a variety of reasons. ${ }^{6}$ Above all, it seems that the valley was regarded as a sacred ground already in the Old Kingdom and was closely related to the cult of Hathor. ${ }^{7}$ The valley was called Jnt Nb-hpt-R in the times of Mentuhotep $I^{8}$ and after his reign, in a later period, it bore the name of $\underline{D} s r t .{ }^{9}$

The complex was an enormous construction project - the features preserved to date include fragments of the processional alley which led from the valley temple to the central terraced building of the temple, surrounded by an enclosure wall, as well as the tomb of the king, carved deep in the bedrock (Fig. 31).

Winlock believed that when Hatshepsut undertook the construction of her temple, she used the neighbouring temple of Mentuhotep II as a model, and the original plan of her edifice, reconstructed on the basis

[^29]

Fig. 31. Deir el-Bahari, Temple of Mentuhotep II, 3 h-swt: plan of the temple of Mentuhotep II (based on Arnold Di., The Temple at Mentuhotep, Pl. 42; Arnold Di., Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep I, Pl. 27; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 32. Dedicatory inscriptions of Hatshepsut: a. based on Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm MM 14385 (Donohue, Hatshepsut and Nebhepetre ${ }^{c}$ Mentuhotpe, Fig. 2); b. based on Liverpool Museum, Liverpool M 11929 (Dodson, Hatshepsut and „her Father", Pl. XXIX [2]; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
of the layout of foundation deposits, was very similar to the plan of his building. ${ }^{10}$ Daniel Polz claimed that in both cases, the tomb of each ruler and their temples are related. ${ }^{11}$

The architecture of both edifices appears similar, both are terraced, with rows of columns and pillars. Apart from the architectural elements, iconographic details were also copied in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$. The scene of Ha-thor-cow, feeding the king, present in $3 h-s w t$, yet unknown from other representations prior to Hatshepsut's reign, is worth closer attention. ${ }^{12}$

## The temple in the times of Hatshepsut

It is extremely difficult to estimate the appearance of the temple of Mentuhotep II in the times of Hatshepsut and understand the degree to which it was exploited. There are merely a few hints which could be used to draw tentative conclusions.

The temple certainly served for cultic purposes under Hatshepsut, which means that it was in good condition. The building was still in use under Ramesses II, when it was renovated. It is indicated by the restoration inscriptions carved on the walls of the temple. ${ }^{13}$ However, it appears that certain parts of the structure were not utilised any longer in the times of queen Hatshepsut. This is probably true for the processional alley, which, as supposed by Winlock, was partly damaged and the rubble was used to fill a new alley leading to the temple of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{14}$ The notion that the alley associated with Mentuhotep II's complex ceased to function is also confirmed by installation of a door in the south wall of the Lower Courtyard. ${ }^{15}$ Such location of the door, which opens from the Lower Courtyard in the direction of the courtyard of Mentuhotep II's temple, clearly indicates the direction of transfer from the temple of Hatshepsut to the temple of Mentuhotep II (Fig. 31). ${ }^{16}$ It was a course of a daily route travelled by the priests involved in the royal cult. It seems that processional feasts bypassed that building.

Other parts of the temple of Mentuhotep II had also fallen out of use. The external wall on the northern side, along with everything which it surrounded,was damaged in some sections and covered in others. ${ }^{17}$

[^30]

Fig. 33. Vota with the name of Hatshepsut (Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple III, Pls XXV [5], XXVII [3]).

If it was not done by Amenhotep I, whose building stood within Mentuhotep II's enclosure walls, ${ }^{18}$ then the devastation occurred under Hatshepsut, who adopted this area for the construction of two lower terraces.

Some modifications were introduced by Hatshepsut in the northern part of the reduced temple. A transverse wall of unknown purpose was built in the east of the Hathor Shrine in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{19}$ The north wall separating the temple complex of Mentuhotep II from the temple of Hatshepsut was overbuilt by Hatshepsut and thus a ramp which led to the Hathor Shrine in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{-} s r w$ was formed. ${ }^{20}$ The terrace of that chapel was erected partly within the grounds of the temple of Mentuhotep II.

It appears that in the times of Hatshepsut, as well as much later, its sanctuary was in use, since this is where the craftsmen commissioned by Ramesses II carved the restoration inscriptions. It is also certain that the cult of Amun in ( $m$ ) $3 h-s w t^{21}$ was observed there, which is suggested by the rituals performed in the sanctuary. The part of the temple which prospered the best was the Hathor Shrine of ( $n$ ) $3 h-s w t$. Its location is still obscure. ${ }^{22}$ There are no relics of its existence left, however, inscriptions which mention the cult of Hathor of $(n) 3 h$-swt can be found in the temple. ${ }^{23}$

## Artefacts from the temple

There are rather few artefacts associated with the temple of Mentuhotep II and dated to the reign of Hatshepsut. In the case of two items, which could be related to the cult of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra, their origin has not been identified. One of them is a small alabaster bowl with the following inscription: "Perfect God $M_{3}{ }^{c} t-k 3-R^{c}$ made (it) as his monument for his father Nebhepetra justified (ntr nfr $M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k z-R^{c} j r . n . f$ $\left.m m n w . f n j t . f N b-h p t-R^{\prime} m \xi^{\prime}-h r w\right) "$ (Fig. 32a). ${ }^{24}$ An identical inscription can be seen on the other item, a small pebble (Fig. 32b). ${ }^{25}$ The former was usurped by Thutmose IV, even though the name of Hatshepsut had not been re-carved. It is possible that this is when the vota were removed from the interior of the chapel and this bowl served for ritual purposes again. If it had been generally accessible, the name of Hatshepsut would have been chiselled off during the reign of Thutmose III.

Small faience vota have been discovered within the grounds of the temple, including those offered by Hatshepsut (Fig. 33). ${ }^{26}$

Another object which comes from Deir el-Bahari is a limestone figurine of the priest of Mentuhotep II's temple, Djehuty, with Hatshepsut's cartouche carved on its side. ${ }^{27}$

A stela, at the moment stored at the British Museum, has been discovered in the temple of Mentuhotep II (Fig. 34). ${ }^{28}$ It bears images of Osiride statues of Mentuhotep II and Amenhotep I venerated jointly. According to Edouard Naville and Dieter Arnold, the Osiride statues of Amenhotep I were originally situated next to the temple of that king, and then removed by Hatshepsut in the course of demolition of that building and

[^31]Fig. 34. Deir el-Bahari, Temple of Mentuhotep II, $3 h$-swt: stela stored in the British Museum, London EA690 (Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple I, Pl. XXV [B]).

placed next to the ramp. ${ }^{29}$ Thus they appeared so close to the Osiride statues of Mentuhotep II that their joint cult became possible. Therefore, if the theory formed by Naville and Arnold is correct, the stela could have been planted during the reign of Hatshepsut.

## Functioning of the temple, people associated with the temple

There is little information left concerning the functioning of the temple of Mentuhotep II during the reign of Hatshepsut. Sen-en-mut was the highest-ranking person involved in the cult of Mentuhotep II, unfortunately, only a part of his title has been preserved: ... $n \mathrm{Nb}-\mathrm{hpt}-R^{c} \mathrm{Sn}-n-m w t .{ }^{30}$ The limestone figurine of Djehuty, mentioned above, bears the following titles: $w^{\prime} b$ priest and lector priest in $3 h-s w t$ ( $w^{\prime} b \underline{h r j}-\underline{h} b t$ $n_{3} 3$ h-swt). ${ }^{31}$ There were also some other $w^{\prime} b$ priests in the temple of Mentuhotep II: Tjay-nefer, ${ }^{32} w^{\prime} b$ priest of Hathor in $3 h-s w t$ ( $w^{\prime} b$ n Hwt-Hrw m $3 h-s w t$ ) Aa-kheper, ${ }^{33}$ Amun-hetep son of Tjembu fulfilled the function of $w^{\prime} b$ priest of Amun in $3 h-s t\left(w^{\prime} b n J m n ~ m h h-s t\right),{ }^{34}$ as well as $w^{\prime} b$ priest of Nb-hpt-R. ${ }^{c}{ }^{35}$

[^32]There is no evidence for the cult of Mentuhotep II in the Second Intermediate Period, it seems to have been restored only in the times of the early 18 th dynasty. ${ }^{36}$ A stela from the times of Thutmose III reports a sacrifice for the $k 3$ of Mentuhotep II, which causes that "the statue in his temple endures" ${ }^{37}$ and which he should receive during all feasts of heaven and earth. ${ }^{38}$ The cult of the statue is also depicted on the stela from the British Museum mentioned above, ${ }^{39}$ where the Osiride statues of Mentuhotep II and Amenhotep I are placed in front of the offering table and are venerated together (Fig. 34).

The cult of Mentuhotep was observed from the times of Senwosret III, who established sacrifice and priests in $3 h$-swt again, ${ }^{40}$ and it flourished until the Ramesside Period, ${ }^{41}$ which is confirmed not only by the restoration inscriptions, ${ }^{42}$ a statue of Amun erected there in the post-Amarna period ${ }^{43}$ but also a high number of vota found in the temple. Priests of the royal cult are attested ${ }^{44}$ and representations of Mentuhotep II with other gods of the necropolis, found in private tombs dated to that period, ${ }^{45}$ have been preserved.

Apart from the cult of Mentuhotep II, cults of Amun ${ }^{46}$ and Hathor ${ }^{47}$ were observed in the temple under Hatshepsut. The htp-dj-nswt offerings for Amun are reported by the aforementioned Djehuty. ${ }^{48}$ The Tjaynefer stela bears a representation of a $w^{\prime} b$ priest of Amun performing a ritual, when he burns incense and spills water. ${ }^{49}$

[^33]
# Temples built in the times of Hatshepsut Temple of Hatshepsut - Dsr-dsrw 



[^34]|  | 1909-1910 - Howard Carter, The Earl of Carnarvon |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1925-1944 - Émile Baraize |
|  | 1931-1932 - Walter Hausner |
| 1934-Ambrose Lansing |  |
| Archaeological work | 1961-1967 - Leszek Dąbrowski (Research Centre in Cairo of the University |
| (continuation): | of Warsaw) |
|  | 1968-1988 - Zygmunt Wysocki (Ateliers for Conservation of Cultural Prop- |
|  | erty) |
|  | 1993-1999 - Franciszek Pawlicki (Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeol- |
|  | ogy of the University of Warsaw) |
|  | 1999 till today - Zbigniew E. Szafrański (Polish Centre of Mediterranean Ar- |
|  | chaeology of the University of Warsaw) |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

The most important element of West Thebes landscape in the times of queen Hatshepsut, transcending everything that had ever been built there, was the temple of millions of years erected at the foot of the mountain in the valley of Deir el-Bahari. It was a temple complex which used Old Kingdom pyramid complexes as models. ${ }^{8}$ The whole group was supposed to be constituted by the Valley Temple situated next to a watercourse, together with a harbour, processional alley leading to the Upper Temple, and definitely the Upper Temple itself. Not all of these elements were completed in the queen's lifetime.

It seems impossible to reconstruct the original intentions of Hatshepsut or the changes introduced into the architecture of the temple under her reign. The works of different missions deformed or irreparably destroyed the information which had been possible to retrieve from the remains of the temple even as late as the time of the research conducted by Naville.

## Orientation of the temple

The location of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple was connected with the natural surface of the area to a great extent, which implied its expansion towards east. The first task which the builders faced was to establish the ritual direction and plan the axis of the temple according to an astronomical phenomenon, i.e. the winter solstice, also used to plan the axis of the 8th Pylon at Karnak. At the moment of the winter solstice, the sun rose on the axis of the 8th Pylon and the sunlight which passed through the granite gate lit the Sanctuary of the temple of Hatshepsut for a short time. ${ }^{9}$

Sunrays reached the Sanctuary on another occasion through a system of two windows built into the wall decoration, one of them in the east wall, the other in the west wall of the Bark Hall. They were supposed to light the statue located in niche B of the Statue Room, which, according to David Furlong, happened about 36 days before or after the winter solstice. ${ }^{10}$ Furlong believes that it was a significant date from ideological point of view, commemorating the ruler's birth or coronation day.

Considering the lunette of the east wall of the Bark Hall, it is obvious that the present structure of the window is secondary. The original window was plugged and the inserted block was decorated with an image of a solar disk. Next, a new window was cut out in the wall, however, it was moved further north. ${ }^{11}$

It was not only the Main Sanctuary of Amun, situated on the central axis of the temple, but also other complexes in the temple, situated in a parallel alignment to the central axis - the Hathor Shrine, the Com-

[^35]plex of the Solar Cult or the Lower Anubis Shrine - were oriented in such a manner that the sunrays hit the inside precisely on the winter solstice. ${ }^{12}$

## Construction work

## Foundation ritual

The foundation of the temple of millions of years at Deir el-Bahari most likely took place in year 7 of the reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{13}$ It was the same year when queen Hatshepsut accessed the throne, nominally taking power over the country, ${ }^{14}$ and sanctioning her actual rule which had already lasted for years. She was undoubtedly the king when the foundation deposits of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ were placed in the ground, as they are mostly signed with her throne name. ${ }^{15}$ Winlock made a suggestion that the foundation ceremony must have taken place in autumn, since the deposits contain fruit which ripens in autumn in Egypt. ${ }^{16}$

There is not much information preserved which describes the beginnings of the construction of the temple complex at Deir el-Bahari. It appears that the text written on an ostracon ${ }^{17}$ found over the temple concerns the foundation ritual. It is damaged in major part and unfortunately does not contain the date, nevertheless, it indicates the exact location of an object, possibly a foundation deposit, in relation to the temple of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra. ${ }^{18}$

The foundation ritual of the temple was depicted on the west wall of the Southern Lower Portico. The scenes represented there consist of the ritual of the stretching the cord performed in front of the goddess Sefekhetabuy, next the queen, accompanied by her $k 3$ was scattering the $b s n$ grains, the following scene showed the ceremony of offering the temple to Amun-Re, and next the unpreserved scene with the name of the temple was depicted. The great offering ithyphallic Amun-Ra close the cycle of scenes. ${ }^{19}$

## Foundation deposits

The foundation ritual was probably performed in accordance with the tradition and one of its elements was the placement of foundation deposits in the ground. At Deir el-Bahari, they were inserted in at least 16 places, ${ }^{20}$ which were supposed, as it seems, to mark the contour of the plan of the temple (Fig. 35). ${ }^{21}$ Foundation deposits were normally located below important elements of the planned building, such as doors, corners, and in the early 18th dynasty, also under obelisks and statues. ${ }^{22}$

[^36]

Fig. 35. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, foundation deposits (based on Weinstein, Foundation Deposits, 151; Wysocki, Deir el-Bahari, 1977-1982, 344, Fig. 22, Pl. 5; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

James Morris Weinstein collected all available information concerning the deposits of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ in his monograph devoted to the foundation deposits in Egypt. He identified artefacts from different museums worldwide, as he also had access to unpublished materials.

In the case of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple, the location of most deposits seems to be easy to understand. The eastern border of the Upper Temple was marked by deposits G, H, I, which were placed along a straight line on the outside of the east wall of the Lower Courtyard. The two deposits situated between them (J and K) were probably supposed to frame the Processional Alley. Deposits A, B, C and G seem to be located along the line of the south retaining wall. Deposits M, L, F and I were probably intended to mark the northern limit, but the precise location of deposits $L$ and $M$ is unknown. They had been stolen before regular archaeological works began in the temple. ${ }^{23}$ It can be supposed that deposits E and N might be associated with the location of the ramps, both are situated to the south of the Lower Ramp (deposit E) and the Upper Ramp (probably stolen deposit N ). The location of deposit D is the only one which is difficult to account for in the context of the present architectural plan. It should be stressed that despite research in the Upper Terrace, scholars have not found any foundation deposits there. ${ }^{24}$

Scholars argue with respect to the number of deposits associated with the Valley Temple. Weinstein states that three of them have been discovered ${ }^{25}$ while Hayes lists five deposits. ${ }^{26}$ On the basis of excavation reports it can be concluded that Weinstein is right: Carter mentions two deposits ${ }^{27}$ - one of them ('B') was, according to Weinstein, disturbed, ${ }^{28}$ and Ambrose Lansing reports the discovery of one deposit, ${ }^{29}$ probably also disturbed. ${ }^{30}$

The $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ deposits were placed in pits dug in the sand or hewn directly in the bedrock. In the former case, the pit was framed with a brick wall to strengthen the structure. ${ }^{31}$ Bricks were not used if the pit was carved in rock. ${ }^{32}$

Although the tradition of foundation deposits reaches back to the 3 rd dynasty ${ }^{33}$ and their contents had been standardised to a great degree by the times of Hatshepsut, particular deposits differed in terms of their composition.

Weinstein notices certain rules which regulate the contents and arrangement of the deposits in the temple of Hatshepsut. The objects placed in a pit were covered with layers of sand, as it was in the case of deposit K. Cattle offerings were mostly placed at the very top of deposits, which can be seen, i.a. in deposits D and K , however, cattle offerings were inserted at the very bottom of the pit in deposits C and E . Scholars mostly found models of vessels, containers for oils, vessel stands, bread moulds in deposits at Deir el-Bahari. Some vessels contained food items: fruit, loaves of bread, beef cuts. ${ }^{34}$ Another category distinguished by Weinstein were models of tools and weapons: hatchets, adzes, hoes, chisels, brick moulds, the so-called rockers, mesekhtiyu instruments. ${ }^{35}$ Other artefacts discovered in the deposits included baskets, rolled mats, pieces of textiles, as well as amulets: faience heads of Hathor, Bes amulets, tjes knots, beads. ${ }^{36}$ Additional objects inserted in the deposits were: faience and bronze plaques, polished stones, and three deposits (G, H, I) contained 306 faience and steatite scarabs. ${ }^{37}$ Most artefacts placed in the deposits feature inscriptions with the name $M \xi^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$ and the name of the temple $-\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r^{\prime} w$. The texts mentioned stretching the cord in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w,{ }^{38}$ and some vessels feature information on their contents. ${ }^{39}$ The presence of Cedrus sp. extract,

[^37]Pistacia sp. and Styrax officinalis resins in the alabaster vessels implies that they contained precious ingredients imported from the south and from the eastern Mediterranean. ${ }^{40}$

The question remains - what exactly was marked by the deposits. Their chronology is also questioned.
Weinstein had no doubts that the deposits were inserted into the soil during the reign of Hatshepsut. He suggested the following interpretation of events: some deposits were placed below structures which exist today, nevertheless, others were installed where the elements had never been built. ${ }^{41}$ The foundation deposits placed under structures which have survived to our times include A, B, C, G, situated under the south enclosure wall and deposits F, I, L, M situated under the north enclosure wall. Deposits J and K formed corners of the processional alley walls and the east wall of the Lower Terrace. There were also deposits D and $E$, inserted before architectural changes, which probably marked the beginning of the ramp leading to the Middle Terrace, deposit N, which, according to Winlock, was located under the planned sanctuary, ${ }^{42}$ and deposit H , which marked the original main entrance to the complex.

Wysocki studied the situation of deposit A, which, according to Naville and Clarke, was supposed to mark the beginning of the original ramp leading to the Hathor Shrine. ${ }^{43}$ Its location was proven to contradict that hypothesis. Both deposits studied by Adam Stefanowicz and Wysocki (A and B) were shifted in relation to the place stated by Clarke and Naville. ${ }^{44}$ The displacement was 1.80 m eastwards and 0.2 m southwards in the case of deposit A , and in the case of deposit $\mathrm{B}, 0.40 \mathrm{~m}$ eastwards and 0.60 m southwards. The depths of the pits were also inaccurately reported, the pit with deposit A was twice as deep as it had been reported by Clarke.

Kate Spence believes the deposit contents and their layout indicate that there were five phases of construction of the temple, which involved the placement of foundation deposits. ${ }^{45}$ Deposits C-F and W are associated with the first phase, B, L-N with the second phase, G-I with the third phase, A with the fourth phase, J and K with the fifth phase. According to the reconstruction, the original plan assumed the design of the temple in accordance with the natural topography of the area, along the same axis as the temple of Amenhotep I, at the back of it. The temple was expanded in phase B, and its axis was adjusted to the axis of the temple of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra. The temple of Amenhotep I was removed in the fourth phase; the range of the temple was moved eastwards and it covered the whole Lower Courtyard. Spence suggested that phases $2-4$ assumed a change of plan and incorporation of the temple into a wider programme of rebuilding of Thebes, establishing of the processional route as well as combination of the temple complex with the tomb of the queen.

It seems that the whole layout of the temple was designed at least before the death of Nefrura since her scarabs were found in deposits G and J, ${ }^{46}$ which mark the range of the Lower Terrace. The remark by Roland Tefnin ${ }^{47}$ that the deposits also contain scarabs of Thutmose I, who cannot have been alive when they were placed in the ground, is not a strong argument. While the names and silhouettes of Thutmose I portray the deceased ruler (all his images in the temple of Hatshepsut are post mortem representations), the depictions of Nefrura have not been attested for the period after her disappearance, they were even intentionally destroyed. ${ }^{48}$ Scarabs of Thutmose I are exceptionally rare in comparison with the number of scarabs of Nefrura, which have been found in high numbers in the foundation deposits. ${ }^{49}$

## History of the construction

## Texts concerning the construction

A plaque which used to be attached to an oil container was found next to the wall of the processional alley, approx. 200 m from the gate of the temple. The plaque bears the date of year 7, third month of the prt sea-

[^38]son, day 25 . It is the earliest date which could be associated with the construction of the temple. According to Winlock ${ }^{50}$ and Hayes, ${ }^{51}$ the location where the plaque was discovered suggests that the processional alley was the oldest part of the temple. It seems, however, rather illogical, as the alley, before it became the processional alley, was a perfect and the shortest route for transportation of heavy building materials. ${ }^{52}$ It is unlikely that it was built as the first structure and exposed to the danger of damage caused by negligence on the part of the workers. On the other hand, it is more than likely that the first phase of works involved preparation of the ground for the alley, including cutting off some rock where it was necessary, so that the materials could be delivered upwards easily.

Day 15 of the fourth month of the $3 h t$ season was the day when the hewing of the temple sanctuary began. ${ }^{53}$ Unfortunately the slate which is the source of that information does not report the year. The hypothesis ${ }^{54}$ which assumes that the text was originally written on the rock next to the chamber, in this case the sanctuary, and then swept out of the Upper Terrace appears to be right. It was eventually found on the Middle Terrace next to the Southern Middle Portico (Punt Portico).

It is certain that the works proceeded quickly and 224 stone blocks were dragged to $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ on day 20 of year 10, the first month of the $\check{s} m w$ season. ${ }^{55}$ Hayes seems to have been right in his remark that if the ostracon reporting these works was found on the Middle Terrace, it might mean that the actions were undertaken in the upper portion of the temple. ${ }^{56}$

Another published ostracon dated to the time of construction of the temple described the need for workers. Unfortunately, also in this case, the fragment with the date has not been preserved. ${ }^{57}$

## Architects and decorators

The most important person who supervised the construction work in the temple of Hatshepsut was Sen-en-mut ${ }^{58}$ - the overseer of works of Amun, ${ }^{59}$ overseer of works of Amun in Dsr-dsrw, ${ }^{60}$ overseer of all works of Amun, ${ }^{61}$ overseer of all works of the king, ${ }^{62}$ and overseer of all works of the king in the house of Amun, ${ }^{63}$ all functions fulfilled by one individual. That official additionally worked as the overseer of other construction works in Thebes. ${ }^{64}$ He was also the overseer of the treasury ${ }^{65}$ and
${ }_{50}$ Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1925-1927, 26; Winlock, Excavations, 134-135.
51 Hayes, Varia, 79.
${ }_{52}$ See above, chap. Construction techniques, pp. 10-12.
53 Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca, 32 [3], Pls IX, IXA.
54 Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca, 32.
55 Winlock, Excavations, 208, 218, 219; Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca, 31-32 [2], Pls IX, IXA; Megally, À propos de l'organisation administrative des ouvriers, 305-306.
56 Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca, 31, Pls IX, IXA. This hypothesis cannot be treated as an undeniable fact, as suggested by E. Dąbrowska-Smektała (Remarks on the restoration of the Eastern Wall, 78), who Tefnin refers to (La statuaire d'Hatshepsout, 50).
57 Wysocki, The Discovery, Research, Studies and the Reconstruction of the Rock Platform, 13, 32-33, Figs 9, 10.
58 Wysocki (The Results of Architectural Investigations, 45-47) doubted that this high official of the queen actually designed the temple. The scholar believed that the change of architect can be detected in the style and manner of construction, and also thought that this type of talent and knowledge must have been passed on from generation to generation. Sen-en-mut and his family were never involved in professions connected with construction.
${ }_{59}$ jmj-r k3t $n(t)$ Jmn: TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, Pls 66-67, 78-79 [BD 110 vignette, N1, S57]); Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 48.149 .7 (Hayes, Varia, 87, Fig. 4; Meyer, Senenmut, 207, 329 [17]).
${ }^{60}$ jmj-r k3t n $(t)$ Jmn m Dsr-[ddsr]w: TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, Pl. 67 [S64-S65]); statue Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth AP 85.2 (Schulman, The Ubiquitous Senenmut, 66, 77, Fig. 4); statue Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst, Munich ÄS 6265 (Dorman, The Monuments of Senenmut, Pl. 20; Meyer, Senenmut, 220).
${ }^{61}$ jmj-r k3t nbt $n(t) J m n$ : statues Brooklyn Museum, New York 67.68 and Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth AP 85.2 (Schulman, The Ubiquitous Senenmut, 63, Figs 2, 4).
${ }^{62}$ hrp k3t nbt nt nswt: statue Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo CG 579 (Borchardt, Statuen und Statuetten II, 128); jmj-r k3t nbt nt nswt: TT 71, TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, 53, 61, Pls 72-73, 76-77 [N32, NW22]), statues British Museum, London EA174 (Meyer, Senenmut, 122, 305 [2]), EA1513 (ibidem, 113, 303 [1]).
${ }_{63}$ jmj-r k3t nbt n(t) nswt m pr-Jmn: TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, 136, Pls 70-71, 83 [a-b] [C74]).
${ }^{64}$ jmj-r k3t $n(t)$ Mwt $m$ Jšrw: statue Brooklyn Museum, New York 67.68 (Schulman, The Ubiquitous Senenmut, 63, 74, Fig. 2); hrp k3t m Jpt-swt: TT 71 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, 37 [Text 7]), sarcophagus Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 31.3.95, 65.274, 1971.209 (ibidem, 72, Pl. 31 [b] [Text 20]).
${ }^{65}$ jmj-r prwj-ḥd: TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, Pls 64-67 [BD 110 vignette, S36]); jmj-r prwj-nbw: TT 353 (ibidem, Pls 64-65, 80-81 [NE22, S36]); jmj-r prwj-ḥd prwj-nbw: TT 353 (ibidem, Pls 66-67, 80-81 [NE10,
granary, ${ }^{66}$ and practically of all temple resources. ${ }^{67}$ Thus he had the whole financial system of the state at his disposal.

The hypothesis that Sen-en-mut was in charge of works in the Valley Temple seems fairly likely. However, he did not see their completion. He was probably present when the foundations were laid, but fell out of favour soon after the works commenced. The most recent information of him goes back to year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{68}$

The officials who supervised monumental construction ventures in Thebes under the predecessors of Hatshepsut were still alive during her reign. Perhaps Pen-iaty, who was responsible for construction works under the father ${ }^{69}$ and husband ${ }^{70}$ of Hatshepsut, participated in the initial stages of construction and design of the $\underline{D} s r$ - $\underline{d} s r w$ temple. He was still active under her reign, ${ }^{71}$ even though he had begun his career in the times of Amenhotep I. ${ }^{72}$ He must have been an old man, who would have found it difficult to supervise the work in person during the reign of Hatshepsut. Another builder, Ineni, had also had a long career. He was no longer active in his field in the times of Hatshepsut, yet was still in favour with the queen. ${ }^{73}$

Min-mes had his share in the construction of the temple. ${ }^{74} \mathrm{He}$ initially managed one of the groups in the temple, ${ }^{75}$ and then took over Sen-en-mut's position as the supervisor of the double granary. ${ }^{76}$

It is clear that the priest of Amun, Pui-em-Ra, ${ }^{77}$ was interested in the progress of works in the Valley Temple. Therefore, he must have been the next person in the hierarchy of those who supervised the construction work. His inspections are attested on blocks from the Valley Temple three times (Figs 36-38). ${ }^{78}$ Another evidence for the inspection is delivered by an ostracon discovered in the area of the processional alley by the Austrian mission. ${ }^{79}$

S62]), sarcophagus (ibidem, Pl. 32 [b] [Text 60.16]), statue British Museum, London EA174 (Meyer, Senenmut, 122, 305 [2]).
jmj-r šnwtj: TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, Pls 74-75 [N41]); jmj-r šnwtj n(w) Jmn: TT 71, TT 353 (ibidem, 30 [Text 1], 37 [Text 7], 47 [Text 13], 52 [Text 24-25], 56 [Text 31], Pls 62-67, 70-73, 76-77, 80-81 [BD 110 vignette, NE5, N83, NW16, C73, C84, S5, S23, S28, S54]), sarcophagus (ibidem, Pls 31 [c], 32 [a] [Texts 9, 59]), stamped mud bricks (ibidem, 69, Pl. 29 [a, d]), Gebel es-Silsila, shrine 16 (James, Gebel es-Silsilah I, 53, Pl. 40), statues British Museum, London EA1513 (Meyer, Senenmut, 114, 303 [1]) and Louvre, Paris E 11057 (ibidem, 209 [18]); jmj-r šnwtj n Jmn m nwt rsjt: statue Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo CG 42114 (Legrain, Statues et statuettes I, 63); jmj-r šnwtj $n(w)$ Jmn-wsr-h3t: statue Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo CG 42117 (ibidem, 66). $n(w)$ Jmn: TT 353, sarcophagus, vessel model (ibidem, 154, Pls 32 [b], 33 [a], 61, 63, 67, 73, 77, 81, 91 [a, g] [TT353 NE11, N33, N66, NW2, NW20, SE14, S5, S52, sarcophagus cat. 11, Texts 22, 60; vessel model cat. 55]; $j m j-r$ pr wr $n$ Jmn: name stone (Hayes, Ostraka and Name Stones, Pl. XXXII [XL]), TT 71, TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, 51, Pls 56-57 [TT 71 Text 22, TT353 N94, N101, S22]); jmj-r mnmnt n(t) Jmn: name stone (Hayes, Ostraka and Name Stones, Pl. XXXIII [LXXI]), TT 71, TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, 56, Pls 72-77, 80-81 [TT 71 Texts 31, TT 353 NE14, N31, N117, nw27]), sarcophagus (ibidem, 72, Pl. 32 [a] [Texts 4, 60.42]), stamped funerary cones (ibidem, 69, Pl. 29 [c]); jmj-r mnmnt n(t) Jmn m Jpt-swt: statue Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo CG 42114 (Legrain, Statues et statuettes I, 63); jmj-r nfrt nt Jmn: TT 353 (Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, Pls 60-63, 66-67, 74-77, 80-81 [NE15, N42-N43, N65, SE13, S29, S53]); jmj-r hntjw-š $n(w)$ Jmn: TT 353 (ibidem, Pls 80-81 [NE23]); jmj-r gs-pr $n$ ḥwt: sarcophagus (ibidem, Text 60.66, Pl. 33 [a]); jmj-r gs-prw n(w) Jmn: sarcophagus (ibidem, Texts 60.34, 60.54, Pl. 32 [c]).
or for Sen-en-mut is year 16, the first month of the 3 ht season, day 8 (Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca, 40 $=$ recto of ostrakon no. 13, 1. 1). See also chap. Valley Temple, p. 63.

74 Wysocki, The Results of Architectural Investigations, 47.
75 Ostracon from year 10, found in the Middle Courtyard (Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca, 31-32 [2]), mentions Min-mes as the supervisor of one of the projects; it is also known that he participated in the transport of obelisks to Karnak (Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI, Pl. CLIV).
${ }^{76}$ I am grateful for this information to Dr Andrzej Ćwiek, who deals with this field.
${ }_{77}$ Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple, 39, Fig. 10.
A block with one of these three inscriptions is now stored in the storeroom no. 1 of the Metropolitan House in Qurna; it was found in season 2008/2009 by the author of the book and was identified by Dawid F. Wieczorek. Another block is stored in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, 12.181.305 (http://www.metmuseum.org/ art/collection/search/576276, accessed November 22, 2016).
${ }^{79}$ Bietak, Theben-West, Pl. IX [b].


Fig. 36. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, Pui-em-Ra's inscriptions on blocks (Carter, The 'Valley'Temple, 40, Fig. 10).


Fig. 37. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, block with Pui-em-Ra's inscription, storeroom 1 at the Metropolitan House (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 38. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, Pui-em-Ra's inscription on block, storeroom no. 1 at the Metropolitan House (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Djehuty, the overseer of craftsmen, boasted of the highest contribution to the construction of the temple of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{80} \mathrm{He}$ definitely had a considerable share in the finishing works. He supervised projects such as the making of the large copper door of the temple, together with the decoration with electrum, ${ }^{81}$ as well as the enigmatic $s j^{\prime} r t-m 3^{\prime} t$ structure, located in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{82}$

Apart from the names of the officials mentioned above, whose task was to supervise the construction work, scholars are aware of many names of the people involved in the building process: middle-rank officials ${ }^{83}$ and workers of lower classes. ${ }^{84}$

Some names written on the walls of the temple include names of scribes and drawers, nevertheless, in many cases, it is difficult to establish their chronology with certainty. The name of a scribe called Amun-hetep is present with the highest frequency. It is recorded several times on the ceiling of the chamber built in order to reduce the load imposed on the ceiling of the Bark Hall, in the place which was not supposed to be decorated. ${ }^{85}$ There is also a $w^{\prime} b$ priest called Amun-hetep, whose dipinto on the wall of the solar altar must be dated to the times of the construction of the temple since it was covered with whitewash. ${ }^{86}$ A scribe of outlines ( $s \check{s}-k d$ ), Neb-Amun, left his inscription in the southern niche of the Hypostyle Hall of the Lower Anubis Shrine. ${ }^{87}$ There are rather few inscriptions truly related to the construction process, which were made in the course of construction and decoration works, and are the record of particular phases of the whole process. It is mainly a consequence of the fact that the activities which followed damaged the evidence by erasing older notes. Such evidence has been preserved in the places which were not subjected to finishing works, e.g. enclosure wall foundations, where it was not necessary to smooth and polish the stones accurately. These places were not easy to access and the records were hidden, covered with soil, as it happened with construction dipinti..$^{88}$ Some construction inscriptions on the decorated walls, i.a. in the Chapel of Hatshepsut and Hathor Shrine, ${ }^{89}$ or on the walls of the Upper Courtyard ${ }^{90}$ were concealed when the decoration was made.

## Architecture of the temple

The temple of Hatshepsut was subjected to a number of changes in the course of its construction, which resulted from the development of the concept of the complex. This book undertakes to locate these changes in time and establish the sequence of expansion.

During more than a century of research into the construction of the temple at Deir el-Bahari scholars have made many attempts to reconstruct the phases of works conducted by ancient builders. Scientific circles have not reached agreement with respect to the original design and the time of construction, and discussions on the subject of the phases of development are still in progress.

[^39]

Fig. 39. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple: plan and section (based on Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple, Pl. XXX; Lythgoe, Lansing, Davies, The Egyptian Expedition 1915-16, 11, Fig. 7; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 40. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the north-east (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

## Valley Temple

The Valley Temple (Fig. 39), discovered by Carter in 1909, is the easternmost part of the complex. ${ }^{91}$
It appears that following the example of temples associated with pyramids, the Valley Temple of Hatshepsut was supposed to be located next to a watercourse so that it would constitute one of the steps of the procession from Karnak to the Sanctuary of the Upper Temple. Most probably, the concept of connecting these temples by water was not eventually completed. There seem to be two arguments in favour of that view. 19th-century maps, drawn before the river regulation, do not show any channel which could reach the Valley Temple. ${ }^{92}$ It cannot be seen by means of modern field research or satellite images. It is definitely not the ultimate argument as it is possible that a channel built in the times of Hatshepsut ceased to function long ago and was filled with soil. The fact of the existence of a channel might be confirmed or contradicted by geophysical research.

The information delivered by the decoration of the walls of the Chapelle Rouge could be another hint. Blocks 185 and 243 from that chapel ${ }^{93}$ depict a procession of Egyptian temple personifications and mention, among other temples, the temple at Karnak, then the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple, and finally $H^{\prime}-3 h t$, followed by the channel of Amun, $W^{\prime} b-k b b$. According to the convention of the list, the name of the temple is followed by the name of a channel associated with it. As it can be seen from the list above, the name of the temple at Deir el-Bahari is not followed by a name of a channel. Perhaps at the time of compilation of the list, the channel, which was supposed to be the last element constructed at the complex, had not been dug yet. In this context, the existence of another channel, situated in close proximity, associated with the $H^{c}-3 h t$ temple seems to be significant. The channel was probably used for transportation of blocks from the locations outside Thebes. Most blocks which served for the construction of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ were relatively small and were delivered from the quarry located nearby to the construction site by land. ${ }^{94}$

[^40]Fig. 41. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, offset of the outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the east (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


The building of the Valley Temple required an enormous amount of preparation work. First of all, it was necessary to cut off a big part of hill $104^{95}$ to make an outlet of the valley. Secondly, the builders were obliged to fill the tomb of saff type which was situated within the area of the future Valley Temple. The queen had some of the walls of the Valley Temple superimposed precisely on the previously existing walls of the tomb. ${ }^{96}$ The location of the Valley Temple was not accidental. The selected place was situated at the border of the desert and farmland, possibly in the location of an earlier edifice, where it would be easy to dig the channel discussed above.

The beginning of the works on the Valley Temple needed to be preceded with the levelling of the ground surface and filling of the vast space of the aforementioned tomb. ${ }^{97}$ The courtyard of the tomb was mostly filled with sand and limestone flakes, ${ }^{98}$ after which the foundation ceremony, including the insertion of foundation deposits, was held.

It is likely that the so-called name stones were placed below the foundations of the Valley Temple, as it normally happened in the case of other sacral buildings of the queen. ${ }^{99}$ This hypothesis is mainly based on the information reported by Hayes, who describes the discovered name stones and states that 46 blocks of that type have been found in the temple at Deir el-Bahari, most of which came from the Valley Temple. They were made of various materials - limestone, quartzite, and one made of diorite or black granite. ${ }^{100}$ The characteristic feature of stones associated with Deir el-Bahari, absent from other name stones, is the presence of hieratic inscriptions made in black ink by lower-rank citizens, which are dedications for
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Fig. 42. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, gate in the outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the north-west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
the higher-rank officials of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{101}$ Some of the limestone and quartzite name stones from the Valley Temple are held in the collections of the British Museum, London ${ }^{102}$ and the Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo. ${ }^{103}$ Only one name stone, made of quartzite, was discovered in situ in the Valley Temple by Carter. ${ }^{104}$

The state of preservation of the Valley Temple is not good enough to draw its complete plan. Carter supposed it had not been finished. ${ }^{105}$ That theory was supported by another archaeologist who worked in this area - Lansing. ${ }^{106}$

A number of scattered tools have been found in the temple, left by the workers at the construction site. ${ }^{107}$ This discovery does not prove that the work was suspended. It was a common practice at Deir el-Bahari to abandon tools when they were damaged or no longer needed. ${ }^{108}$

It appears that the temple was supposed to resemble the form of the Upper Temple, situated at the foot of the slope. It was a terraced structure with at least two levels. The ceiling of the Lower Portico was supported by pillars identified by Carter on the basis of a fragment of one of them, preserved in the northern part. ${ }^{109}$ The height difference between the two terraces was approx. 4.5 m .
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Fig. 43. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, gate in the outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the north-west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

The remains of the temple preserved in situ are very sparse. ${ }^{110} \mathrm{~A}$ fragment of the enclosure wall (Figs $\mathbf{4 0} \mathbf{- 4 1}$ ) can still be seen, with a small entrance on the northern side (Figs 42-43). It is difficult to establish the actual relationship between that wall and the Valley Temple. The base of the wall was 2.6 m thick and its height reached 6 m . Its structure is typical of the walls erected in the times of Hatshepsut: it was built on a sandstone foundation, each of its slanted faces was made up of a single row of limestone blocks, and the space between them was filled with fragments of unpolished limestone and mortar mixed with sand. The enclosure wall became wider as it led east to the area of the portico of the first terrace and then narrowed to the original width. The widened part was probably necessary due to technical requirements, to strengthen the wall which supported the ceiling of the portico. The builders left construction dipinti on the blocks of the enclosure wall in the inner part. ${ }^{111}$

In the course of excavations conducted in winter 1898-1899 in the area called Birabi, located to the north of the Valley Temple, archaeologists discovered a corner of a building constructed from bricks stamped with the name $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{c}{ }^{112}$ There was also a scarab which featured the name $M_{3}{ }^{c} t-k 3-R^{c}$ found among the bricks. Additionally, two so-called name stones were found in the corner of the building. ${ }^{113}$ The enclosure wall next to the Valley Temple could have been the wall of the temenos, however, it is difficult to state what other buildings it surrounded. It does not seem to have surrounded the Valley Temple as it turned southeast and thus the distance between the structures increased. Information concerning the wall is very limited. If the presence of a brick structure near the Valley Temple is taken into consideration, it seems obvious that the material scattered in the vicinity also contains bricks stamped with the throne name of Hatshepsut, i.a.
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Fig. 44. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, plan of the Bark Station (based on Eigner, Die monumentalen Grabbauten, Pl. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
a brick stamped with the cartouche $n s w t$ bjtj $M 3^{`} t-k 3-R^{{ }^{1114}}$ was found in the Valley Temple. They could have come from the royal foundation, i.e. so far unidentified structure used for economic purposes connected with services for the temple complex. ${ }^{115}$

It seems that the Valley Temple was the last element of the complex to be built. It had never been completed, which is indicated by i.a. unfinished door frame of the side entrance and the adjacent fragment of the enclosure wall, only partially smoothed (Fig. 43). ${ }^{116}$ Sen-en-mut was undoubtedly involved in the construction as his name is inscribed on a block from the temple, ${ }^{117}$ which means that the work began before year 17 of the reign of Thutmose III.

## Processional Alley and Bark Station

The first element which had to be planned by the builders of the temple was a road that could be used to deliver building materials to the site. ${ }^{118}$ Probably the first step was only to harden its surface and later it was rebuilt to reach its final shape. Thus it became an element which connected the Valley Temple with the Upper Temple, and functioned as the processional alley. Winlock would be inclined to view the processional alley as the first part of the temple which was built. ${ }^{119}$ It should be taken into account that transport of building material poses risk of damage and completion of this portion of the temple at the beginning of the construction process would simply be uneconomical. Wysocki's interpretation is worth considering he suggested that the transportation route had existed there earlier, from the times of construction of the early 11th dynasty tomb of Neferu, and was subsequently used by those who wanted to access the temple of Amenhotep I. ${ }^{120}$ According to Wysocki, the existence of this route made it possible to begin with the construction of the upper portions of the temple and gradually move down. ${ }^{121}$

The processional alley itself was approx. 1000.0 m long ${ }^{122}$ and 37.0 m wide. ${ }^{123}$ It was framed on both sides with a limestone wall which was approx. 2.0 m thick at the base, ${ }^{124}$ erected on sandstone foundations. In some places, mud bricks were laid under the foundation. ${ }^{125}$ It does not seem that the builders laid a pavement in the inner portion. ${ }^{126}$

The alley was divided into two sections, with the Bark Station as the central point (Figs 44-47). The Bark Station was built at a distance of 525.0 m (1000 royal cubits) from the door leading to the Lower
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Fig. 45. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, remains of the Bark Station, view from the north-east (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 46. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, remains of the Bark Station, view from the north (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 47. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, remains of the Bark Station, detail of stairs, view from the west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Terrace. ${ }^{127}$ It can be seen in situ and also on a plan drawn by Dieter Eigner in 1984, ${ }^{128}$ and thus it is possible to verify the plan made by John Gardner Wilkinson, who marked another door at that point. ${ }^{129}$ The Bark Station was also included in the reconstruction of the Processional Alley made by Felix Arnold on the basis of unpublished documentation by Winlock and Walter Hauser. ${ }^{130}$

There is not much information concerning the Bark Station, its name has not been published yet. ${ }^{131}$ The station is twice referred to as wzhijjt on the north wall of the Upper Courtyard, ${ }^{132}$ which depicts the rest taken by the bark between the river and the Sanctuary. Since the proper name is absent, it is not certain that this is the bark station in question, especially that the term wzhjjet appears in the context of the name $\underline{H n m t-} n h \underline{n}$. As the results of the excavations conducted at that point by Hauser ${ }^{133}$ have never been published, information on the subject can only be obtained from isolated notes. The bark station was a small kiosk which measured $10.0 \times 15.0 \mathrm{~m},{ }^{134}$ framed with pillars. Two containers for trees were placed on the eastern side and Osiride statues of the queen next to the corner pillars. ${ }^{135}$ Stairs which can still be seen in situ led to the inner part of the Bark Station (Fig. 47).

The plan of the Bark Station is often compared with the plan drawn on ostracon EA41228 discovered in the fill which covered the temple of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra. ${ }^{136}$ The ostracon, apart from the sketch, contained the dimensions of the structure, therefore, it seems that it served as a note for the builders. ${ }^{137}$

Halfway of the alley length, a line of statues in two rows were installed and they led to the Sanctuary. The visitors followed the route of the Processional Alley along the two rows of sandstone sphinxes planted regularly at distances of approx. $15.5 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{138}$ The sandstone sphinxes associated with the temple of Hatshepsut belonged to three categories. Some of them featured tripartite wigs on their heads, some other - the nemes or khat headdresses. ${ }^{139}$ The ones which were probably placed along the Processional Alley "wore" the nemes and khat headdresses and those with tripartite wigs probably stood at the axis of the ramp leading to the Hathor Shrine. ${ }^{140}$ Winlock reconstructed the bases of the statues and concluded that they were approx. 3.0 m long and 1.0 m wide. The height of the sphinx together with its base reached $2.2 \mathrm{~m} .^{141}$ Unfortunately there are so few preserved elements that a precise reconstruction of the form and dimensions is very difficult. ${ }^{142}$ Tefnin believed that the sphinxes located within the Processional Alley were one of the most recently made in the temple. ${ }^{143}$ The statues, in major part, were later discarded at the quarry near the
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Fig. 48. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, north-western corner (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
tomb of Sen-en-mut and could be seen throughout the Antiquity. For this reason they were exposed to the danger of robbery. Tamarisks were planted among the sphinxes at regular intervals in containers whose diameters measured $1.5 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{144}$ The sphinxes and trees marked a route, 5.5 m wide, which was travelled by the bark during a procession. ${ }^{145}$ There were persei trees, planted in specially made containers, directly next to the door leading to the Lower Terrace. ${ }^{146}$ The containers were constructed from low stone walls with water conducted into them by means of ceramic pipes. ${ }^{147}$

## Lower Terrace

It could be considered whether the initial design differed from the one which was eventually implemented. Perhaps, according to the original plan, there was an intention of building a retaining wall decorated with the Horus name of Hatshepsut, which would create a type of avant-corpse on at least two sides: the southern and eastern ones. However, this concept was abandoned and the Lower Porticoes were constructed next to the retaining wall on the eastern side. It can be noted that at least the southern part of the Southern Lower Portico was a secondary addition there. ${ }^{148}$ Photographic documentation shows badly damaged flat west wall of the Southern Lower Portico, which is built of polished limestone blocks, and the added, extremely thick, south wall of the Portico. If that southern part had been originally planned, the west and south walls would have featured a typical connection by means of corner blocks and a fill inside instead of a polished wall. Verification of this hypothesis seems to be difficult at the moment - the wall has been reconstructed to its full height and covered with roof by Carter. ${ }^{149}$

## Courtyard

The Processional Alley led to a spacious courtyard framed with an enclosure wall. The courtyard was 128.15 m long and 77.50 m wide. The shape of the main entrance to the temple has not been established, but it is certain that the double-leaf door opened inward, which is indicated by the placement of the door
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Fig. 49. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, enclosure wall, north-western corner (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
sockets. Clarke categorically contradicted the hypothesis that the entrance corresponded with the shape of a pylon. ${ }^{150}$ The height of the enclosure wall can be grasped at the north-western corner, it reached 3.103.15 m . Clarke reports that the enclosure wall was 2.04 m thick. ${ }^{151}$ The whole wall was built of fairly small limestone blocks, and it reached as far as the enclosure of the complex of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra in the north ${ }^{152}$ nevertheless, the east wall was erected on a sandstone foundation. ${ }^{153}$

The whole height of the enclosure wall has been preserved at some points in the north, and its partially preserved walls can be seen along the whole length of the north wall. The eastern part of the enclosure wall in its northern portion has also survived to a height of at least $2-3$ courses of blocks. In the south and in the southern part of the east wall there are only foundations left. In the portions where the enclosure wall has been preserved to at least a small height, i.e. in the northern part of the courtyard, it is possible to see its unworked, unpolished fragments of the wall ${ }^{154}$ which differ from the adjacent polished surface (Figs 48-49). Most of them are rectangular and approx. 30 cm high. Four such surfaces are present on the north wall, starting from the north their lengths are: $1.94 \mathrm{~m}, 3.93 \mathrm{~m}, 1.20 \mathrm{~m}, 1.04 \mathrm{~m}$. They are situated at irregular intervals. Irregular surfaces of this type can be found in the places where another structure touched the wall and covered that part or where a protruding element was chiselled off the wall without a proper level of accuracy. These protruding unpolished fragments seem to indicate that relatively low pedestals used to be installed there. Perhaps they constituted a type of base for statues or stelae placed on top, directly next to the wall. It must be stated, however, that their presence cannot be accounted for at the present state of research.

Another elevated feature of this type can be seen on the north wall (Fig. 50), its remains can be detected up to the eastern door and along a considerable distance spreading from the mid-length of the east wall between the main entrance to the temple (Fig. 51).

The west wall in the northern part of the Courtyard also features similar marks which spread to the south, starting from an Osiride statue. These elevations, also situated at irregular intervals, measured: 1.62 m , $1.04 \mathrm{~m}, 1.15 \mathrm{~m}, 0.74 \mathrm{~m}$ and 0.28 m . A slightly chiselled detail, which stretches vertically and then turns left

[^47]

Fig. 50. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, enclosure wall, north wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
(Fig. 52), can be seen in the corner, between the Osiride statue and the first elevated component. Similar chiselled details have been found on the wall which closes the Upper Portico North, and they spread along the torus moulding, exactly like in the aforementioned case. ${ }^{155}$ It appears that they should be interpreted as marks connected with rain gutters.

The north enclosure wall which surrounds the Lower Terrace features an unpolished portion of its face on the outer side. It spreads along the whole length, gradually rises towards the western edge, and consti-

[^48]

Fig. 51. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, east wall, northern part (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 52. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, west wall, northern part, smoothed detail next to the Osiride statue (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 53. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, enclosure wall, north wall, view from the north-west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

tutes a negative which resembles stairs. Solely the surface of the top 65 cm of the wall was polished at the level of the western gate.

The north wall of the enclosure had two entrances whose presence is difficult to explain. The east one was fitted relatively close to brick structures which in literature are referred to as houses for the builders ${ }^{156}$ or priests, ${ }^{157}$ framed with a sinusoidal wall from the north. 7.19 m west from that entrance, outside the range of the temple, there was a wall which issued from the north wall and headed north. Corner blocks are the only preserved ones from that feature (Fig. 53). At the current stage of research the function of this wall has not been clarified. In the north of the other, western entrance, the tomb of Min-mes, one of Hatshepsut's officials, has been discovered. ${ }^{158} \mathrm{He}$ seems to have taken over the function of the overseer of the double granary from Sen-en-mut. It is known that the enclosure wall which surrounds the Lower Terrace is one of the more recent elements of the temple, therefore, if it is assumed that the presence of the door in the wall is related to the construction of the tomb, it would have to be accepted that the construction of the wall took place after year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III.

The door in the south-western corner of the west wall of the Lower Terrace led from the Lower Courtyard to the Hathor Shrine. Initially, it was the only possible way to reach the Shrine.

Another door, placed in the eastern portion of the south wall of the enclosure, led from the Lower Courtyard to the temple of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra.

The door to the temple of Mentuhotep II, like the door to the Hathor Shrine, opened from the temple of Hatshepsut, while both doors in the north enclosure wall and the entrance in the east wall opened inward.

Two T-shaped small and shallow pools on both sides of the road were dug at the foot of the ramp that led to the Middle Terrace, along the processional route, which continued behind the door to the Upper Temple and constituted an extension of the Processional Alley. The walls of the pools, in which papyrus

[^49]sedges were planted, were carefully covered with silt, and the basins were framed with flowering plants in containers. ${ }^{159}$ Di. Arnold mentions approx. 66 containers altogether. ${ }^{160}$

Trees were also planted in other parts of the Courtyard. The plan made by Di. Arnold shows a container carved halfway between the Lower Ramp and the Northern Lower Portico. ${ }^{161}$ The same author marked a tree exactly on the opposite side of the ramp on the plan in Lexikon der Ägyptologie. ${ }^{162}$ Both trees were indicated in the reconstruction prepared by Winlock. ${ }^{163}$

The image of the Lower Courtyard would not be complete without a description of sculpted decoration which partially filled that vast area. Two rows of sphinxes were a continuation of the sphinx alley from the Processional Alley. They were situated opposite each other, along the route between the main entrance to the courtyard and the beginning of the ramp which led to the Middle Terrace. The number of the sphinxes is still a subject of discussion. Winlock managed to find 11 ureauses, by which he deduced that there were at least 6 pairs in the Courtyard. ${ }^{164}$ Winlock ${ }^{165}$ and Tefnin, ${ }^{166}$ who cites him, believe that this place was equipped with sandstone sphinxes that featured heads covered with khat headdress ${ }^{167}$ and tripartite wigs. ${ }^{168}$ Ćwiek ${ }^{169}$ disagrees with them, as he regards the tripartite wig as a hathoric ornament and thinks that sphinxes depicted wearing them marked the route to the Hathor Shrine. Tefnin suggests that the sphinxes with tripartite wigs and khat headdreasses were the oldest in the temple in terms of style. This remark might be another argument to suport Ćwiek's hypothesis since it seems that the Hathor Shrine is one of the oldest elements built in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{170}$

Two monumental, over 7-m-tall Osiride statues of the queen constituted another element of sculpted decoration in the Lower Courtyard. ${ }^{171}$ They were situated at the outer ends of the Porticoes to the north and south. The northern statue probably featured the double crown, fragments of which have been preserved, ${ }^{172}$ and the southern one - the white crown. ${ }^{173}$ They were constructed in the same manner as the Osiride statues located in the Upper Portico - they were built of segments connected with the wall ${ }^{174}$ as shown by two rows of blocks preserved in situ in the north, which the monumental statue was cut off from. ${ }^{175}$

[^50]
## Lower Porticoes (Obelisks Portico and Portico of Hunting) ${ }^{176}$

The proper façade of the temple was constituted by the Lower Porticoes. It was highlighted by the decoration of the pillars resembling decoration of a palace façade. ${ }^{177}$ The Northern Lower Portico was 24.76 m long and 5.65 m deep, the Southern Lower Portico was 24.86 m long and 5.57 m deep.

The west wall of both Porticoes is inclined in the same manner as all west walls of the Porticoes located higher (Fig. 9). At the same time it functioned as a type of retaining wall, which stabilised the fill of the Middle Terrace, ${ }^{178}$ and additionally blocked access to the 11th dynasty tomb of queen Neferu. ${ }^{179}$ That wall, as opposed to the free-standing walls, which were built of two rows of blocks with a fill between, consisted of one row of blocks. ${ }^{180}$

The row of 12 pillars, whose cross section resembled letter $\mathrm{D},{ }^{181}$ was situated in both Porticoes on the outer side, and the inner row, which supported the ceiling, consisted of 1216 -sided columns. These pillars were planted directly on the floor, where their outlines can be seen, and were devoid of bases. There was a balustrade, 41 cm wide, between the pillars of the Northern Lower Portico. It left some marks on the pillars and its remains have been preserved in the northern part of the Portico. The column bases were also situated directly on the floor, without being integrated with it, which implies their secondary installation.

The pavement of both Porticoes was raised 1.54 m in relation to the pavement of the Terrace. As opposed to the Middle Porticoes, this elevation of the pavement had been planned from the beginning of the construction work, and the floor is situated below the level of the walls. Wysocki believed that the design of the pedestal could have been connected with the change of the architect and a new architectural concept. ${ }^{182}$

A small unpolished surface which measures $28 \times 20 \times 28 \mathrm{~cm}$ can be seen in the south-western corner of the Northern Lower Portico. This place must have featured an elevated element similar to the one which finished the line of elevated details below the Portico. ${ }^{183}$

It seems that the southern part of the edifice differed from the northern one. Most probably it resulted from the organization of work in the temple, where the construction took place in the southern portion and then in the northern part, ${ }^{184}$ e.g. the concept of placement of the Osiride statues in the Lower Terrace emerged after the work on the Southern Lower Portico had begun. This can be indicated by the fact that the southern statue was connected with the wall above the base while the northern one was connected with the wall from the level of the base.

The wall extended from the back of the Southern Lower Portico as far as the enclosure wall of the complex of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra and featured only the door which led to the complex of the Hathor Shrine.

Both Lower Porticoes could be accessed by means of small ramps which stretched along both sides of the Lower Ramp. ${ }^{185}$

## Lower Ramp ${ }^{186}$

The Middle Terrace could only be reached by ascending the Lower Ramp. Di. Arnold suggested, ${ }^{187}$ referring to a publication by Winlock, ${ }^{188}$ that it was built in year 7 of the reign of Thutmose III. It seems that while the construction and strenghtening of the road should belong to the earliest phase of preparatory works, the finishing of a ramp is a fairly late stage of building activity. The argument which contradicts such
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Fig. 54. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Middle Terrace, outer wall in the north, added to the Northern Colonnade (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
an early chronology is the fact that the bricks from the structure erected by Amenhotep I, demolished to build the new one, were discarded in Sen-en-mut quarry in the layers dated on the basis of notes on ostraca to the period between years 10 and 16 of Thutmose III's reign. ${ }^{189}$

The Lower Ramp was a structure with its own sandstone foundation, still to be seen in situ. ${ }^{190}$ It was 43.28 m long and 7.8 m wide. Sandstone stairs of the same width as the granite gate which led to the Upper Courtyard extended in the middle. ${ }^{191}$ The Ramp was framed with a polished balustrade, whose first lower blocks featured two pairs of lions watching the gate of the horizon, ${ }^{192}$ modelled in sunken relief. The surface of the first upper blocks, which measured $1.14 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.61 \mathrm{~m},{ }^{193}$ was polished. These blocks were interpreted as pedestals for small limestone sphinxes. ${ }^{194}$

It should be noted that the decoration motifs preserved in the lower portions of the Lower and Upper Ramps were also represented in the tomb of Surer from the times of Amenhotep III as the decoration of the kiosk which was the seat of the king. ${ }^{195}$

The balustrade of the Lower Ramp continued at the border of the Middle Terrace and surrounded the Middle Courtyard on three sides.

[^52]Fig. 55. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, retaining wall, unfinished panels with the Horus name of Hatshepsut and beginning of the ramp leading to the Hathor Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


## Middle Terrace

## Courtyard

The original shape of the Middle Terrace is not clear. The Courtyard occupied a vast space, and was 83.50 m long and 78.8 m wide (the width measured in the eastern part). It seems to have naturally been divided into two parts: the eastern and the western one. The western part was levelled and its whole surface was paved. There are a threshold and small stairs which have been preserved at a distance of 36.05 m from the border of the Porticoes. These features are interpreted as the original eastern border of the enclosure wall. ${ }^{196}$ It definitely separated the western part from the eastern one, which most probably had never been paved. The ground level lowered gradually from the aforementioned threshold ${ }^{197}$ towards east. ${ }^{198}$

The north wall of the Middle Terrace was polished in the upper portion on its northern (outer) side. The polished section started on the top and reached a depth of 59 cm in the mid-length of the wall and decreased

[^53]

Fig. 56. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Middle Terrace, Northern Colonnade added to the Lower Anubis Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
in its northern part. It appears that a narrow ramp, divided by small platforms, extended on the outer side of the wall and led towards the Upper Terrace.

The Middle Terrace was initially planned as slightly wider in the north, thus the wall which closed it on this side was an extension of the north wall of the Northern Colonnade (Fig. 54). ${ }^{199}$ The next stage was moving of the wall 1.61 m southwards, so that it was almost in line with the wall which closed the Northern Colonnade from the east. The wall added in the east of the Colonnade was originally supposed to have a different shape from the one which is there today. It was definitely topped with a moulding, which can be seen in the negative, and its height was probably only slightly lower than the height of the Colonnade.

It could be supposed that the Middle Terrace preserved an unchanged surface in the south. There was a retaining wall which stretched between the Upper and Lower Terraces. The original shape of the east wall of the Middle Terrace is unclear and the reason for building such a thick wall which closed the Southern Middle Portico is unknown.

The retaining wall, erected on sandstone foundation, ${ }^{200}$ constituted the southern façade of the temple building. It was expressed with the decoration made by following the example of the wall enclosing the Upper Temple of the pyramid of Senwosret I at el-Lisht, ${ }^{201}$ where the Horus name, carved along the whole height of the wall, created an impression of an avant-corpse. ${ }^{202}$ The avant-corpse was never completed (Fig. 55).

The height and shape of the south retaining wall in its western part during the first phase of the construction of the Hathor Shrine is unknown. At that time, the entrance to the Shrine was independent and it was not possible to reach it from the Middle Terrace. ${ }^{203}$ After modification of the plan and addition of the First Hypostyle Hall in the second phase of the construction, it was possible to access the Shrine precisely from the level of the Middle Terrace. ${ }^{204}$ It is unclear, however, how advanced the construction of the retaining wall was at that moment or whether it was necessary to demolish a part of it to build the passage.

The processional route continued in the Middle Courtyard, marked by two rows of three large granite sphinxes on each side. ${ }^{205}$ According to Tefnin, they were planted at intervals of approx. $10.0 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{206}$ The
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Fig. 57. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Middle Terrace, cornice of the Northern Colonnade viewed from the north wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
statues differed in size, they were 2.90-3.43 m long, approx. 1.0 m wide, $1.35-1.64 \mathrm{~m}$ high (without the base), ${ }^{207}$ and weighed nearly 7.5 tonnes. ${ }^{208}$ Their heads were adorned with the nemes and the inscription placed between their paws clearly identified them with the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. ${ }^{209}$ They were discarded in the quarry like other sculptures left by Hatshepsut. They might have been one of the first to be destroyed since they were discovered in the deepest parts of the fill. ${ }^{210}$

## Northern Colonnade

The Northern Colonnade is a portico added on a fairly small elevation of the height of one course of blocks $(53.0 \mathrm{~cm}),{ }^{211}$ to the east of the wall which closes the Lower Anubis Shrine from the north. It formed the façade of four chapels topped with a vaulted ceiling. ${ }^{212}$ The north wall, which functioned as the retaining wall placed next to the rock, was 35.47 m long, and the portico was 3.95 m deep. The chapels were relatively small, $1.54-1.57 \mathrm{~m}$ wide and $2.62-3.16 \mathrm{~m}$ deep, ${ }^{213}$ their single-leaf doors opened inward (Fig. 14).

The Northern Colonnade was not part of the original plan. It was added to the wall of the Lower Anubis Shrine and covered a portion of the chapel façade, perhaps together with the place for a planned statue (Fig. 52)..$^{214}$

[^55]Zygmunt Wysocki supposed that the Colonnade had been initially designed according to the module, however, technical problems which resulted from the presence of the tomb below, forced the builders to change the plan and build four chapels instead of five. ${ }^{215}$

As opposed to other complexes in the temple, the portico of the Northern Colonnade was not composed of three rows, but of a single row of 15 columns. ${ }^{216}$ Another difference from the other parts of the temple can be seen in the placement of columns in the eastern portion of the Northern Colonnade, namely, they were situated directly on the floor, where their positions were marked with outlines, and not on bases. The columns were supported by undecorated sandstone architraves. ${ }^{217}$

The Northern Colonnade was built in a hurried manner, of fairly small blocks of inferior quality, the weaker points were often covered with patches, and smaller gaps filled with putty. The fillings are present even in the segments of columns, which implies exceptionally careless work of the builders. The walls and columns were only covered with whitewash. ${ }^{218}$

Scholars believed that the Colonnade was the last element built in the temple as the builders did not manage to complete it. ${ }^{219}$ Nevertheless, the observation of the wall added to the east wall of the portico suggests that it was another element of a puzzle, and subsequent structures were added to the Colonnade, including the wall enclosing the Middle Terrace and then the Lower Terrace, which was further on connected with the Lower Portico. ${ }^{220}$ Wysocki put forward a hypothesis that the Colonnade had not been completed due to the fact that the builders noticed its lack of stability. ${ }^{221}$ This was a consequence of its location over the ceiling of the tomb of queen Meritamun, the wife of Amenhotep I. ${ }^{222}$ The key argument in favour of the theory that the ceiling slabs had not been finished and placed where they should was the concept, according to which the blocks of the balustrade and moulding were laid properly to create an impression of a finished structure, but they were cut evenly in the back and only imitated the placement of the ceiling. ${ }^{223}$ However, it is not consistent with the actual state of affairs. The balustrade blocks obviously protrude out of the line of the moulding, exactly as if they pressed against the moulding and were laid on the ceiling blocks at the same time (Fig. 57). Such arrangement could not be accounted for in any other case. Perhaps, then, the construction was completed and the ceiling blocks, as well as some architraves, being large and undecorated, were later stolen and reused in other structures.

It must be emphasised that although the Portico might have been completed in architectural terms, the decoration of the walls and architraves was never commenced. ${ }^{224}$

## Middle Porticoes (Punt Portico and Birth Portico) ${ }^{225}$

In the same manner as a major part of the temple, the Porticoes of the Middle Terrace were not planned in such shapes as they were eventually built in.

215 Wysocki, The results of research, 336-342.
${ }_{2} 16$ Baraize (Sur quelques travaux de consolidation, 152, Fig. 2) mistakenly marks 16 columns instead of 15 on his plan.
217 Both Clarke (Architectural Description, 18) and Wysocki (The results of research, 329-330, 332) believed that the blocks originally belonged to another structure. Clarke indicated the nearby temple of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra as the most likely location, however, Wysocki opposed this hypothesis by showing that the blocks in the columns of the Northern Colonnade are bigger than the ones in the temple of Mentuhotep II (Wysocki, The results of research, 332).
${ }_{2} 18$ Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari II, 8.
${ }^{219}$ Clarke, Architectural Description, 14, 21; Wysocki, The Results of Architectural Investigations, 45; Wysocki, The results of research, 338. French references term it "inachevée" (Witkowski, Le rôle et les fonctions des chapelles d'Anubis, 431).
${ }^{220}$ See also: Wysocki, The Raising of the Structure, 251, Pl. 47 [b].
${ }_{221}$ Wysocki, The results of research, 338-342, Figs 4-5.
${ }_{2}^{222}$ DB 358; remarks concerning the chronology of the tomb in relation to $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ : Winlock, The Tomb of Queen Meryet-Amūn, 5-6; Kees, Die Königin Meritamun, 275; Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt II, 52-54; Romer, Royal Tombs, 194-196; Logan, Williams, The Identity of the Meritamun, 23-29; Wente, (rev.) L'Épouse du dieu Ahmes Néfertary, 71; Blankenberg-van Delden, A genealogical reconstruction of the kings and queen, 33-34 and references there; PM I. $1^{2}, 421$ and references there (this publication cites Winlock, who discovered the tomb, and on that basis associates the tomb with the daughter of Thutmose III, the wife of Amenhotep II). In favour of dating the structure to the times of Amenhotep I, see: Thomas, The Royal Necropoleis, 175-176; Thomas, The Tomb of Queen Ahmose (?) Merytamen, 171-182; Barwik, The owner of the cliff tomb MMA 1021, 18-21.
${ }^{223}$ Wysocki, The results of research, 340.
${ }^{224}$ Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari II, 8; Karkowski, The Arrangement of the Architraves, 140.
${ }^{225}$ For decoration, see: Iwaszczuk, Sacred Landscape of Thebes 2, 41-58.

Fig. 58. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Ramp of the Hathor Shrine (1st phase): remains of the sandstone threshold which supported the ramp in the 1 st phase of construction of the Hathor Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


The original plan assumed the construction of two porticoes measuring 26.92 m of length and 6.36 m of depth (the southern one) as well as 26.51 m of length and 6.34 m of width (the northern one), which means the Southern Middle Portico was 41.0 cm longer than the Northern Middle Portico. ${ }^{226}$ Each Portico featured 11 pillars in two rows. The pillars were 80.0 cm wide and were spaced at 1.5 m , which can be seen thanks to the outlines on the floor ${ }^{227}$ and lines drawn in red paint in the lower portion of the walls, ${ }^{228}$ which marked the location of the pillars. The walking level of the Porticoes was designed at the level of one course of blocks above the pavement of the Courtyard. Initially, the short portion of the wall which formed the front wall of the Southern Middle Portico was intended to create an impression of an external façade and was decorated with a panel similar to a palace façade, ${ }^{229}$ in the same way as the south retaining wall. However, the addition of the Second Hypostyle Hall of the Hathor Shrine ruined the effect.

The level of the Porticoes was raised in the next phase. It was done after the decoration had been completed. It could possibly be associated with the construction of the Lower Porticoes as the higher walking level ${ }^{230}$ was planned there from the very beginning. According to Wysocki, the design of the higher socle is connected with a change of the architect and general architectural vision of the temple. ${ }^{231}$ In the end, the pavement was raised by $75.0 \mathrm{~cm},{ }^{232}$ the lower parts of the pillars were enclosed with blocks that covered the old floor, as a result of which the height of the decoration made earlier was lowered. The Middle Porticoes, like the Lower Porticoes, were closed with a balustrade in the east. ${ }^{233}$ The Porticoes could only be accessed by means of small ramps with steps built along the Upper Ramp. ${ }^{234}$ The foundations of these small ramps
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Fig. 59. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Ramp of the Hathor Shrine (1st phase), south retaining wall of the Middle Terrace with the negative of the ramp from the 1st phase of construction and decoration connected with it (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
were situated directly on the original stone pavement in the upper part, and directly on the ground in the lower part. ${ }^{235}$ The Northern Middle Portico could additionally be reached from the Lower Anubis Shrine by means of small stairs installed there. ${ }^{236}$

## Hathor Shrine ${ }^{237}$

The Hathor Shrine was situated in the southern part of the Middle Terrace. Throughout most of its existence it had been separated from the rest of the temple, and even after building a connection, it still had a separate entrance with a separate ramp. The inscriptions situated in the Shrine itself define it as $h w t-n t r^{238}$ or $r$-pr. ${ }^{239}$

The layout of the shrine was in accordance with the modular grid of $1.5 \times 1.5$ royal cubits as shown by Waldemar Połoczanin. ${ }^{240}$

Scholars have not reached agreement on the subject of the history of construction of the Hathor Shrine. It can definitely be understood that it was not built according to one plan, and it was rebuilt in the course of construction, which led to an altered appearance of the final version. The question of the modifications remains open. The most recent contribution in that discussion was made by Nathalie Beaux and Karkowski, ${ }^{241}$ who considerably changed the fixed view of these modifications. They arrived at the conclusion that the chapel was built in three phases, not in $\mathrm{two}^{242}$ or four, ${ }^{243}$ as it had been stated by other scholars earlier.

The original architectural design of the Hathor Shrine is unclear. The west wall of the Second Hypostyle Hall does not have angled joints with the south wall of the retaining wall of the Upper Terrace, which

[^57]Fig. 60. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, narrow room located to the south of the Hathor Shrine, torus moulding chiselled off in the course of addition of the First Hypostyle Hall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

implies its secondary nature in relation to the Upper Terrace. ${ }^{244}$ On the other hand, the Hathor Shrine might have been carved at the same time as the Main Sanctuary of Amun, and only the attempts to connect the two sanctuaries could be more recent than the original plan.

According to Beaux and Karkowski, the original plan of the Hathor Shrine involved carving the Sanctuary and Vestibule in rock and the Hypostyle Hall anterior to them ${ }^{245}$ (at the moment termed the Second Hypostyle Hall) with a terrace in front, as well as a ramp which led there from the level of the Lower Terrace. ${ }^{246}$ The ramp rested on a sandstone threshold which has been unearthed (Fig. 58). ${ }^{247}$ The decoration of the south retaining wall seems to have been completed at that time (Figs 55 and 59). ${ }^{248}$ Both the Sanctuary and the Vestibule featured the pavement at the same level as the pavement of the Southern Middle Portico, located nearby. The term of the original ramp actually refers to a short flight of stairs added to the retaining wall of the Middle Terrace, which can be seen in the negative. The terrace of the Shrine, built on a sandstone foundation, projected approx. 1.0 m towards east in relation to the present façade, ${ }^{249}$ and the level of the pavement was lowered by $95.0 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{250}$

[^58]

Fig. 61. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, cornice over the west wall of the Second Hypostyle Hall (Phot J. Iwaszczuk).

Other scholars suggested a different reconstruction of the terrace. According to Clarke ${ }^{251}$ and Tefnin, ${ }^{252}$ the terrace finished slightly to the west of the more recent façade, and Wysocki ${ }^{253}$ stated that its border was located 2.0 m to the east of the façade. It appears that in the original plan the façade of the chapel was shifted back and it was impossible to access it from the Middle Terrace. ${ }^{254}$

When the structure was ready and the decoration of the north wall of the terrace, which had become the north wall of the First Hypostyle Hall after rebuilding, completed in sunken relief, ${ }^{255}$ a concept of expansion of the Shrine emerged. The pavement of the Second Hypostyle Hall was raised by $68.5 \mathrm{~cm}^{256}$ and the First Hypostyle Hall added in the east, ${ }^{257}$ with four pillars in the façade and four in the passage as well as eight columns. ${ }^{258}$ The bases of the pillars in the passage issued directly from the pavement, however, the bases of the pillars in the façade seem to be secondary as they were planted on the already existing pavement and are not combined with it. ${ }^{259}$ It shows that the façade was shaped to its final form only in the third phase. A narrow undecorated room was added in the south of the complex, but its function remains unknown. It was 6.2 m long and 1.05 m wide. Its undecorated walls have not been preserved well enough to estimate whether it was covered with a ceiling. Perhaps that was the manner in which the builders closed the space

[^59]which had been used for completely different purposes, e.g. as a staircase, and thus created a useful storage unit, so scarce in the temple of Hatshepsut. Its façade was lower than the newly-formed external façade of the Shrine, which is indicated by the presence of a torus moulding in the upper portion of the façade. ${ }^{260}$ The plan made by Rosanna Pirelli ${ }^{261}$ suggests that the west wall of the narrow room was connected with its north wall already in the original design while, in fact, its eastern part was added later. ${ }^{262}$ However, it can be seen clearly that the west wall was also added to the existing north wall of that room, and the torus moulding was inaccurately masked in the north-western corner (Fig. 60).

The second phase of construction involved building another ramp and shortening the anterior terrace of the Shrine - its border is still preserved in the east and south. ${ }^{263}$ The expansion of the Shrine and raising of its floor probably resulted in the possibility of access from the Middle Terrace. ${ }^{264}$

The terrace was expanded again in the final phase of construction, but the level of the pavement remained unchanged. In order to enlarge the terrace, a supporting wall was built in the east and south. ${ }^{265}$ The third ramp associated with the Hathor Shrine, whose marks are still to be seen as a difference in the patina on the retaining wall of the Middle Terrace, comes from that final phase of construction.

After the last changes had been implemented, what emerged was an independent, ${ }^{266}$ even though connected with temple, ${ }^{267}$ complex of rooms located along an axis which was parallel to the main axis of the temple. It was possible to enter from two directions, both from the Middle Terrace at its south-western end, and through a narrow door which led from the Lower Terrace, along an open passage between the south retaining wall of the temple and its enclosure wall. It is possible that sandstone sphinxes, with heads covered with tripartite wigs, were situated in front of the entrance. ${ }^{268}$

Directly behind the entrance, a narrow ramp ${ }^{269}$ rose between the aforementioned walls. ${ }^{270}$ It led to a small platform and then to the courtyard located in front of the First Hypostyle Hall, which also provided access to the narrow room mentioned above.

The external wall, which was at the same time the retaining wall of the added platform, was closed from the top with a cornice. The cornice was hammered off at a certain time and the fragment of the surface polished, which left marks that are still to be seen.

The cornice which was hammered off at a later stage of construction, and whose marks can still be seen, also closed the west wall of the Second Hypostyle Hall (Fig. 61).

The façade of the First Hypostyle Hall was slightly shifted ahead of the face of the Middle Terrace Porticoes, yet it still combined into a harmonious whole with the façade of the Middle Terrace, which extended from the Lower Anubis Shrine along both Porticoes. ${ }^{271}$ Two wings of the walls included the First Hypostyle Hall and passed into a portico which consisted of four pillars and led into the Hall. The Hall was 15.54 m long, 5.54 m wide and its ceiling was fitted at a height of 6.63 m . Pillars situated along the axis led further into the Hall as far as the threshold which was the border of the Second Hypostyle Hall. All walls of the Hathor Shrine were vertical, and there was no need to thicken them. The niches of the Shrine were carved in the rock, not in free-standing walls as it was the case with other parts of the temple. Additional columns were planted in the middle part of the First Hypostyle Hall to support the roof. The architraves of both Halls, arranged transversely to the axis of the Shrine, differed from the architraves of the Upper Terrace they were significantly bigger. ${ }^{272}$ The pillars which marked the processional route were decorated on three

[^60]sides with raised relief, and from the side of the axis - with sunken relief. Perhaps it should be understood that the space between the pillars was not covered.

A relatively small threshold, 29.0 cm high, separated the First Hypostyle Hall from the Second Hypostyle Hall. The Second Hypostyle Hall, lower than the hall which preceded it, was 5.49 m high, 6.22 m wide, and 15.60 m long. The first row of four columns formed a façade similar to the façade of the First Hypostyle Hall. The two remaining rows consisted of six columns each, with partially unfinished capitals. The roof of this room was flat, its fragments have been preserved in the north-western corner.

The Hypostyle Halls were merely the forecourt of the proper Shrine, hewn in rock. In order to reach these relatively low and dark rooms, it was necessary to climb a small flight of stairs which was 50 cm high and consisted of three steps made of a single added block. The name of the gate which led to the rock portion stated the function of the Shrine: "gate: $M 3^{c} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}$ is the one who makes offerings of food in the house of Hathor. ${ }^{י 273}$ A double-leaf door let the visitors inside (Fig. 14). The first chamber of the speos was a transverse Vestibule, which was 6.50 m long and 3.63 m wide. Its flat ceiling, situated at a height of 4.94 m , was supported by two columns and a row of architraves arranged transversely to the axis. There were four niches located in three walls: symmetrically in the north and south walls and in the west wall on both sides of the entrance to the Bark Hall. The entrances to the niches are situated at a height of 28.0 cm above the floor level. The niches in the west wall were smaller, ${ }^{274}$ and in the north and south walls larger. ${ }^{275}$

The north-eastern corner of the Vestibule of the Hathor Shrine lacks the angled joints of the walls as far as the seventh course of the blocks. The walls are connected from the level above the lintel. Moreover, there is an obvious difference in the height of the courses of blocks of the two walls up to this level. The same feature can be seen looking from niche D . The walls are not connected along the whole height of the niche in its north-eastern corner. The difference in the height of the courses of blocks can be noted there as well. It most probably means that this part of the room was originally supposed to have a different form, and then, in the course of advanced construction process, the builders decided to add the east wall of the Vestibule.

It appears that the columns situated in the Vestibule were not initially planned as their bases are installed directly in the floor. ${ }^{276}$

The central part of the west wall of the Vestibule constituted the façade of the pr-wr chapel. ${ }^{277}$ In the central part of the façade there was: "door: $M 3^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$ is joint with the beauty of Hathor who is upon Thebes. ${ }^{י 278}$ The double-leaf door which opened inward led to the Bark Hall along two-step stairs. The Bark Hall had a flat roof and was 1.78 m long, 3.67 m wide, 3.6 m high. It was mostly built of large blocks, which changed in the passage to the Vestibule, where blocks in the walls were notably smaller. A difference in the height of the courses of blocks can be seen on both sides of the passage between the Bark Hall and the Vestibule, which suggests that the vestibule was built later.

It was the Bark Hall which most probably accommodated the stone statue of a cow placed in a bark on a pedestal supported on runners. ${ }^{279}$ It is even more likely as the floor shows four depressions where such a statue, of a width of at least 1.67 m and length of 2.43 m , could have been installed. ${ }^{280}$ This suggestion could be additionally confirmed by images of Sen-en-mut carved in the niches, now carefully chiselled off, which showed the official of the queen kneeling, facing outward and not inward, as it was the case in

[^61]practically all other circumstances. ${ }^{281}$ That change of direction might indicate that the individual who was venerated by Sen-en-mut was to be found in front of him. The niches where representations of Sen-en-mut were carved differed from all others in the temple. They were the smallest in the temple, situated at the level of the floor, very badly made. The only decoration was the aforementioned portrayal of Sen-en-mut, situated behind the door.

The head of a cow which is a fragment of a statue made of calcite, stored in the British Museum, is associated with the Hathor Shrine. ${ }^{282}$

The last room in the west was the Sanctuary. The visitors entered over a high threshold, which raised the level of the pavement. This chamber was also entered through a double-leaf door which opened inward (Fig. 14) and was called "gate: $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}$ is the one who offers love in the house of Hathor." ${ }^{283}$ That room, hewn deep in bedrock must have been dark. As opposed to the Main Sanctuary of Amun, the light was not directed there, thus the sun could only hit it through the door when it was open. The room was not big, it measured 3.65 m in length, 1.5 m in width, and was topped with a vaulted ceiling at a height of 3.6 m (at the highest point). The axis of the chamber was marked across its central part with a line carved on the pavement. The pavement in the north-western corner was made by exploitation of the natural shape of the rock, which was levelled flat and created an impression of two enormous blocks, and the remaining space was filled with relatively small limestone blocks. The lateral walls featured one niche each at the level of the pavement, where the images of Sen-en-mut were also the only decoration, ${ }^{284}$ although this time facing the inside of the niches.

## Lower Anubis Shrine ${ }^{285}$

On the other side of the Middle Terrace, in its northern part, there was the Lower Anubis Shrine ${ }^{286}$ built behind the Northern Middle Portico (Birth Portico) in such a manner that its façade constituted a natural extension of the Portico.

The Shrine was described in the inscription on the south wall of the Hypostyle Hall as "she-ntr of Anubis who is on his mountain [...] foremost of Dsr-dsrw" (sh-ntr nt Jnpw tpj dw.f[..] hntj Dsr-d $\underline{d} s r w$ ). ${ }^{287}$ Sh-ntrr is also mentioned on architraves of the Hypostyle Hall ${ }^{288}$ and in the Vestibule of the Shrine on the north wall. ${ }^{289}$

The Shrine of Anubis was interpreted as a place of divine cult, where sacrifice for gods was offered. The shrine could additionally be the venue for rituals performed at annual feasts, e.g. the feast of Osiris in the month of Khoiak. It is possible that the Lower Shrine functioned as a place for veneration of ancestors and for celebration of the sed festival, as it was an extension of the Northern Middle Portico. ${ }^{290}$

The sacrificial function of the shrine is undoubtedly referred to in the name of its gate: "gate: $M_{3}{ }^{c} t-k_{3}-R^{c}$ is endured with the offerings of food in the house of Anubis, ${ }^{,{ }^{291}}$ which corresponds with the name of the gate in the Hathor Shrine. ${ }^{292}$

The Shrine consisted of a complex of three rooms hewn in rock, preceded by the Hypostyle Hall, built outside bedrock. The subsequent rooms of the speos were lower and lower.

[^62]The façade was decorated with a cornice and balustrade which bore a gargoyle in a form of a lying lion at the border of the Portico and the Shrine.

It seems that the Shrine was designed in its present shape from the very beginning. It might be indicated by the angled joints between the south wall of the Hypostyle Hall and the north wall of the Northern Middle Portico, as well as the fact that there were large blocks in the lower courses of the north, south, and west walls. Blocks of such size are rare in the temple and they can only be seen in the Main Sanctuary of Amun as well as the Bark Hall and the Sanctuary of the Hathor Shrine, which are generally regarded as one of the oldest architectural elements of the temple. ${ }^{293}$ Perhaps the builders planned to erect an Osiride statue on the northern side of the Shrine, ${ }^{294}$ however, this concept was abandoned and the place was covered with the west wall of the Northern Colonnade. ${ }^{295}$ The blocks inserted into the wall, which were intended as the material for the statue, can still be seen as a side view at the border of the Lower Anubis Shrine and the Northern Colonnade (Fig. 56). The west wall of the Hypostyle Hall created a continuous line with the west wall of the area located to the north of the Upper Portico, which means they were built at the same time.

The Hypostyle Hall was in fact a portico open to the Courtyard of the Terrace, located in front of the speos. Its flat roof was supported by three rows of columns, four columns in each row. ${ }^{296}$ They were practically spaced evenly, ${ }^{297}$ in such a manner that they did not indicate a clear passage which led to the gate situated in the west wall, which led further into the bedrock to subsequent rooms. The bases of the columns were elements of the pavement, and the columns were topped with architraves arranged along the north-south axis. The portico measured 11.0 m of length, and 6.58 m of width, with a ceiling placed at a height of $5.6 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{298} \mathrm{Its}$ two walls, the north and the south one, were exceptionally thick, which could be explained by the presence of two small niches situated opposite each other. ${ }^{299}$ The doors of both niches opened inward ${ }^{300}$ and featured an incised line in the mid-lengths of their thresholds which marked the transverse axis of the Hall. ${ }^{301}$ The north and south walls of the Hypostyle Hall looked like a type of pylon of the Shrine ${ }^{302}$ to anyone who looked from the outside, analogically to the façade of the Hathor Shrine. ${ }^{303}$ The west wall was thinner than the others and was adjacent to the rock. The aforementioned entrance was located in the middle of the wall, slightly raised in relation to the level of the pavement laid in the whole Hypostyle Hall. A small flight of stairs, which consisted of three steps, led to the entrance, ${ }^{304}$ the stairs were 38.0 cm high and 158.0 cm wide, built of one block. ${ }^{305}$ The double-leaf door opened inward (Fig. 14) ${ }^{306}$ and the visitors entered the Vestibule located in bedrock. ${ }^{307}$ It was relatively small ( 4.19 m long and 1.83 m wide), with a vaulted ceiling placed lower than the ceiling of the Hypostyle Hall, at a height of 3.1 m. The pavement slabs of the Vestibule rested on one layer of foundation. ${ }^{308}$

A much smaller door led from that room to the Sanctuary. The lintel was constructed from several smaller blocks instead of one large piece. ${ }^{309}$ Maciej G. Witkowski believes that the lintel implies a secondary nature of the Sanctuary, which was not included in the original plan. ${ }^{310}$ This interpretation can be additionally confirmed by the fact that the reliefs in this chamber were made in a hurried manner and the

[^63]wall was built of small blocks, without a proper level of accuracy. ${ }^{311}$ The door to the Sanctuary was planned in the north-western corner of the Vestibule, the axis of the Sanctuary was at a right angle to the axis of the Vestibule. It was a single-leaf door which opened inward. The Sanctuary was a little bigger than the Vestibule, it was 5.22 m long, 1.33 m wide, and its vaulted ceiling was installed even lower than the one in the Vestibule. The height of the Sanctuary was 2.94 m at most. The south wall of the Sanctuary was practically completely occupied by a single-leaf door ${ }^{312}$ which had a lintel made of a sandstone block. ${ }^{313}$ A low bank was located next to the north wall, along the whole width of the room. ${ }^{314}$ It constituted a type of altar and was 50.0 cm high, made of two large limestone blocks, and finished with a cornice in its upper part. ${ }^{315}$ Witkowski noticed that it highlighted the height of the single-leaf door of the niche, situated in the northern part of the west wall and installed at approx. 50.0 cm above the pavement of the Sanctuary. ${ }^{316}$ The door opened inward (Fig. 14).

The axis of the niche fell at a right angle to the axis of the Sanctuary. It was the smallest room of the complex. It was 2.13 m long, 78.0 cm wide, and its vaulted ceiling was lower than in the anterior room 2.14 m at its highest. ${ }^{317}$ The entrance was highlighted by a window sill finished with a cornice. The lintel inside the niche was also made of sandstone. ${ }^{318}$ The door was of a double-leaf type and the sockets have been preserved on both sides, the perforations carved in the door jambs indicate that the door was barred. ${ }^{319}$ The floor of the niche rests directly on the rock. ${ }^{320}$

## Upper Ramp

Another ramp led to the highest terrace - the Upper Terrace. The structure of the ramp was quite close to the structure of the one placed lower, however, the decoration differed. It was built of unevenly arranged, tapering rows of blocks, which is described by Clarke as an "excellent example of poorly-made stonework." ${ }^{321}$ Such a state of affairs could be a consequence of i.a. the fact that the blocks are inclined at two angles at least. It creates an impression that the ramp was originally planned as shorter and more slanted, and only the changes introduced in the final phase established its ultimate shape. ${ }^{322}$ The walls of the ramp supported its structure on two sides, and its fill was contained between them. ${ }^{323}$ The ramp was paved in the upper part.

The ramp rests on a narrow elevation built of a single course of limestone blocks. It projects from below the ramp on both sides to the width of two small blocks, i.e. one cubit.

The walls of the Ramp were covered with whitewash on the outside. ${ }^{324}$ Just like the Lower Ramp, the Upper Ramp features pedestals installed in the lower and upper portions, and a balustrade between them. In the case of the Upper Ramp, the balustrade was a natural extension of a statue based on a pedestal. ${ }^{325}$ The statue represented a falcon which embraced a cobra with its wings, and the cobra's tail coiled in a serpentine up the ramp. The cobra probably rested on a $k 3$ sign and its head was adorned with a Hathoric disk. ${ }^{326}$ The
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Fig. 62. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, view of the Lower Anubis Shrine and retaining wall at the back of the area located to the north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico) (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
stairs were situated in the central part of the Ramp, most probably analogically to the Lower Ramp. According to a reconstruction suggested recently, the steps were 3 (royal) cubits wide, 2 cubits deep, 2 hands high, and were built of limestone, ${ }^{327}$ not sandstone like the Lower Ramp. ${ }^{328}$ The hypothesis concerning the material raises doubts, the more so due to the fact that a large fractured sandstone block was discovered there in the course of excavations. ${ }^{329}$

## Upper Terrace

The so-called Upper Terrace was the highest part of the temple. ${ }^{330}$ It was the destination of the processions of the bark of Amun, the most important rituals were performed there.

The main axis of the temple, which extended from the Valley Temple to the Main Sanctuary of Amun, was connected with the cult of that god. It is notable not only due to its architectural design, but also because of the subjects of the scenes and the objects of the cult. The significance of the axis is emphasised by the names of the gates. The visitors entered the Courtyard through a monumental granite gate called sb3 ' 3 Jmn $\underline{d} s r m n w,{ }^{331}$ and left the Courtyard, passing on to the Main Sanctuary of Amun, through a gate called $s b 3 M_{3}{ }^{`} t-k z-R^{`} J m n h t p h r m n w . s,{ }^{332}$ to finally reach the Statue Room, whose gate was called sbz Jmn šsp mnw hnmt-Jmn-ḩ̧t-špswt. ${ }^{333}$ Other names of the gates did not refer directly to the edifice ( $m n w$ ), or its particular parts, but rather to the ritual function of the rooms which they led to. It was only in the case of the main axis of the temple that the rooms were connected and their gradually increasing private function in relation to Hatshepsut was marked. At the entrance to the Bark Hall the queen fulfilled a completely official
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Fig. 63. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area located north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico) (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
role, which is indicated by her throne name, while in the last room, the Statue Room, her proper name, Hatshepsut, is mentioned in the name of the gate.

## Upper Portico (Coronation Portico) ${ }^{334}$

The front wall of the Upper Courtyard consisted of a row of Osiride statues of the queen placed along two porticoes composed of a row of pillars in the front and a row of columns inside, 11 in each row. It seems that it was not planned in the first phase of construction. Both the columns and the pillars rested on the already paved floor and the bases of the columns did not form integral parts of the floor. ${ }^{335}$ The floor is one of the few elements which did not suffer damage as a result of earthquakes or anthropogenic activity. ${ }^{336}$ It can be concluded on the basis the fragments preserved in the northern part that the paving was made of small irregular blocks. ${ }^{337}$

The outlines made by the builders to mark the location of the columns and pillars have been preserved in the lower portion of the west wall. ${ }^{338}$

The Upper Portico was designed according to the module, therefore the spaces between the pillars were approx. 160.0 cm long. ${ }^{339}$

The row of pillars which supported the Osiride statues of the queen ${ }^{340}$ was the most characteristic element of the Upper Portico. The pillars, if the historicity of their inscriptions is accepted, were placed there to clebrate the first sed festival. ${ }^{341}$ They were practically square in cross section and their sides measured:
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Fig. 64. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico), view of the west wall of the area located north of the Upper Portico (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
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Fig. 65. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area located north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico) (based on Kwaśnica, Szafrański, The Problem of Reconstruction of the Retaining Wall, 56; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
$78.0-85.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ on the nort-south axis, $77.0-80.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ on the east-west axis. ${ }^{342}$ The statues were inseparable with the pillars as they were built of segments which incorporated a part of a pillar and a part of a statue. ${ }^{343}$ There are two differing opinions concerning the headdress of the Osiride statues. Karkowski states that the heads of all Osiride statues were adorned with the combined crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, ${ }^{344}$ and each of these sculptures bore the throne name of Hatshepsut, $M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k 3-R^{c} .{ }^{345}$ However, Tefnin men-

[^66]

Fig. 66. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico), fragment of the north wall of the retaining wall with building dipinti (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
tioned that some heads bore white crowns while others had double crowns. ${ }^{346}$ The statues held in their hands the ' $n h$ and flagellum on the southern side, and sceptres $h / k 3$ and wzs on the northern side. ${ }^{347}$

The preserved column bases were attached to the pavement by means of mortar. ${ }^{348}$ The diameter of the column bases was approx. 140.0 cm and they were 12.0 cm high. ${ }^{349}$ The dimensions of typical 16 -sided columns in the Portico were as follows: 84.0 cm in the lower part, 72.5 cm in the upper part. ${ }^{350}$ The spaces between the columns and pillars located in the middle were bigger than between the others, which resulted from the width of the granite portal $(315.0 \mathrm{~cm})$. For this reason, in order to support three converging architraves, the capitels of the columns situated in the passage had to be bigger and their diameter in the upper part was approx. $78.0 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{351}$

Out of the architraves which rested on the columns and pillars, none was preserved in situ. Nevertheless, it is known that they were approx. 240.0 cm long, ${ }^{352} 71.0-73.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ high, and $77.0-78.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ wide. ${ }^{353}$ As it has been mentioned above, the longest architrave was placed above the entrance, it must have measured more than 315.0 cm as that was the width of the gate.

The ceiling slabs, approx. 60.0 cm thick, were based directly on the architraves. ${ }^{354}$


Fig. 67. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space at the back of the Upper Portico, corner of the retaining wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

[^67]

Fig. 68. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space at the back of the Upper Portico, fragment of the west wall of the retaining wall with an erasure covered with plaster (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 69. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space at the back of the Upper Portico, fragment of the north wall of the retaining wall with a chiselled part (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

## Area located north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico)

The area in the north of the Coronation Portico and above the Lower Anubis Shrine seems to have been rather neglected by scholars so far (Figs 62-69). ${ }^{355}$

That area was to a great extent located not over the Shrine of Anubis but over the north wall of the Shrine, which formed a type of a wide retaining wall. The north wall of the Hypostyle Hall of the Lower Anubis Shrine is disproportionately thick in relation to the south wall. Its width could theoretically be accounted for by the presence of a niche, however, there was a niche in the south wall, and it was almost half the width. Thus it appears that the greater thickness was an intended feature which could serve to bear the load of an additional structure planned above the north wall.

The space in the northern part of the Coronation Portico is 16.74 m long and 6.9 m wide. Its west wall, which extends from the Coronation Portico towards north, bears a negative of walls(?) or other flat features which were placed there before. The blocks in the lower courses display unpolished surfaces and building dipinti (Fig. 66). The negative shows that the original level of the pavement was situated higher than it has been reconstructed, i.e. higher than the pavement of the Coronation Portico. Next, a block with polished upper corners, which resembles a balustrade, can be seen at a distance of 4.5 m . Further on, the area lowered by 50.0 cm , then rose by 45.0 cm at a distance of 4.35 m . The final part, three blocks wide, constituted a type of a small pedestal (Figs 64-65, 67). Scholars are not aware of the width of these descending and ascending surfaces.

[^68]

Fig. 70. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space above the Hathor Shrine, fragment of the retaining wall with lowered floor level, analogical to the lowered floor of the retaining wall above the Lower Anubis Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 71. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space above the Hathor Shrine, fragment of the retaining wall with lowered floor level, analogical to the lowered floor of the retaining wall above the Lower Anubis Shrine (detail) (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 72. Osiride statues in front of the Hnmt- ' $n h$ temple (based on Davies, Two Ramesside Tombs, Pl. 13; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 73. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area north of the Upper Portico, fragment of the wall closing the Upper Portico from the south with traces of smoothed surface (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

The object which can be seen above the "pedestal" is very interesting. It seems that the blocks projected from the wall or a certain architectural or sculpted element was connected with the wall. Most probably it was chiselled off, and then inaccurately polished and covered with plaster (Fig. 68). This characteristic feature can be seen along the whole height in the north-western corner. Another notable element is the recess in the north wall at the height of the last block of the "pedestal" (Fig. 69), which appears to be a type of "anchor" for a heavy object that was supposed to be additionally attached to the wall in this manner.

Similar traits are displayed by the area preserved above the Hathor Shrine. A wall with a mul-ti-step floor can be seen there as well (Figs 70-71). Unfortunately, that wall was preserved only partially in the southern portion.

As it seems, it could be suggested the two heavy objects were placed on platforms on both sides of the temple on the Upper Terrace, at equal distances and heights. They were so heavy that it was necessary to build a type of a dedicated retaining wall. A reconstruction of two Osiride statues of the queen in these two places seems to be a logical explanation.

Such a solution, however, requires reconsideration of the complete reconstruction of this area. The pedestal for an Osiride statue appears to be feasible, nevertheless, a question arises - what was the function of the recess, one height of block deep, which was situated in front of the pedestal. Perhaps its interpretation can be facilitated by two images described by Christian Leblanc in the context of the cult of Osiride statues. ${ }^{356}$ One of them is associated with an artefact from the valley of Deir el-Bahari and was found by Naville in the temple of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra. It is a stela which represents cult performed in front of two pairs of Osiride statues of Mentuhotep II and Amenhotep I. ${ }^{357}$ The statues were places on both sides of the stela, and in front of them, in the centre, there were four connected small basins and small altars with burned offering (Fig. 34).

The other image comes from a tomb dated to the Ramesside period ${ }^{358}$ and has been preserved only partially. It depicts the front of a temple with a pylon, and next to that there are two Osiride statues of Thutmose I. As in the former case, there is a type of a small basin in front of each statue (Fig. 72).

Thus this aforementioned concavity in the floor in front of the pedestal for a statue might have been a type of basin which was strictly connected with the cult of Osiride statues.

The presence of marks left by probably two rain gutters (Fig. 73) on two adjacent walls of the portico is another argument in favour of a structure associated with water: on the east wall, in its northern portion, and the wall which formed the southern border of the part located in the north of the Upper Portico. The walls in these places were slightly sunken along their whole height and there was a gargoyle installed in the

[^69]balustrade. Another gargoyle was fitted in the southern part of the Upper Portico, which implies a symmetrical layout of that space. ${ }^{359}$

Another question is related to the chronology of the structures situated above both chapels (Lower Shrines of Anubis and Hathor Shrine) as well as who and when decided to remove the statues and leave the space devoid of ritual use.

The construction of the Lower Anubis Shrine, which is a relatively late structure in the temple complex, should be the terminus post quem for the building of the platform. However, the representations of Sen-enmut preserved inside suggest that it was decorated in his lifetime, i.e. not later than year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III. It also appears that at the same time as the shrine and its ceiling were under construction, the builders managed the design of the platform based on the ceiling.

The question of the time when these representations of the queen were destroyed is much more challenging. Due to the lack of any clues, two concepts apear to be likely. According to one of them, it was the queen herself who changed the plans and the Osiride statues were eventually mounted on the Lower Terrace. However, the number of 28 statues seems to be more relevant in ritual terms than $26,{ }^{360}$ which would suggest that the concept according to which Thutmose III was responsible for the removal of queen's statues is more likely. In the later period of his reign the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple did not have such a significance in the cult as in the times of Hatshepsut. Thus the fact of leaving the space unused might be more comprehensible than it would be with reference to the time of the construction of the temple. At that moment architectural changes were still possible if it was noted that a certain area which had served for cult was no longer exploited for the purpose for which it had been built.

## Upper Courtyard ${ }^{361}$

The entrance to the Upper Courtyard must have made a great impression. The only route from the outside led through a monumental granite gate, whose double-leaf door opened inward, then further on through a field of columns in the dark, to finally deliver the visitor to the sun-drenched courtyard. It was a festival courtyard (wsht hhbyt), ${ }^{362}$ situated in this place for Amun-Ra, which was stated by Hatshepsut in the dedicatory inscription on one of the columns of the Courtyard. ${ }^{363}$ The wsht hbjjit courtyards served i.a. for offering sacrifice, including burned offerings, ${ }^{364}$ which means they had to be open so that smoke could easily dissipate.

The courtyard was 37.4 m long and 25.3 m wide. It was merely a forecourt to the complexes of rooms grouped around it, which were exploited for cultic as well as storage purposes. It should be stressed that the function of the surrounding rooms was defined by the names of the gates which led to them. Some names have not been preserved to our times, names of the gates of some other rooms were never written down. This was the case with the Northern Room of Amun, Southern Room of Amun, and the Room with the Window. The absence of the names seems to have resulted from a non-ritual (or at least non-sacrificial) function of these rooms. ${ }^{365}$

It appears that the Upper Terrace was eventually designed in such a manner that the processional routes formed two perpendicular axes ${ }^{366}$ which crossed in the festival courtyard. ${ }^{367}$ One of them led through the granite gates to the sanctuary, the other connected the northern and southern rooms. The former was associated with the cult of Amun, the latter was related to the royal cult.

[^70]
## Walls ${ }^{368}$

The courtyard was closed on all sides with high, inclined walls which were analysed by Wysocki in terms of their architecture. According to that scholar, most walls of the Courtyard were built in the earliest phase of construction of the temple. ${ }^{369}$ These included the south, west, and north walls, as well as small portions of the east one, which differed from the other three. All the three walls were inclined and were approx. 2.4 m thick at the base and 1.35 m thick at the top, which means they were one of the thickest walls in the temple. This phenomenon can be accounted for by the presence of niches in the north and west walls as well as a window in the south one. ${ }^{370}$ The east wall, also inclined, was notably narrower, it was 1.6 m thick at the base and 1.1 m thick at the top. The inclination of the walls is approx. $7 \mathrm{~cm} /$ $1 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{371}$ The height of the Courtyard walls is reported differently by various scholars, who report the measurments of $5.745 \mathrm{~m}^{372}$ to $5.83 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{373}$

The reason for the inclination of the walls is intriguing - it was explained as a technical requirement to resist the pressure of the wall of the fill. ${ }^{374}$ However, this inclination does not seem to have technical significance. It was remarked by Wysocki, who indicated that the walls of the temple of Mentuhotep II were also slanted even though they were solely built of stone blocks. ${ }^{375}$

The east wall, thinner than the other three walls of the Courtyard, was naturally divided by the red Aswan granite gate situated in its central portion. The gate must have been installed in the course of the construction of the wall since its section and height are the same as the section and height of the wall. ${ }^{376}$ It was erected on the floor, built of three large blocks. Two of them, measuring 4.3 m of height, served as door jambs and the third one rested on them and constituted the lintel. The depth of the gate was 1.58 m at the base and only 1.14 m in the upper part of the lintel. ${ }^{377}$ The gate, which was 1.58 m wide ${ }^{378}$ (i.e. precisely 3 royal cubits), accommodated a double-leaf door closed with a bar inserted in the sockets in the door jambs. The anchors in the pavement and lintel as well as the sockets in the jambs are the only marks left by the door. Djehuty states that "its great door leaves were made of copper and worked with electrum," ${ }^{379}$ which is additionally confirmed by the dedicatory inscription located on an architrave in the Upper Courtyard, ${ }^{380}$ as well as the text spoken by Amun-Ra, recorded in the panel over niche H (Fig. 74). ${ }^{381}$ The gate slightly projects out of the wall on the outside but it forms one line with the wall inside. ${ }^{382}$

The thickness of the south wall resulted from the window installed in it. The wall was 25.3 m long and 2.55 m thick at the base. Three doors installed in that wall led to the Southern Room of Amun, Complex of the Royal Cult, and to the so-called Room with the Window. The construction of the south wall was a serious challenge to the builders, above all, due to the fact that the rock in the eastern part of the Courtyard sloped steeply and it was necessary to even out the level by building a partial platform. The foundations under the south wall in its eastern part are made of as many as 11 courses of blocks. ${ }^{383}$

The west wall of the Upper Courtyard was one of the oldest elements of the temple. ${ }^{384}$ It was 37.4 m long and was divided in mid-length into the northern and southern parts by the granite gate which led to the Sanctuary. As it was erected along a rock massif, its architectural form differed from the other walls. It
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Fig. 74. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, west wall, scene over niche H (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

should be mentioned that the walls in the temple of Hatshepsut which were not built directly next to the rock were made up of two parallel walls and the space between them was filled with rock debris, fragments of blocks, mortar, sand, etc. ${ }^{385}$ In the case of walls which touched the rock, the west wall of the Upper Courtyard being one of them, the additional parallel wall was not necessary since the rock fulfilled its function. ${ }^{386}$

Połoczanin believed that the original design of the wall did not assume the presence of niches. ${ }^{387}$ Demolition of a considerable part of the wall and building of the niches was the second phase of work. ${ }^{388}$ It shaped the beautiful façade of the Sanctuary with large open niches ( 320.0 cm high, 80.0 cm deep), each of which accommodated an Osiride statue of the queen. ${ }^{389}$ They were separated with small, even though deep, niches ( 190.0 cm high, 160.0 cm deep) which most probably served as storage space for royal cultic statues. ${ }^{390}$ The small niches were closed with double-leaf wooden doors - fragments of wood are still present in the door sockets. ${ }^{391}$ Blocks which formed the lateral walls of the niches were fastened by means of dovetail cramps. ${ }^{392}$ The lintels of the niches were made of larger blocks which were 130.0 cm long, 80.0 cm wide, and 45.0 cm high. ${ }^{393}$ Each niche was framed with a torus moulding up to the level of cornice and thus constituted a small independent shrine. ${ }^{394}$

The Osiride statues situated in the niches create an impression of a secondary feature as they had not been inserted into the back wall of the niche as in other parts of the temple, but were merely planted next to the wall and anchors were added at different heights for different statues. ${ }^{395}$ The northern statues wore the double crown, the southern ones the white crown, ${ }^{396}$ and they held the ' $n h$ sign in their hands. ${ }^{397}$

The number of the niches was a subject of discussion - it was supposed that the central part of the wall, between niches I and N , had additionally been demolished, ${ }^{398}$ possibly after the construction of the niches

[^72]but before the decoration work. It is likely that the builders might have originally planned to create 10 high niches and 10 smaller ones. These two additional smaller niches should be located, according to the module, between the last high niches and the granite gate. ${ }^{399}$

The rooms carved in rock were reached through a monumental granite gate which granted access only to the select few. It seems that initially the gate was more moderate and only in the later period of Hatshepsut's reign it was replaced with the monumental form. Originally this place was filled with a limestone gate, which can be confirmed by the fact that the walls on its both sides (from the Courtyard and the passage to the Bark Hall) are composed of blocks of the same height, and marks of rebuilding have been preserved at the back of the granite gate (Fig. 75).

The gates must have been replaced after the decoration had been made. The space behind the silhouette of Nefrura (later recarved into Ahmose ${ }^{400}$ ) was cropped, with no place for the geometric frieze. ${ }^{401}$ It probably happened at the same time when the gate which led to the Upper Terrace was constructed. ${ }^{402}$ It also seems that it was installed after the decoration of the west wall had been completed. ${ }^{403}$ Dariusz Niedziółka supposes that the original limestone gate was called $s j^{\prime} r t-m 3^{\prime} t$ and there was a portico in front of it, which bore the same name, ${ }^{404}$ and was made of carved wood plated with sheet electrum. ${ }^{405}$ Niedziółka's claim is based on the functional similarity of the name $s j^{\prime} r t-m 弓^{\prime} t$ to the names of the gates of the vestibules of the Lower Anubis Shrine ( $M 3^{`} t-k 3-R^{`} m n t d f 3(w) m p r J n p w^{406}$ ) and of the Hathor Shrine ( $M 3^{i} t-k 3-R^{`} j^{i} r t d f 3(w)$ $m p r H w t-H r w^{407}$ ), as well as the significance of this name for rituals. That gate, according to Niedziółka, was supposed to be installed in front of the shrine mentioned on the stela of Djehuty in the line preceding $s j^{\prime} r t-m 3^{i} t$, which the author would locate in the last room of the Sanctuary. However, that shrine cannot be associated with the last room for certain, the more so due to the fact that Niedziółka's concept concerning the shape of the room appears to be outdated at the current stage of research. ${ }^{408}$ The key element of the reasoning made by that scholar is the identification of a block published by Mikołaj Budzanowski, connected with the last room of the Sanctuary. Nevertheless, the identification raises a number of controversies. ${ }^{409}$ The decoration of the block was not finished, but it was partially chiselled off.The provenance of the block is unknown, it was discovered in the area of Asasif and transported to the temple. ${ }^{410}$ The type of limestone does not conclusively indicate whether it belonged to $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ since there were other structures made of the same material. ${ }^{411}$ Additionally, the block definitely did not belong to the last room as suggested by Budzanowski. ${ }^{412}$ Thus the identification of $s j{ }^{\prime} r t-m \jmath^{\prime} t$ with the structure, even if temporary, ${ }^{413}$ seems uncertain.

The granite gate was, as it appears, the last element added to the west wall and it did not completely fill the gap in the wall, which had been hewn where the previous gate used to function.

The question of the finishing of the upper portion of the west wall has not been explained so far. It has been established that a window which let the sunlight into the Bark Hall was installed in that wall. ${ }^{414}$ It

[^73]was situated at the height of the ceiling slabs, and over the ceiling there are two more courses of blocks with unpolished surfaces, which must have been hidden from view. The window itself would have been blocked in that way. Thus a question arises how the issue of directing the light was further solved and what concealed the two courses which projected over the ceiling. Perhaps there was a special perforation carved in the ceiling slab to let the light in. If such a perforation in the ceiling slab existed, it must have been an exceptionally precise work performed by the queen's craftsmen.

Marks left by the aforementioned two courses of unpolished blocks have been preserved over the west wall, at the border with the retaining wall of the Upper Terrace in the central part. They suggest that a certain architectural element which covered them up was located in front. There are no direct indications which would clarify the matter. This is a consequence of the fact that there are no buildings from the times of Hatshepsut preserved to such a height to provide an analogy. The only exception is the small temple at Medinet Habu, whose roof is topped with a single cornice. ${ }^{415}$ In the case of the Upper Courtyard of the temple of Hatshepsut, the cornice decorated the area over architraves around the open portion of the Courtyard, and was pressed with the balustrade which covered the ceiling slabs in the upper part. It is possible that the builders decided to add a cornice with a balustrade also at the top of the west wall.

The last wall which framed the Courtyard, the north wall, separated the Courtyard from the Complex of the Solar Cult and the Northern Room of Amun. It was a thick wall, which was 2.45 m thick at the base, probably due to the niche inserted in it on the side of the Solar Courtyard.

## Colonnade ${ }^{416}$

Architects and Egyptologists have not reached an agreement concerning the final form of the Courtyard. It is known that there were rows of columns along each wall, yet the number of columns in a row and the number of rows are still a subject of discussion. It appears that the Courtyard was shaped in two phases of construction. Two rows of columns along each wall were probably planted in the first phase, however, there is also a suggestion that two rows were installed along each of the longer walls and three rows along the shorter ones. ${ }^{417}$ The second phase involved an addition of a single row along one of the longer walls, which is shown by the presence of a group of architraves with a relief decoration recarved from sunken relief to raised relief. ${ }^{418}$ Since the rule was that sunken relief was assigned for the elements exposed to direct sunlight, ${ }^{419}$ it could be concluded that the architraves which were originally located externally became at a certain moment the architraves of an inner row. ${ }^{420}$

Egyptian architecture obeyed a few simple rules which introduced order into its composition and execution of the construction work. The major trait was symmetry, however, it happened that it was sacrificed for the sake of functionality or ideological necessity. Another important feature was an exceptionally practical approach to construction, which was displayed by economical exploitation of labour and materials. The reference to these rules helps to make a critical evaluation of the hypotheses formed by scholars, which concern the architectural arrangement of the Courtyard.

The present appearance of the Courtyard is completely a result of a reconstruction. The following elements had to be taken into consideration in the course of reconstruction of the arrangement of the Upper Courtyard: outlines on the blocks of the floors or walls, layout of the columns (the number of the bases), the number of the columns with the so-called panel, i.e. columns of the external rows, the arrangement of the sockets of architraves and the inscriptions on architraves. ${ }^{421}$ Additionally, each row of architraves had its characteristic traits, e.g. the width of the undecorated panels. Nevertheless, different hypotheses are sometimes formed on the basis of the same arguments.

Even though architectural elements have not always been preserved in situ, ancient Egyptians sometimes aided reconstruction by leaving carved or painted outlines on the floor or walls which they used as guidelines. Unfortunately, the outlines have not been preserved in the Upper Courtyard. ${ }^{422}$ The original pavement is also represented by very few fragments. ${ }^{423}$ There is very little left of it at the moment: a number
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Fig. 76. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, column location according to Dąbrowski (based on Dąbrowski, The Main Hypostyle Hall, 51; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 77. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, column location according to Wysocki (based on Wysocki, The Upper Court Colonnade, 68; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 78. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location according to Karkowski (based on Karkowski, The Arrangement of the Architraves, 139-154; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 79. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location according to Pawlicki (based on Pawlicki, Skarby architektury, 81, Fig. 69; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
of excavation and restoration works resulted in the present situation - very few floor blocks can be found in situ. It should also be mentioned that most probably the floor was renovated in the times of the Ptolemies, when the portico was erected and many decorated blocks from the temple walls were inserted into the floor. ${ }^{424}$

The bases of the columns were installed directly into the floor. It seems that both the floor and the bases were laid when the walls of the Courtyard had already been erected. It is known that the south wall was not decorated at the moment of laying the pavement, ${ }^{425}$ nevertheless a part of the Complex of the Royal Cult had been built and decorated. It can be proven by the traces left by the settlement of the platform of the Upper Terrace in its southern portion, which were detected both in the southern part of the Upper Terrace and on the wall of niches in the Vestibule of the Chapel of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{426}$ The bases of the columns in the southern part of the Courtyard were raised by 6.0 cm , so that they could be at the same level as the columns which had not experienced settlement. ${ }^{427}$

The shape of the columns planted on the Upper Terrace was characteristic for the the columns from the reign of Hatshepsut: they were 16 -sided, had a diameter of approx. 80.0 cm and were 4.95 m high, ${ }^{428}$ the external columns featured a vertical decoration panel on the side facing the courtyard. ${ }^{429}$

The columns supported architraves which were approx. 80.0 cm high and wide, and their length fell in the range between 230.0 and 285.0 cm . Some architraves were installed in the walls, in properly made architrave sockets and thus connected the walls with the colonnade and stabilised the whole structure.
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Fig. 80. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location according to Kwaśnica (based on Szafrański, Szafrański, Deir el-Bahari. Season 1999/2000, 190, Fig. 4; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

It appears that in the course of the studies on the decoration of the walls and the architecture, scholars established the location of the architrave sockets and their positions in the walls. ${ }^{430}$ The north and south walls had four sockets each, and the east and west walls - two. ${ }^{431}$

Many theories concerning the reconstruction of the shape of the Upper Courtyard have emerged so far. It should be remembered that the particular stages of understanding of the temple and studies on certain architectural elements repeatedly indicated solutions which were later rejected.

The number of the columns has been a controversy from the very beginning of research. Clarke remarked that the arrangement of the columns in the Upper Courtyard was not correlated with the location of the niches in the west wall. ${ }^{432}$ Naville suggested a reconstruction of two rows of columns on each side of the Upper Courtyard on the basis of the outlines on the floor. ${ }^{433}$

In 1961-1967 Leszek Dąbrowski (Fig. 76) cleared the floor from the material which had been collected there in the times of Naville and established that the number of columns was much higher than the one reported by Clarke. ${ }^{434}$ He discovered two types of columns from the Upper Courtyard - smaller ones of a diameter of approx. 70.0 cm and reconstructed height of 494.0 cm as well as bigger ones of a diameter of approx. 80.0 cm and reconstructed height of $567.0 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{435} \mathrm{He}$ also examined the decoration of the panels of columns of the Courtyard. In the course of research conducted at that time, the scholars found three fragments of different columns with representations of the so-called rekhyts ${ }^{436}$ turned to the right and as many

[^76]turned to the left. For this reason, it was accepted that three columns were situated in each external row of the southern and northern rows of columns. ${ }^{437}$ Initially, Dąbrowski proposed to reconstruct a roofed hypostyle hall there..$^{438}$ According to another reconstruction he suggested, the Upper Courtyard accommodated 108 columns in four rows in the south, west, and north, as well as two rows in the east. The internal rows would consist of the lower columns while the external rows of the higher ones. ${ }^{439}$

The bases of columns found by Dąbrowski were verified by Wysocki, who indicated that Dąbrowski's theories were partially wrong (Fig. 77). ${ }^{440}$ Wysocki analysed the bases still left in the Courtyard and learned that Dąbrowski mistook fragments of the pavement for column bases. ${ }^{441}$ Wysocki agreed with Dąbrowski on the subject of the decoration of columns while the discovery of additional fragments of rekhyts made it possible to establish the number of at least four columns in the southern and northern rows. ${ }^{42}$ Wysocki eventually reconstructed two rows of columns in the south, east, and north as well as three rows in the west (Fig. 77), composed of columns of the same height of 495.0 cm and the diameter of the base of $82.0-84.0 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{433}$ According to that scholar, the columns with a decorated panel were only located in the internal part of the courtyard. However, he rejected columns of a smaller diameter, of approx. 70.0 cm , whose height he reconstructed at $418.5 \mathrm{~cm},{ }^{444}$ which he regarded as associated with other parts of the temple.

Karkowski agreed with most Wysocki's findings, however, he added one row of columns in the south and north, even though he did not contradict the possibility of existance of two rows (Fig. 78). ${ }^{445}$

The plan published by Pawlicki (Fig. 79) shows three rows of architraves in the east. He situated the sockets of the third, added row in the south and north walls. ${ }^{446}$ This concept is rather unlikely in view of the established decoration system of these walls.

The hypothesis formed by Andrzej Kwaśnica (Fig. 80), which has been under discussion lately, assumes that an additional row was added in the east in order to mask the error in architecture and, above all, to highlight the new north-south axis. ${ }^{447}$ When the hypothesis is critically analysed, it must be emphasised that the axis was created very early. The south wall, as well as the passage located there, were planned from the very beginning, and the external walls of the courtyard: north, west, and south are regarded as the oldest elements of the temple. ${ }^{48}$ Moreover, an addition of another row in this place would not highlight the axis but rather mask it. The inscriptions associated with the added row are typical ${ }^{449}$ and they do not indicate any ideological explanation for that rebuilding. The hypothesis also assumes that the number of columns in the north must have differed from the number in the south. It was supposed to be a consequence of the spacing between the architrave sockets but also of the identification of one of the architraves, whose length reached 275.0 cm , while he estimates the spacing between the columns to have been approx. $240.0 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{450}$ Nevertheless, it seems that the length of the architrave falls within the normal range, and the longest ones from the Upper Courtyard are approx. 285.0 cm long. It is enough for an architrave to rest along a length of 25.0 cm to remain supported by a column. ${ }^{451}$ It was not necessary to change the spacing between the columns if the spacing is 240.0 cm and their diameter reaches $82.0-84.0 \mathrm{~cm}$. The concept of a different number of columns in the opposite rows is doubful, furthermore, there is no known analogy for such a spatial arrangement. The idea to reconstruct 10 columns in the north and 9 columns in the south seems to be surprising in view of the taste for symmetry characteristic for ancient Egyptians and the absence of symmetry exceptionally disturbing. The suggested change in the spacing between columns would have been a great undertaking
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Fig. 81. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location: summary (based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).
and would have involved dismantling of the roof, removal of the architraves, and moving of the already planted columns.

The presence of the Ptolemaic Portico constructed from three rows of paired columns provided an argument for most scholars to suggest the location of the added row in the west. Kwaśnica attempted to disprove the theory which assumed the column bases had been planted in the times of Hatshepsut by stating that the bases of the two external columns of the Ptolemaic Portico were situated 6 cm higher than the other ones. ${ }^{452}$

However, the addition of the third row of columns in the east seems rather unlikely, also for technical reasons: the ground surface was much less solid in the east, and particularly in the south-east, since the foundations were laid on an added platform. An addition of another heavy element, which would exert pressure towards the south-east, would be very risky and might have a detrimental effect as the structure settled with time. ${ }^{453}$ On the other hand, the addition of the third row of columns in the west could be explained with safety reasons: it would expand the roof, i.e. the area where stones could fall as a result of torrential rains or earthquakes.

Summing up all the arguments, it seems that the layout of the courtyard should be symmetric and the added row was situated in the west (Fig. 81). If the suggested location of architraves is accepted, the labour invested in expansion of the portico would be relatively the lowest. At the same time, it would incorporate most suggestions of Egiptological nature made by Karkowski, together with analogies which he indicated in $\underline{D} s r-3 h t$ and the temple of Thutmose IV at Qurna, ${ }^{454}$ where the third row was situated in the west. What is also significant, the entrance to the Sanctuary was emphasised with a triple portico, which corresponds with the structure of the Shrine of Anubis (architraves preserved in situ) and Hathor Shrine (layout of architraves reconstructed by Karkowski). ${ }^{455}$

## Statuary

The image of the Upper Courtyard would not be complete without the description of the statues incorporated in the architecture. Scholars associate the Upper Courtyard with three types of statues: large granite statues which represent standing queen ${ }^{456}$ as well as large ${ }^{457}$ and small ${ }^{458}$ granite statues of kneeling queen.

Two standing statues of the queen, 2.42 m tall (without bases), ${ }^{459}$ have been found smashed at the bottom of "Sen-en-mut quarry". ${ }^{460}$ Winlock suggested that they should be situated either in front of the granite gate which led to the Courtyard, or in front of another gate which led from the Courtyard to the Bark Hall. ${ }^{461}$ This suggestion was supported by Tefnin. ${ }^{462}$ Dorothea Arnold is in favour of locating the statues next to the gate to the Sanctuary, ${ }^{433}$ and refers to the statues of Thutmose III discovered by Jadwiga Lipińska in exactly such a context. ${ }^{464}$ On the other hand, other representations contemporary with the statues in question depict such statues planted in front of the pylon, i.e. the entrance to the temple. ${ }^{465}$

[^78]Fragments of eight kneeling statues, reaching the height of $2.57-2.79 \mathrm{~m},{ }^{466}$ were scattered in the whole area of the temple and its surrounding after the destruction by Thutmose $I I I^{467}$ in later years of his reign. ${ }^{468}$ The large kneeling statues seem to form four pairs. ${ }^{469}$ The first pair consisted of statues defined as A and H according to the nomenclature by Winlock, together with additional fragments identified by Aleksei Shukanau. ${ }^{470}$ They were made of red granite and featured small pointed pillars with inscriptions in one column, which were turned in opposite directions - statue A to the left, statue H to the right. Statue A was topped with the white crown, statue H - the double crown. The second pair consisted of statues D (together with fragments described as statue A by Shukanau) and E (with fragments of statue B reconstructed by Shukanau) carved in granodiorite, with small pointed pillars as well as the white crown (D) and double crown (E). The third pair consisted of statues B and G, made of red granite. Each of them featured the nemes and small rectangular pillars decorated with two columns of text. The royal names were turned right and the divine names were turned left on statue B , exactly opposite to the ones on statue G . Statues C and F , made of red granite, constituted the last pair. They were decorated with the nemes and pectorals. Their pillars were rectangular and displayed one column of text each, turned in the same direction in both cases. Thus it can be understood that the large kneeling statues did not form a homogeneous group. Moreover, Shukanau claims, on the basis of the proportions of the fragments he examined, that the statues with the nemes were larger than the ones with the white or double crowns. ${ }^{471}$ Winlock, as well as Cathleen A. Keller and Shukanau, believed that they were placed in the Upper Courtyard. ${ }^{472}$ Do. Arnold represented a different opinion and was inclined to locate them along the main axis of the Middle Courtyard on the basis of the place where they had been found in the quarry. ${ }^{473}$ Some other scholars who studied this issue associated them with the the festival courtyard axis. ${ }^{474}$ Perhaps they should not be treated as one group and the statues of the first two pairs, with the white and double crowns, were situated in the Upper Courtyard, along the main axis, and represented a three-dimensional model of the scene depicted in relief on the lintel of the granite gate which led to the Sanctuary. The scene shows images of kneeling statues facing each other, although the ones in the northern part feature the red crown instead of the double crown. ${ }^{475}$ The decoration of the lintel of the granite gate was one of the two arguments which Winlock used to support his hypothesis. The other argument involved the remains of lime mortar preserved on a fragment of the base which probably belonged to statue G. He thought that they must have come from a statue planted in a paved courtyard, however, the courtyards of the Lower and Middle Terraces were not paved. ${ }^{476}$ The arrangement of the four statues wearing the nemes is depicted on the south wall of the Upper Courtyard, ${ }^{477}$ although only two of them definitely hold the $n w$ vases. Out of these four statues, only G could have been planted in the southern part of the Courtyard due to the direction of the inscription, therefore the question of their location remains unsolved.

Hayes suggested that the 12 small granite kneeling statues, discovered in the so-called Hatshepsut's Hole, ${ }^{478}$ should be located around the Courtyard - perhaps they used to stand among the columns. ${ }^{479}$ Do. Arnold, however, believed that they should frame the path from the entrance to the Courtyard to the Sanctuary, instead of the large kneeling statues. ${ }^{480}$
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Fig. 82. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, probable location of the altar (a) Dąbrowski, The Main Hypostyle Hall, Pl. XLVIII; b) based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).

Another possibility which could be considered is whether this part of the temple was equipped with an altar in the north-western corner of the Courtyard (Fig. 82). This could be expected due to the function of the Upper Courtyard, which was, i.a. a venue for rituals associated with sacrifice offering. ${ }^{481}$

## Main Sanctuary of Amun ${ }^{482}$

The Sanctuary, carved in bedrock, could be reached from the Upper Courtyard. It consisted of two rooms situated one after another - the Bark Hall and the Statue Room. It was one of the earliest parts of the temple and one of its most important elements - this is where Amun-Ra from $\underline{D} s r$ - $\underline{d} s r w$ was venerated, which is stated in the dedicatory inscription. ${ }^{483}$

## Bark Hall ${ }^{484}$

The Bark Hall was reached through a granite portico and double-leaf door which opened inward (Fig. 14). It was a spacious room which was 9.0 m long and 3.5 m wide. Its height at the highest point measured $5.9 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{485}$ Light could reach the chamber solely by means of a system of small windows in the walls, the so-called skylights, and the further one moved into the room, the darker it was. The objective was to direct the light in such a manner that it would illuminate the statue of the god twice a year. ${ }^{486}$ It was illuminated once more every year, when the sunlight reached it through the open door of the Courtyard, then through the doors of the Bark Hall and Statue Room on the winter solstice. ${ }^{487}$

Both rooms featured vaulted ceilings constructed from large blocks. In order to prevent the ceiling of the Bark Hall from collapsing under its own weight, a special relief structure was built above. It exerted pressure on the ceiling blocks and at the same time transmitted their pressure onto the walls located below (Fig. 18b). The significance of the relief structure can be attested by the fact that it was visited repeatedly in the course of the construction work: Amun-hetep the scribe, left his inscriptions and writing samples on its walls. ${ }^{488}$


Fig. 83. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Hall: Osiride statue of Hatshepsut, partially reconstructed north-western Osiride statue of Hatshepsut with chiselling marks on the northern side (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

According to the original plan, the Bark Hall was probably designed to have a different shape and at least its east wall was supposed to look different. It could be concluded from the fact that it was dismantled at a certain time and assembled again. This is indicated by the absence of joints of the east wall with the north and south walls while these two walls are clearly connected with the west wall of the room.

[^80]Osiride statues of the queen, 3.42 m tall, were placed in each corner of the Bark Hall. ${ }^{489}$ They were originally integral parts of the walls ${ }^{490}$ and were erected together with the walls. This can be seen as carved shapes which show the silhouettes and heights of the statues (Fig. 83). ${ }^{491}$ As in other cases of Osiride statues of the queen, they also featured the white crown in the southern part and the double crown in the northern part, ${ }^{492}$ as well as ' $n h$ signs in their hands. ${ }^{493}$ These statues, like all other ones, were smashed and discarded outside the north-eastern corner of the temple and in the western part of the quarry. ${ }^{494}$

There were niches in the longer walls of the Bark Hall - three in the north wall and three in the south one. ${ }^{495}$ They were approx. 1.5 m high, 0.8 m wide, and 1.0 m deep. ${ }^{496}$ They probably served for storage of small statues which depicted the living and dead members of the royal family. ${ }^{497}$

This chamber housed the bark of Amun carried there by priests during festivals. ${ }^{498}$ The bark rested on a platform, which has not survived to our times, nevertheless, its representations reconstructed in the post-Amarna times have been preserved on both sides of the Bark Hall and on the north wall of the Upper Courtyard. ${ }^{499}$

## Statue Room ${ }^{500}$

The floor of the following chamber, the Statue Room, was located 54.0 cm higher than in the Bark Hall. ${ }^{501}$ Small four-step stairs made of a single limestone block led to that room. It had a double-leaf door which opened inward. The chamber was relatively small -3.42 m long, 2.18 m wide, 3.1 m high at the highest point of its vaulted ceiling. ${ }^{502}$ A small narrow window was carved in the east wall of the Statue Room, which let spots of light in, while on the winter solstice sunlight reached the cult statue situted in niche B of the naos directly through the open door. ${ }^{503}$ The Statue Room was rebuilt during the reign of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{504}$ The results of the latest research indicate that it was originally designed as a room with three niches in the south, west, and north walls, ${ }^{505}$ however, the concept changed at a certain point and two lateral niches were converted into more spacious shrines, thus some blocks from the original niches were inserted into the walls of the new shrines. The changes were introduced after the decoration had been completed and the work was probably conducted in a hurried manner, which is indicated by imprecise polishing of the block surfaces or inaccurate masking of the original decoration, ${ }^{506}$ as opposed to other cases. ${ }^{507}$ The door of niche C was of double-leaf type before the changes, which is implied by the decoration preserved on both sides directly next to the entrance, and after the rebuilding a double-leaf door which opened outward (Fig. 14) was installed again. On the other hand, the door of chapel A, located in the southern part, opened inward (Fig. 14).
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$5^{507}$ E.g. in the case of the rebuilding of the niche in the north wall of the Courtyard of the Solar Cult into the Upper Anubis Shrine, the blocks which were inserted into the wall were placed in such a manner that the surface bearing the older decoration could not be seen (Karkowski, The Solar Complex, 39).

The studies of the architectural aspects of the western part of the Statue Room took the longest time. It was widely believed, ${ }^{508}$ that there was the so-called third room of the Sanctuary, in a form of a small chamber. This concept was particularly promoted after the discovery and interpretation of fragments which originally belonged to the door frame initially situated in the west wall of the Statue Room. ${ }^{509}$ It was also suggested that the west wall of the third room might have been decorated with a false door, ${ }^{510}$ analogically to the false door in the chapel of Mentuhotep II. ${ }^{511}$

Witkowski suggested that there was a niche in the west wall of the Statue Room. ${ }^{512}$ This theory was referred to again when a fragment which constituted a lateral wall of a niche in the west wall was discovered. ${ }^{513}$ The final reconstruction of the central niche (B) made by Mirosław Barwik ${ }^{514}$ led to the conclusion that the door frame of the niche was originally 196.0 cm high, 122.0 cm wide, and located approx. 79.0 cm above the floor of the Statue Room, at the same level as the other two niches. Its door opened inward. The depth of the niche was calculated at 205.0 cm from the west wall of the Statue Room. It has been accepted that there was a statue inside the naos, and its face, situated at a height of 150.0 cm over the floor of the niche, was illuminated by sunlight reaching it by means of a system of skylights twice a year. The ebony naos found above the Lower Anubis Shrine, ${ }^{515}$ stored in the Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, in Cairo ${ }^{516}$ at the moment, is associated with that niche.

## Complex of the Royal Cult ${ }^{517}$

The Complex of the Royal Cult was located at the southern end of the north-south axis. It incorporated the largest chamber of the temple - the Offering Chapel of Hatshepsut, as well as the Oferring Chapel of her father, Thutmose I. There were vestibules and courtyard in front of both chapels, and the complex was reached through a single door which opened inward (Fig. 14).

The Complex of the Royal Cult was designed in such a manner that in order to reach it from the Upper Courtyard, it was necessary to "turn left" southwards. ${ }^{518}$

In the case of this complex, its final form also differed from the original design. Wysocki's hypothesis that the initial plan did not include development of the temple outside the south wall of the Upper Terrace should be carefully considered. ${ }^{519}$ Both the west and the east walls of the Upper Terrace (looking from the Upper Portico ${ }^{520}$ ) were erected along their whole lengths as one of the first and according to the same design. ${ }^{521}$ There are no indications which would support the concept that their southern parts were added later. On the other hand, the layout of the rooms within the space marked by the two walls in the south of the Upper Courtyard was definitely arranged later. The shape of the Southern Room of Amun remained

[^81]unchanged. Its south wall is clearly connected with the west one, which can be seen by examining the places of contact of the two walls from the inside of the room. ${ }^{522}$ Another suggestion made by Wysocki ${ }^{523}$ that should be questioned is the idea that the Southern Room of Amun was originally longer, and perhaps was intended as an open space with a staircase leading to a platform which is not detectable any longer, in the north of the temple. If the Southern Room of Amun had indeed been planned as a long one, the outlines of its foudations would be preserved on the rock of the present Chapel of Hatshepsut, in the same manner as under other walls. ${ }^{524}$ Such outlines, however, do not exist. The wall which separated the Southern Room of Amun from the Chapel of Hatshepsut was not built on both sides simultaneously. The northern face of that wall was erected independently from its southern face, which can be concluded from the uneven height of courses of blocks on the two sides. Wysocki supposed that the wall was initially planned thicker and was built thinner when the Chapel of the queen was added. ${ }^{525}$

There is an additional argument in favour of original exploitation of the area located to the south of the Upper Courtyard - the fact that no fragment of a wall which could limit the platform added to the southern part of the temple has been discovered in the course of excavations within the Complex of the Royal Cult. It means that the platform in its present shape was constructed in this way from the very beginning along its whole surface. This may lead to the conclusion that the space which the temple was supposed to occupy did not expand southwards from the moment the construction commenced, but merely the division of the internal space into chambers changed in the course of the work.

It should be noted that there are no joints of the internal walls of the Complex of the Royal Cult with the west and south walls of the Upper Courtyard (apart from the chapel of Thutmose I, where there are angled joints everywhere), ${ }^{526}$ which might mean that the west and south walls of the Upper Courtyard were erected in the first phase while the internal walls were built later. All noticeable changes in the architectural plan took place soon after the initiation of the construction activities.

It seems that the present level of knowledge prevents scholars from reconstruction of the original architectural plan of this part of the temple. There are no remains of the original walls and it is possible that apart from the south wall of the Chapel of Thutmose I and the Southern Room of Amun as well as the west wall of the Chapel of Hatshepsut, the construction of no other internal walls was initiated at the early stage of construction.

The original design definitely assumed the existence of the Chapel of Thutmose I, ${ }^{527}$ even though its initial function might have been different. ${ }^{558}$ The chamber is not shaped like a typical offering room, its north wall is inclined, which affects the shape of the most important wall of the chapel - the west wall which accommodates the false door. The latter wall is not rectangular, but romboid.

The next phase of alterations was the rebuilding of the north wall of the Chapel of Hatshepsut. This modification must have been made before any chamber was planned to the south of that wall. The concept did not change in the time necessary to lay five courses of blocks. ${ }^{529}$ The Chapel of Hatshepsut was designed during that phase and the architectural pattern of the space located to the south of the south wall of the Upper Courtyard was rearranged then. This is confirmed by the absence of angled joints of the north and south walls with the west wall of the Chapel of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{530}$ The north wall was not connected with the west wall along its whole height, as far as up to the torus moulding, while the south wall was connected from the sixth course upwards. Thus when the decision of the modification of the design was taken, it

[^82]was necessary to add the south wall of the Complex. ${ }^{531}$ The eastern part of the north wall of the Chapel of Hatshepsut was added simultaneously with the construction of the south wall of the Chapel, together with the walls connected with it: the east wall of the Chapel of Hatshepsut and the east wall of the Room with the Window. ${ }^{532}$ All these walls have angled joints with the south wall and the heights of the block courses in the walls which issue from the south wall and in the south wall itself are the same. The changes in the north wall of the Chapel of Hatshepsut can be seen looking from the inside of the Chapel and from the gate to the Chapel of Thutmose I. ${ }^{533}$

The wall which separates the Complex of the Royal Cult from the Room with the Window was built after preparations for the decoration of the north wall of the Complex (i.e. the southern face of the south wall of the Upper Courtyard) had been completed. It was polished, covered with plaster, and the drawing of relief outlines was in progress. ${ }^{534} \mathrm{It}$ is also possible to see certain signs of addition of a wall which separated the south wall of the Complex. ${ }^{535}$

It appears that the hypothesis advocated by Wysocki, who is inclined to situate a colonnade in the south of the Upper Courtyard, ${ }^{536}$ is not supported by any evidence. There are no preserved outlines in the lower layers of the south wall of the Upper Courtyard, and the attempt at reconstruction based on the analogy of the northern part is highly doubtful. Even more so, if the following concept derived by Karkowski is accepted: the outlines on the south wall of the Solar Courtyard are the final stage of construction which was not completed, ${ }^{537}$ and not the first, abandoned idea as suggested by Wysocki. ${ }^{538}$

Karkowski believes that the gate which leads from the Upper Courtyard into the Complex of the Royal Cult is a secondary structure ${ }^{539}$ which was inserted in the already existing south wall of the Courtyard and constructed from blocks which came from that wall. It would account for the equal height of block courses on both sides of the door. However, he does not provide any evidence for that. It has not been confirmed so far; the excavations conducted by Zbigniew E. Szafrański and Stefanowicz next to the new gate did not deliver any data on this subject. ${ }^{540}$

## Courtyard ${ }^{541}$

The Complex of the Royal Cult reached its final form after it had been separated from the Room with the Window and the east wall had been added. At that moment the entrance located in the south wall of the Upper Courtyard definitely led to a small courtyard, 4.56 m wide and 3.0 m long, with two roofed vestibules. Although the ceiling has not been preserved, a change in the style of decoration from sunken to raised relief helps to make certain attepts at the reconstruction of that ceiling.

## Vestibule of the Chapel of Hatshepsut Cult ${ }^{542}$

The Courtyard provided a passage to the Vestibule of the Chapel of Hatshepsut. The Vestibule, although relatively small, was a complex structure in architectural terms. It was 4.56 m wide and 5.79 m long. Karkowski suggested that it accommodated three columns which supported three rows of architraves (Fig. 78). ${ }^{543}$ These columns, slightly smaller than the columns of the Upper Courtyard ${ }^{544}$ were supposed to form a portico in front of the Chapel. The south wall of the Vestibule contained a niche (C) whose floor was built of blocks that formed the wall. The orientation of the niche is indicated by the outline preserved on the

[^83]floor blocks. ${ }^{545}$ The research is still in progress and the height of the niche is not known yet. ${ }^{546}$ Another two niches ( A and B ) are situated in the east wall of the Vestibule. Their shape is unique among the niches of the temple. The east wall of the Complex was expanded in order to accommodate them. Both niches were larger than most other ones in the temple and, as opposed to the others, they were not closed with a door. They were both located at a height of 1.25 m above the ground level. ${ }^{547}$ Niche A was smaller - it was 2.62 m long, 1.19 m wide, and its ceiling was 2.17 m above the floor. Niche $B$ was 1.25 m deep and 2.63 m wide, the opening of the door was only 0.9 m wide. ${ }^{548}$

## Chapel of Hatshepsut ${ }^{49}$

The Offering Chapel of queen Hatshepsut was accessed from the Vestibule. The entrance to the Chapel was as high as other doors of the Complex and the double-leaf door opened inward (Fig. 14). The Chapel was topped with a vaulted ceiling. The proportions of the chamber, which was 13.25 m long and 5.2 m wide, resembled proportions of Old Kingdom offering chapels. ${ }^{550}$ Its height at the highest point was 6.35 m . The vertical wall was separated from the ceiling with a torus moulding. The east wall of the Chapel featured a small niche. ${ }^{551}$ The west wall was equipped with a granite false door for the queen. It was completely destroyed in the period of destruction of Hatshepsut's images and a reconstruction of its decoration is impossible at the moment.

Winlock proposed that the sitting statue of Hatshepsut, now part of the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (29.3.2), ${ }^{522}$ should be situated in front of the false door. The statue is 1.95 m high and represents the queen wearing the shendjyt and nemes, ${ }^{553}$ in the same way as she was depicted in the erased decoration on the lateral walls of the Chapel. ${ }^{554}$ This thesis was supported by Di. Arnold, ${ }^{555}$ as well as Budzanowski. ${ }^{556}$

## Vestibule of the Chapel of Thutmose I ${ }^{57}$

The Vestibule of the Chapel of Thutmose I was unusually low, it measured 2.65 m of length and 2.41 m of width at the base of the walls. For this reason, the architrave which supported its ceiling rested on the north and south walls without the need for supporting columns. ${ }^{558}$ Both walls were inclined, which resulted in a larger distance between them in their upper parts (more than 0.5 m ) than in the lower ones. Thus the architrave which rested on them had to be longer and thicker than those which were supported by columns.

## Chapel of Thutmose $I^{59}$

The double-leaf door in the west, inclined wall of the Vestibule, opened inward (Fig. 14) and led to the Offering Chapel of Thutmose I, which was close to the Chapel of Hatshepsut in terms of architecture and decoration. It was a small chamber, 5.36 m long and 2.65 m wide, which was the major difference between

[^84]the two chapels: proportions of the Chapel of the Cult of Thutmose I did not display similarities to the architectural heritage of the Old Kingdom. The ceiling of the Chapel of Thutmose I was definitely vaulted, ${ }^{560}$ and emerged relatively low, at the height of the seventh course of blocks. ${ }^{561}$ Unlike in the case of the lunette in the Chapel of Hatshepsut, the surface of the ceiling was not separated from the walls by means of a torus moulding. South wall of the Chapel was vertical while the north one, which constituted the south wall of the Upper Courtyard at the same time, as well as east and west ones, were inclined (Fig. 9). A large portion of the west wall was occupied by a granite false door dedicated by Hatshepsut to her father. ${ }^{562}$ The false door measured 2.69 m of height, 1.51 m of width, and reached 19.5 cm deep into the wall. ${ }^{563}$ It was added to an existing wall, which is indicated by complete unpolished blocks from the dismantled part of the wall, found in a fill by Wysocki. ${ }^{564}$ Small niches were built between the lunettes in the east and possibly also in the west walls, however, they are still subjected to research. The niche in the east wall has been postulated purely theoretically by Karkowski, who merely mentions its existance and location on the plan. ${ }^{565}$ The niche from the west wall can only be identified on the basis of an unpublished photograph taken by the Metropolitan Museum of Art expedition ${ }^{566}$ after the removal of the false door but still before installation of its copy. The presence of the niche accounts for the thickness of the wall, which matches the thickness of the walls of the Upper Courtyard. ${ }^{567}$

## Complex of the Solar Cult ${ }^{568}$

The north-south axis of the Upper Terrace connected the Complex of the Royal Cult with the Complex of the Solar Cult. It should be mentioned that the traditional connection of the complex devoted to solar cult with the north dates back to the Old Kingdom. ${ }^{569}$

The final architectural version of the Complex of the Solar Cult in the temple of Hatshepsut consisted of: a dim roofed vestibule and an open sunny courtyard with an altar. There was a direct passage from the courtyard to the Upper Anubis Shrine.

The original design was different also in this case.

## Vestibule and Courtyard ${ }^{570}$

Even the initial plan involved development of the area located to the north of the Upper Courtyard. Two doors were situated in the north wall of the Upper Courtyard. The north and west walls of the northern section

[^85]were erected in the course of implementation of one plan. ${ }^{571}$ The wall between the Northern Room of Amun and the Solar Cult Courtyard crowned with the Maat brick shaped cornice was also an element of the original design. ${ }^{572}$

The modification of the original plan took place relatively soon, in the course of the construction of the north wall of the Upper Courtyard. It involved an addition of a wall which separated the vestibule from the Solar Cult Courtyard. The angled joints of the layers of the added wall and the north wall of the Upper Courtyard can be seen in the third course of blocks and above. The plans changed so rapidly that earlier ones were abandoned almost as soon as they were initiated. Most likely, the builders did not intend to erect the walls which


Fig. 84. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Solar Cult Complex, Altar Court, small altar of the first phase (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk). were supposed to form the rooms of the future Complex of the Solar Cult in the initial phase of construction. The implementation was still not very advanced when the plans changed and the Courtyard was separated from the Vestibule by addition of the wall. ${ }^{573}$

The hypothesis advocated by Wysocki that the original design involved only the Northern Room of Amun should be rejected. ${ }^{574}$ The north and west walls were combined in their lower parts in a premedited manner, just like the ones which divided the northern area: the wall between the Northern Room of Amun and the Solar Cult Courtyard as well as the east wall of the Vestibule. Nevertheless, the joints of the walls which shaped the rooms in the Complex with the north wall of the Upper Courtyard did not display the same trait. The north wall of the Upper Courtyard had already been built up to a certain height when the wall separating the Vestibule from the Solar Cult Courtyard was added to it. The angled joints of the block layers can be seen from the third course of the blocks up. The same type of connection is used in the case of the wall which separates the Complex from the Coronation Portico as well as the one between the Courtyard of the Complex and the Northern Room of Amun.

The monograph written by Karkowski presents three likely phases of the construction of the Complex, the last of which was fully completed. ${ }^{575}$ The first phase involved construction of the roofed Vestibule, whose roof was supposed to be supported by three columns, and a niche in its north wall featured a dou-ble-leaf door which opened outward. This phase was also connected with the design of the open Solar Cult Courtyard together with a small altar reaching a height of 110.0 cm , situated in the centre of the Courtyard (Fig. 84). ${ }^{576}$ The entrance to the Solar Cult Courtyard, 140.0 cm wide, was situated in the southern part of its east wall. The plans assumed construction of at least three niches in the Solar Cult Courtyard, one in the centre of each of the walls: south, west, and north. Their floor level corresponded with the balustrade of the altar, approx. 140 cm above the pavement of the Courtyard. ${ }^{577}$ Their doors were planned as double-leaf ones, opening outward. A minor change was introduced already at the initial stage of the construction the builders added six-step stairs which led to the altar from the western direction. The Vestibule was also built in this phase, which is indicated by the original joints between the north wall and the northern part of the wall separating the vestibule from the Solar Cult Courtyard as well as the location of the niche of the Vestibule at the height of the original altar. The original plan was abandoned fairly soon, the walls around the door had not even been started, and only outlines of the entrance from the Vestibule to the Courtyard were left on the floor.

In the next phase distinguished by Karkowski, the door from the Vestibule to the Solar Cult Courtyard was walled up, a fragment of the wall separating the Courtyard from the Northern Room of Amun (Fig. 85)

[^86]

Fig. 85. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Solar Cult Complex, the door between the Northern Room of Amun and the Courtyard of the Solar Cult Complex: a) view from the Solar Cult Complex; b) view from the Northern Room of Amun (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
was dismantled so that a door could be installed in the southern part of that wall. In this phase, access from the Upper Courtyard to the Solar Cult Courtyard was possible only from the west, through the Northern Room of Amun. The door was slightly narrower than the one in the east wall - it was 112.0 cm wide. In order to install the door at this point, the builders were obliged to demolish this part of the wall to the level of foundations to lay foundation for the door. The north jamb was carved in the existing wall, the south one was made of blocks which differed from the original ones in terms of size. The altar was significantly enlarged (Fig. 86), the smaller stairs were rebuilt into larger ones, consisting of nine steps, while the balustrade and cornice were moved and fulfilled the same functions on the enlarged altar. ${ }^{578}$ The niches constructed in the walls of the Solar Cult Courtyard were rebuilt to situate them at the same level as the upper surface of the new altar. The changes appear fairly significant, not only was their floor raised by means of blocks which formed a type of threshold, but also fragments of the walls around the niches were dismantled without damaging the back walls of the niches. As a consequence, the back walls of the niches were isolated from the lateral walls and the gaps were filled with mortar. It seems that in the case of the west wall, the construction must have been relatively advanced, only two final courses of blocks along the whole length are of equal heights. The Vestibule became an independently functioning room in this phase. This project was also abandoned in the course of work, although the walls were erected to a fairly high level judging from the blocked passage between the Northern Room of Amun and the Solar Cult Courtyard as well as the rebuilding of the niches.

The final phase distinguished by Karkowski was also associated with considerable changes. The position of the door was moved again - the one in the west wall of the Solar Cult Courtyard was walled up while the east wall was partly dismantled in its central portion so that foundation could be laid for the new door, planned as a single-leaf type which opened inward (Fig. 14). In order to make way for the passage, it was necessary to move the columns of the Vestibule, planted in the first phase, farther apart. Guiding lines which marked the range of the columns were incised and partly painted in the lower parts of the north and southwalls to prevent errors in the removal. These lines must have been made after polishing of the wall.

[^87]

Fig. 86. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Solar Cult Complex, Altar Court, enlarged altar (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Karkowski associates the final phase, particularly the construction of the Upper Anubis Shrine, with the change of Thutmose I's position in the royal ideology, which probably transpired in year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III and was indicated by the removal of the body of the king to tomb KV 20. ${ }^{579}$ The change of perception of Thutmose I resulted from the absence of a legal heir who would justify the presence of Hatshepsut on the throne. The situation most likely emerged after year 11, when Nefrura disappeared from history. It provided Hatshepsut with an impulse to undertake certain actions, only some of which have been detected. The walls of the two chapels bore representations of Sen-en-mut, which places the chronology of the decoration before year 16. It could be supposed that it took place directly before the disappearance of the official since the Upper Anubis Shrine displays only a sketch of his silhouette which was not finished as a relief.

It is possible that further modifications were planned but not implemented. Guiding lines, made on the polished wall surface, have been preserved on the south wall of the Solar Cult Courtyard. ${ }^{580}$ They look as if they had been marked twice, erroneously at first, that is why another set of lines was made in order to correct the former ones. These lines suggest a portico situated at least along the south wall. ${ }^{581}$ Karkowski supposes that the planning of a new concept concerning the development of the courtyard was the reason why the decoration of the niches and altar was not completed. ${ }^{582}$

## Upper Anubis Shrine ${ }^{583}$

Accepting the chronology of architectural modifications suggested by Karkowski, it must be assumed that the niche situated in the north wall of the Solar Cult Courtyard was demolished in the course of the change of plan in the second phase and its place was taken by the Upper Anubis Shrine.

[^88]The entrance to the Upper Anubis Shrine was located in the centre of the north wall of the Courtyard, opposite the solar altar. The door represented a single-leaf type and opened inward (Fig. 14). The Shrine was completely hewn in rock. Its architectural form as well as the decoration were analogical to the Lower Anubis Shrine. The Upper Shrine consisted of two rooms: the Sanctuary and niche. The axis of the Sanctuary was perpendicular to the axis of the Courtyard, marked by the altar. The narrow entrance ${ }^{584}$ which led from the Courtyard accommodated a narrow door, most probably bolted. ${ }^{585}$ The Shrine was 5.27 m long, 1.59 m wide, and its vaulted ceiling closed it at a height of 3.12 m . The floor of the Sanctuary has been preserved intact. ${ }^{586}$ Along the whole length of the north wall, the Upper Shrine featured, just like the Lower Shrine, a type of a low table finished with a cornice, built of two blocks, which emphasised the entrance to the niche located at the same height. ${ }^{587}$

The niche was situated at a height of 50.0 cm and measured 2.17 m of length and 0.76 m of width. The vaulted ceiling was located at a height of $2.12 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{588}$ The axis of the niche, like in the case of the niche in the Lower Shrine, was perpendicular to the axis of the Sanctuary. The entrance was relatively wide and occupied nearly the whole width of the east wall of the niche, the door was of a sigle-leaf type. ${ }^{589}$ In this case, like in the Lower Anubis Shrine, the lintel was made of sandstone.

The research on the Shrine conducted by Witkowski ${ }^{590}$ resulted in a few hypotheses. He believes that the Shrine was built for the opening of the mouth ceremony. He also suggested that during annual feasts it might have fulfilled the same role as the Sokar Complex in later temples, where the Upper Shrine was the Upper Tomb while the Lower Shrine, perhaps with the Northern Colonnade, would be the main venue of the celebration. Moreover, he supposed that certain elements of the cult of ancestors might have taken place there. He also perceived the presence of the deceased members of the royal family (Senseneb, Thutmose I, Ahmose) in the decoration of the Shrine as a connection between the Shrine and the Complex of the Royal Cult located on the opposite side of the Upper Courtyard.

## Rooms for potential storage purposes located on the Upper Terrace

Apart from the complexes of rooms devoted to cult, whose ceilings were of vaulted type and where one could only enter through a door whose name defined the nature the particular room, the Upper Terrace comprised chambers with flat roofs, whose doors bore no names. They include rooms which issue directly to the Upper Courtyard: the Northern Room of Amun, Southern Room of Amun ${ }^{591}$ and the Room with the Window. They were independent rooms, not incorporated into the system of chapels, as opposed to the other three groups of rooms, connected with the Upper Courtyard, but constituting independent cult complexes.

Interpretation of these rooms admits their possible storage function, for which there is no foundation in the case of any other chambers. ${ }^{592}$

[^89]
## Southern Room of Amun ${ }^{593}$

The Southern Room of Amun is one of the few rooms in the temple which has not been redesigned. ${ }^{594}$ It was 2.64 m wide, 3.15 m long, and its roof made of limestone slabs ${ }^{595}$ was flat. ${ }^{596}$ Like the Northern Room of Amun, it had a double-leaf door which opened inward (Fig. 14) and bore no name. Two walls, the north and west ones, which constituted the walls of the Upper Courtyard at the same time, were inclined, the other two were vertical. Apart from the south wall, all the other were designed and built as thick ones.

Despite the fact that it was termed a chapel in earlier publications, ${ }^{597}$ it seems that like the Northern Room of Amun it did not have an offering function but was a type of a storeroom for textiles and oils. This could be implied by its decoration with a frieze depicting chests with textiles and oils. ${ }^{598} \mathrm{Di}$. Arnold was in favour of such identification as he analysed the wall decoration. ${ }^{599}$ Khaled Ahmed Hamza Awad attributed the room with the function of a treasury ( $p r-h \underline{d}$ ), explaining that he meant a room for storage of less precious objects. ${ }^{600}$

Hermann Kees noticed ${ }^{601}$ that the royal $k 3$ is described on the east and west walls of the Southern Room of Amun as being foremost of (hnty) $\underline{d} b 3 t$ and $p r-d w z t .{ }^{602}$ Scholars attempted to locate the $p r-d w z t$ in the temple and it was associated with the Room with the Window. ${ }^{603} \mathrm{Di}$. Arnold believed that the scene which defines this type of rooms is the scene of "baptising the pharaoh", which depicts the king positioned between Horus and Seth or Thoth, and purified with water. ${ }^{604}$ It is intriguing that exactly such a representation begins the cycle of scenes on the south wall of the Upper Courtyard, which leads to the Southern Room of Amun. Further scenes described by Arnold are as follows: scene of the offering table, ${ }^{605}$ offerings, ${ }^{606}$ and the portrayal of the king wearing a coat, with a crown and sceptre. Among them the representation of offerings is the only scene present in the Southern Room of Amun. The Southern Room of Amun can be perceived as a type of sacristy, $p r-d w 3 t$ and $\underline{d b} b t$, the place of transformation of the king ${ }^{607}$ and preparation for the rituals, accommodated within one space together with a small storage space for objects necessary for the key rituals performed in the temple, most of all textiles and oils.

## Northern Room of Amun ${ }^{608}$

The room described as the Northern Room of Amun was located in the north-western part of the Upper Courtyard. Its entrance featured a double-leaf door which opened inward (Fig. 14). The room was 9.57 m long, 5.75 m high, and only 2.42 m wide. The shape of the chamber seems surprising - it is disproportionately narrow, which makes it difficult for the visitor to understand the single-register decoration. The room was topped with a flat roof.

[^90]This room was also subjected to modifications in the course of construction works. Karkowski supposes that the room was originally planned to be situated in the eastern part of the complex, yet the rebuilding of the Solar Cult Complex forced the builders to move it to the west. ${ }^{609}$ The southern portion of the east wall showed traces of abandoned work on construction of a door. ${ }^{610}$ The west wall was an extension of the west wall of the Upper Courtyard. All walls of the Northern Room of Amun seem to be connected with one another, the courses of blocks are of equal heights, thus it could be concluded that they were designed at the same time, in the original plan.

Some scholars were inclined to locate the ebony shrine ${ }^{611}$ discovered by Naville ${ }^{612}$ in this room, however, in view of the research conducted by Barwik and his reconstruction of the niche in the Statue Room, ${ }^{613}$ this theory seems unlikely.

Naville defined the room as the North-Western Hall of Offerings ${ }^{614}$ when he published its decoration and thus suggested its function. Literature termed it the Northern Chapel of Amun ${ }^{615}$ but now the name of the Northern Room of Amun ${ }^{616}$ has been accepted. Most of the names indicated the offering function of the room, which raises doubts. ${ }^{617}$

The ritual function of the room has not been clarified so far. Di. Arnold concluded from the decoration that it fulfilled the role of the Offering Table Hall. ${ }^{618}$

## Room with the Window ${ }^{619}$

The Room with the Window, located in the south-eastern corner of the Upper Terrace, has been mentioned in literature very rarely. It can be understood as it bears no decoration, for this reason its complete architectural form and function seem to be difficult to interpret.

The concept of separating the space located in the south of the Upper Courtyard did not belong to the original plan. ${ }^{620}$ The room was isolated from the area of the Complex of the Royal Cult relatively late by addition of a wall - the chamber was 10.02 m long, 4.43 m wide in the wider part and 3.21 m wide in the narrower section. Its door was probably of a single-leaf type and opened inward (Fig. 14). The traces left by the addition of the wall are evident. The south wall of the Upper Courtyard had not only been built, but also the preparations for covering the walls with decoration also began. The wall had already been polished and covered with whitewash, an outline of the the head of Horus in black and red ink has been preserved and below a sketch of a hieroglyphic inscription. ${ }^{621}$ It seems that the west wall of the Room with the Window was built as the last one and it does not have joints with the north or the south wall. ${ }^{622}$ It can be proven by the irregularity of distribution of the block courses extending over the height of six courses, i.e. along the whole preserved height of the south wall in its western portion. ${ }^{623}$ The east wall of the Upper Terrace was also rebuilt, it was a clearly secondary addition to the north wall of the Room with the Window. ${ }^{624}$ Thus an image of the Complex of the Royal Cult emerges with two chambers and a courtyard of a square shape, which was eventually shortened by separating a narrow space in the east. This was done by adding a wall to the face of existing south wall and at the same time extending it to the north wall.

The north wall of the room (the south wall of the Upper Courtyard) was a thick one due to the window located in it, it was also inclined, like the east wall, which was the extension of the east wall of the Upper

[^91]Courtyard. The two remaining walls were much thinner and vertical. More or less in the middle of the Room with the Window its area was reduced in the western section, which resulted from the building of two niches from the direction of the Vestibule of the Chapel of Hatshepsut.

It appears that while the south wall of the Upper Courtyard was built according to the original plan, the construction of the Room with the Window is secondary. The design must have assumed the presence of the window from the very beginning. It is the only explanation for the thickness of the south wall of the Upper Courtyard and there are no traces left by re-carving of the window. Since it starts at the floor level, such traces would have been preserved if the alteration had been made later.

Clarke believed that the room was covered with flat ceiling slabs. ${ }^{625}$ It cannot be stated with certainty that it was indeed covered, although it seems that if it had a roof, it must have been flat. This opinion is shared by Karkowski, even though according to him, the wider part of the room was roofed and the narrower constituted a type of courtyard. ${ }^{626}$ Naville suggested that it was an open courtyard. ${ }^{627}$ The walls was not decorated.

Like in the two chambers mentioned above, the door of the Room with the Window did not have a proper name. Thus the function of the room remains unclear. It was described by scholars as a palace. ${ }^{628}$ Karkowski, on the other hand, identified it as a small slaughterhouse ${ }^{629}$ on the basis of the decoration around the window on the outside, where butchery scenes can be seen.

The interpretation of the window as a window of appearances, and as a consequence, the Room with the Window as a palace seems to be difficult to defend. ${ }^{630}$ The decoration of the window of appearances is not homogeneous, ${ }^{631}$ in the Amarna Period it depicts the king looking out of the window, which constitutes a type of shrine with a frieze of uraei at the top, while the windowsill, covered with a pillow, is shaped like a cornice. ${ }^{632}$ In the Ramesside Period the decoration was extremely varied, scenes with images of prisoners, athletes, and foreigners began to appear. ${ }^{633}$ It must be noted that butchery scenes never appear in the decoration of windows of appearances.

Olga Białostocka interprets the Room with a Window as a palace. ${ }^{634}$ Her theory is supported by the arguments already known: to the location of the Room with the Window south of the royal cult complex she added a theoretical reconstruction of the original layout of the area south of the offering chapels of Hatshepsut and Thutmose I as a space for a dais with a throne. She also claims that later palaces were residences of the living ka of the king. Her reconstruction, however, ignores the fact that the area south of the royal offering chapels had never been finished and the concept was changed before the decoration was carved on the north wall of the complex or even earlier since the south wall of the complex (to which the wall separating the Room with the Window and the Royal Cult Complex was added) appeared as an effect of a rearrangement of the complex. Elements of decoration suggested by Białostocka as equipment of the original palace, like a dais covered with a relief and a statue of the queen, could be introduced only to the decorated room and not to the room in the process of decoration.

Crucial differences between the later palace in temples and the room to the east of the Complex of the Royal Cult can be detected. Rainer Stadelmann ${ }^{635}$ reports these differences: the decoration has not been preserved, ${ }^{636}$ and there was only one door leading to the Room with the Window, which did not provide a connection with the part of the temple where the royal cult was practiced. On the basis of later analogies,

[^92]the author suggests that the room functioned as the $p r-d w z t$, a room which served as a changing room and the place of purification. ${ }^{637}$

It should also be emphasised that the distance between the last step and the ceiling was reconstructed as merely 1.39 m and the width as 1.25 m . The space is too small to move easily, particularly the height seems extremely inconvenient, especially if it is assumed that the king was supposed to move there with complete royal paraphenalia.

Nevertheless, it appears that Karkowski's interpretation is more likely and that precisely on the basis of the decoration around the entrance and the window, the room can be identified as the place where food items were stored directly before they were delivered to the altars. ${ }^{638}$

## Wall over the Upper Terrace

The 120-metre-high rock above the temple was not in a good state also in the antiquity and the builders of the temple realised that. In the worst scenario, it might have posed a risk of covering the temple with debris in the event of an earthquake or torrential rains, and in the daily functioning of the temple - serious damage if larger boulders should fall off and hit the structure directly. The builders of the temple of Mentuhotep II, located nearby, were also aware of that. ${ }^{639}$ For this reason, a decision was taken to construct a special platform over the temple, which would absorb the shock of falling stones and stop most of them before they reached the temple. It was another massive project. Tonnes of material had to be dragged up to fill the space between the rock and the west wall of the temple as well as the retaining wall situated even higher. The result was a wall which stretched along the whole temple in the west and then turned to protect its northern section as well. ${ }^{640}$ Its height was established at 10 modules, i.e. 15 royal cubits. ${ }^{641}$ It was a smooth undecorated wall topped with blocks which were slightly rounded in their upper parts - a shape known from the balustrades in other parts of the temple. ${ }^{642}$ The blocks used for construction of the wall differed in size. The lower courses reached a height of even 40.0 cm , however, their sizes decreased higher, the height of the uppermost preserved layers was $28.0 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{643}$ The blocks were laid without mortar. The end of the retaining wall in the southern part is unknown, perhaps it was destroyed by Thutmose III's builders during the construction of his temple. ${ }^{644}$ There are no remains in the eastern part of the north wall, therefore it is not clear how it was finished in this section, either. The platform extended in the space between the rock and the retaining wall. Wysocki believed that the platform was accessed along a passage in the south, as he had not found any evidence for a passage in the north. ${ }^{645}$

The retaining wall fulfilled two roles. On one hand, it prevented the soil in the platform from sliding, on the other, it concealed the rather unattractive shape of the relieving structure situated over the Bark Hall. ${ }^{646}$

## Auxiliary buildings

The question of economic management of the temple during the reign of Hatshepsut has not been researched well enough, which mostly results from a limited number of sources.

It is difficult to establish the moment when the economy of a given temple begins, it seems that the time of naming the temple or the ritual of stretching the cord could be accepted as the beginning. ${ }^{647}$ This is the most likely date when the economic and administrative organisation of the complex started to emerge, initially for the requirements of the construction process, then to move on to the regular tasks related to the functioning of the temple. Such an early chronology of the beginnings of economic activity is based on two

[^93]documents: Sen-en-mut's stela from North Karnak ${ }^{648}$ dated to year 4 of Thutmose III's reign (even though this chronology is disputable ${ }^{649}$ ) and the tablet from Deir el-Bahari with a list of offerings delivered by a number of officials, dated to year 5 of Thutmose III's reign. ${ }^{650}$

## Buildings for economic applications

## Representations incorporated into the decoration programme of the temple

Foundations established by rulers started to manage royal cult temples in the Old Kingdom and they were the providers of goods which were offered at the temples both in the course the daily ritual practices and during great feasts. ${ }^{651}$ It appears that in the case of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple there were at least two such domains: "Hatshepsut is the one who finds the horizon of Amun" ( $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$ gmt 3 ht $J m n$ ) (Fig. 87) ${ }^{652}$ and "Thutmose I beloved by Atum" ('3-hpr-kз-R' mrjj Jtm). ${ }^{653}$

The name of the first domain is attested on both sides of the passage from the Bark Hall to the Statue Room. It is intriguing when it is considered in a broader sense. The representations on the south wall of the Upper Courtyard depict the king performing an offering ritual ${ }^{654}$ before the statue of Amun. It seems that other parts of the temple can


Fig. 87. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, passage from the Bark Hall to the Statue Room, north wall (Phot. M. Jawornicki). also be regarded as documents concerning the daily cult. Thoth making a speech is portrayed on both sides of the passage to the Bark Hall. The text delivered by the god describes the establishment of offerings (north wall) ${ }^{655}$ and daily cult (south wall). ${ }^{656}$ These two elements seem to be closely related. Scenes of the offering ritual are then shown in the niches of the Bark Hall and the Statue Room and continue further on the walls of the ebony naos, most probably located in the western niche of the Statue Room. ${ }^{657}$ In addition to that, kneeling fecundity figures make offerings in the scenes situated over the entrance to the Statue Room while on both sides of the passage between the Bark Hall and the Statue Room there are images of female silhouettes with epithets referring to the South and North respectively and their heads are topped with the aforementioned name of the domain $-M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k_{3}-$

[^94]

Fig. 88. Deir el-Bahari, stela of Senenu with a newly added fragment (drawing based on Brovarski, Senenu, Pl. XIA; Phot. Z. Doliński; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
$R^{\prime}$ gmt 3 ht Jmn. The texts which are situated above the name suggest offerings from the south and north. It could be supposed that either Hatshepsut established two domains for the cult of Amun - one in Upper Egypt, another in Lower Egypt, or one domain accepted offerings from both the north and the south.

The name of the other domain, ' $3-h p r-k 3-R^{\prime} m r j j$ Jtm, was inscribed on the east wall of the Courtyard of the Complex of the Royal Cult ${ }^{658}$ and, as it appears, fulfilled a different function: its task was the management of the cult of Thutmose I. Considering the fact it was mentioned among the names of nomes of Lower Egypt, it was located in that region. ${ }^{659}$

## Written sources

Written sources cannot add much more about the resources of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. The claim that particular regions took "material" responsibility for the royal cult, as well as the cult of gods, seems not only to be merely fiction inscribed on the walls of the temples, but is also confirmed in the texts written on ostraca discovered in the vicinity of the temple of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{660}$

Obligations due to a particular complex were formed at the time of the decision to begin the construction. Therefore, the fact that certain officials or nomes sent materials or workers, confirmed by evidence provided by ostraca, can be understood as an example of economic relations. ${ }^{661}$

Sen-en-mut had a foundation inscription carved on a stela discoverd at North Karnak. ${ }^{662}$ Apart from other donations, the one made to the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple was mentioned on it. He donated a field of 5 aruras ${ }^{663}$ for the six-day feast and daily use as well as a male slave and female slave for the hour service in the $\check{s} n^{\prime}$. He also declared obligations concerning offerings, which are difficult to understand as the text is interrupted in this place. Delivery of offerings from different officials is also attested on a tablet from year 5 of the reign of Thutmose III as well as on some ostraca. ${ }^{664}$

It could be supposed that indeed the temple had resources at its disposal, which were used to pay for the donkey hired for the time of construction. ${ }^{665}$ Moreover, the funds were managed reasonably - knowing the required amount of work performed by the animal as well as the costs and effort connected with its upkeep, it was not bought but only borrowed.

## Workshops (šn')

It is known that the basic economic units of the temples were treasury ( $p r-h \underline{d}$ ), granary ( $\check{s} n w)$, garden $(k 3 r j j)$ and workshops ( $\left(\check{s}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}\right) \cdot{ }^{666}$

There are no clues concerning the functioning of treasuries, gardens, or granaries associated with the temple at Deir el-Bahari. The fact of the existence of the šn connected with the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple was indicated by Sen-en-mut's foundation and indirectly confirmed by one of the titles of Senenu, who was i.a. ḥrj $m r w$, the overseer of $m r w$ workers. ${ }^{667}$ Mrw were a group which derived from prisoners of war, who were employed in the $\check{s}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ to work on weaving and textile processing and exploitation as well as food processing, baking, butchery, etc. as indicated by later sources. ${ }^{668}$ Another title associated with the $\check{s} n^{\prime}$, discovered in the course of search in the storeroom at Deir el-Bahari, can be added to the one already mentioned. ${ }^{669}$ One of the four additional fragments of Senenu's stela found in the storeroom (Fig. 88) deserves particular attention in this context. It bears the beginning of a title, whose further part is situated on a published fragment

[^95]and after reconstruction seems to be as follows: overseer of the $\check{s} n^{\prime}$ of [Amun] in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ (jmj-r šn ${ }^{\text {c }}$ [ $n$ $J m n] m \underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ ). It is essential information from the point of view of its economy and dependence, especially in financial terms, on the central temple at Karnak. Such unilateral dependence can be detected in the sparse information preserved in the tombs from the times of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{670}$ It is known from these sources that goods from the storehouses at Karnak were sent to numerous temples located on the West Bank, i.e. also to the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. ${ }^{671}$ However, considering that $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ had its own property as well as the $\check{s} n^{\prime}$, where objects and food items for cult were made, the situation appears to be more complex. A question arises whether the land property was too small to support the daily cult and feasts, or the temple at Karnak had obligations towards $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, like officials and nomes did. It seems highly likely that certain types of goods, such as incense must have been delivered solely to the temple at Karnak, which held monopoly on it.

## Material remains of buildings for economic applications

The information concerning the $\check{s} n^{\prime}$ at $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ is extremely important for the reconstruction of the economic condition of the temple of Hatshepsut as well as the topography of West Thebes. So far, no area for any type of economic or administrative activity within the temple or its vicinity has been identified.

Very few clues can be helpful for an attempt at the reconstruction of the landscape.
In the case of later temples, the area for economic application, together with storehouses and workshops, was accommodated within the enclosure wall surrounding the temple complex. ${ }^{672}$ Such enclosure wall surrounding $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ has not been identified yet. Nevertheless, it should be doubted if it could contain the whole complex spreading over the length of more than 1.5 km . There was no space for such facilities directly next to the rock. It seems, therefore, that their remains should be looked for in the eastern part of the temple complex, where the area was not limited by the land surface. For this reason, closer attention should be paid to the fact that both isolated bricks stamped with the name of the queen and parts of walls constructed from such bricks were found along the stretch from the north of the Valley Temple to the Ramesseum. ${ }^{673}$ In the case of areas adjacent to temples they are most likely the enclosure walls, however, there are certain places which might indicate the existence of economic areas.

Solely a fragment of the enclosure wall was detected to the north of the Valley Temple. ${ }^{674}$ Although it was built of mud bricks, its foundations contained the so-called name stones, the same as in the case of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. ${ }^{675}$ It might suggest the existence of an outer wall, enclosing a larger area than the temple alone.

The most characteristic, non-sacral building in the region of West Thebes, dated to the reign of Hatshepsut, is a structure built of bricks stamped with the names of the queen, located to the north of the mortuary temple of Ramesses II by the French Mission. As it is reported by Leblanc, ${ }^{676}$ it was most likely a room with a vaulted ceiling, which, in connection with the building material, would indicate it was a storage building, most probably situated within the economic area.

Perhaps when Hatshepsut planned such an enormous cultic complex, she could have decided to establish only one economic area, ${ }^{677}$ which would serve all cultic facilities and which consisted of separate departments responsible for services provided for particular temples. They were able to guarantee cultic

[^96]services for the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple and also other buldings erected by Hatshepsut, during the lifetime as well as after the death of the ruler.

## Construction dump: "Sen-en-mut quarry"

The construction work resulted in such an amount of waste that it was bound to cause storage problem. A nearby quarry served this purpose perfectly, and it seems that it was used for it throughout the building process. In the north-western end of the quarry, Winlock found a dump which mostly consisted of stamped bricks from the dismantled chapel of Amenhotep I, and among them, hieratic ostraca mentioning Sen-en-mut and years 10 and 16 of the reign of Thutmose III. He concluded that the final part of the material from the temple must have been deposited there soon after years 16 of Thutmose III's reign as an ostracon with such date was discovered under the bricks stamped with the name of Amenhotep I. ${ }^{678}$ The place was convenient, located directly next to the side door which led to the Lower Courtyard of the temple, however, it did not become a permanent dump which would function after the construction had been completed. This is indicated by the absence of waste associated with human activity, food remains or tools and damaged objects. Such type of midden has not been identified in the vicinity of the temple.

## Dwelling structures

At the foot of the hill rising behind the north wall of the Lower Terrace of the temple of Hatshepsut there were houses of irregular shapes which were built of reused mud bricks, dated to the 11th and early 18th dynasties. ${ }^{679}$ The buildings examined by Carter included a small
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Fig. 89. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, auxiliary buildings, dwelling structures: a) mud brick houses; b) stone basin in one of the houses; c) serpentine wall (Carter, Excavations in the Valley of Dêr El Bahari, Pls XIX-XX).
offering area - a concavity where a date palm was planted, framed with limestone blocks. An offering of a few vessels and a damaged figurine was buried next to the tree. ${ }^{680}$ This feature was interpreted as houses of workers employed for the construction of the temple. ${ }^{681}$

A chamber was hewn in the rock over the houses, and its walls were covered with whitewash. A small ramp led to the entrance. Inside, a number of artefacts were discovered: a broken reed, badly-made seat, fragments of a mat, basket, torn fragments of a papyrus with chapter 41 of the Book of the Dead, ball of clay for stamp impressions, cord for handling a donkey. Carter described this room as the office of a scribe for the time of construction of the temple. ${ }^{682}$

Above these structures, on the slope of the hill, a number of rooms have been preserved (Fig. 89a). One of them accommodated a type of sanstone basin with a hole which could have conveyed water out. According to Carter, it was a bathroom for the workers (Fig. 89b). ${ }^{683}$

A serpentine wall (Fig. 89c) built of reused bricks from the times of the 11th dynasty, Amenhotep I, and Hatshepsut enclosed the dwelling area in the north, 8.0 m above the houses. ${ }^{684}$ Remains of this type of walls have been discovered in many places both on the Lower Terrace of the temple of Hatshepsut and around the temple of Mentuhotep II. ${ }^{685}$ They are associated with shelters for workers, which functioned during the construction work. ${ }^{686}$

It appears that the houses were not removed after the completion of the bulding process, moreover, they could not possibly hold such a high number of workers as the one indicated by sources. ${ }^{687}$ The temporary nature of the buildings is not implied by the fact of planting the date palm. The attention to the convenience of simple workers is astonishing. Perhaps then, these houses functioned as houses for priests who were not numerous. This might be indicated by the artefacts such as i.a. the fragment of the papyrus with the chapter of the Book of the Dead or the ball of clay for stamp impressions. Not much is known about other temples of that period, however, the example of the Hnkt-`nh temple indicates that houses for priests were situated around temples (in this case on its northern side) and were inseparably connected with them, being located inside the temple enclosure wall. ${ }^{688}$

## Chronology and phases of construction of the temple

It is not possible to establish precisely the time when changes were made to the original architectural design of the construction of the temple of Hatshepsut. Some technical solutions were implemented in the course of the works. The disappearance of Nefrura, who sanctioned the reign of Hatshepsut, was a serious reason for that. From that moment, her policy was to legitimise her power through her father, Thutmose I. Therefore, she instals an offering chapel for him in her own temple, converts the niche in the north wall of the Solar Courtyard into a chapel which emphasises the role of her ancestors, including Thutmose I. Most likely at the same time the Lower Anubis Shrine, closely related to the theology of power, is built. Nefrura is removed from decoration, her existing images are erased and replaced with portrayals of Hatshepsut's mother, queen Ahmose. ${ }^{689}$

Nevertheless, diversions from the original plan, which cannot be related with changes in the royal ideology and Nefrura, are found in high numbers. These alterations included i.a. the addition of the third row of columns and the replacement of the gates in the Upper Courtyard, addition of the Northern Colonnade, changes in the Hathor Shrine, addition of the enclosure on the Lower Terrace, or expansion of the Southern Lower Portico. These elements can be detected due to the changes in wall bonds, absence of corner blocks connecting walls, relics of earlier construction phases, or changes in decoration as it can be seen on the added third row of architraves in the Upper Courtyard.

It is possible to indicate relative chronology of certain changes, there are more precise clues in the case of some other. However, these clues are also points in time which could be shifted since the knowledge

[^98]of history in the times of Hatshepsut is still very limited. These precise indications are constituted by the presence (or absence) of images of Sen-en-mut and Nefrura in decoration. The last information concerning Sen-en-mut dates to year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III ${ }^{690}$ while Nefrura is last mentioned in year 11. ${ }^{691}$ It definitely does not mean that these are absolutely certain dates of their disappearances, but it is suggested that their existence is confirmed up to these particular moments.

The relative, imprecise clues include the presence of the cryptogram frieze $M_{3}{ }^{\iota} t-k 3-R^{\iota}$, which is attested in the decoration of two lower terraces while on the Upper Terrace it appears only in the fairly late Upper Anubis Shrine. Marta Sankiewicz ${ }^{692}$ distinguished three types of the frieze and remarked that some appear earlier, others later, along the development of the concept. The more recent types of that frieze have also been discovered in other buildings erected by the queen.

## Artefacts from the temple

Very little can be said about the cult performed in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ in the times of Hatshepsut, and even less about the objects associated with the cult. Most small artefacts found in the temple represented private possessions. They were, most of all, private statues and vota.

Royal statues were closely related to the temple architecture and have been described in the corresponding chapters.

Private statues placed in temples were regarded as an honour granted by the king, who was asked for permission in each case of such activity. ${ }^{693}$ There are very few objects of that type which have been preserved to our times, and their attribution to the temple of Hatshepsut raises certain issues. The most important statues associated with $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ with a fairly high degree of certainty are as follows: a diorite statue of Sen-en-mut, ${ }^{694}$ fragment of limestone statue of Amenhotep, ${ }^{695}$ and sanstone statue of the royal wet nurse Sat-Re with young Hatshepsut in her lap. ${ }^{696}$ The first two officials were indisputably connected with the temple and probably that is why they were favoured with a permission to plant their statues there. The presence of the figure of the royal wet nurse is not astonishing either. ${ }^{677}$ The storehouses of the temple of Hatshepsut contain a lot of fragments of complete statues and stelae, as well as unfinished statues, which can be dated to the early 18th dynasty due to the style and material. Perhaps there were stone-working workshops in the vicinity, which manufactured this type of objects to order. The material used to manufacture them could be a clue - in many cases it was local limestone, also used to build the temple of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{698}$

The location of private statues in the royal temple raises some questions. The neighbouring temple of Thutmose III can provide some useful data. 39 out of 66 private statues were discovered in the hypostyle hall, 19 in close proximity or scattered in the temple of Mentuhotep II, they might also have come from the hypostyle hall. ${ }^{699}$ Earlier instances from the Old Kingdom and especially from the Middle Kingdom show that an open courtyard was the place where private statues were installed. ${ }^{700}$ Therefore, considering the analogy of the temple of Thutmose III, it can be concluded that private statues were also planted in the wsht ḥbjjt in Dss-d ${ }^{\prime} s r w$.

The other type of artefacts was constituted by vota, which are also sparse. Most probably, the majority of these objects were offered to "Hathor who is upon Thebes". A fairly low number of the votive artefacts can be dated to the times of Hatshepsut. They mostly included scattered scarabs, faience plaques, cartou-

[^99]ches, beads, and perhaps faience vessels. ${ }^{701}$ Bertha Porter and Rosalind L.B. Moss in their Topographical Bibliography report a stela which is not mentioned by Geraldine Pinch, representing Hatshepsut sucking Hathor-cow. ${ }^{702}$ The area of the temple of Hatshepsut also delivered a fragment of a plaque with titles of Hatshepsut, which might have been a part of destroyed foundation deposit or a votive offering, ${ }^{703}$ as well as two Sen-en-mut's beads offered to Hathor. ${ }^{704}$ In a later period the offering made for Hathor consisted of faience, pottery, wooden and stone objects (vessels, beads, figurines, sistra, phalluses), stelae and statues, decorated textiles and clothing. ${ }^{705}$ In most cases, these artefacts cannot be dated precisely.

Unfortunately, no pottery, which must have been used in big amounts to deliver offerings to altars, has been preserved. The only vessels from the times of Hatshepsut, which have been found in the temple, come from the fill of the walls ${ }^{706}$ and cannot be associated with cult in any case.

## Functioning of the temple

## Cult

As it has been shown above, the matter of offerings made on the altars of the temple was closely related to the economy of the temple and its foundations. The places of the preparation, making, and redistribution of the offerings seem to be essential.

Offerings were made in many places of the temple and each of the aforementioned complexes might have had its own altar. Thus the offering ritual was performed in the Complex of the Royal Cult in front of the false door stelae, in the Complex of the Solar Cult on the solar altar, in the Shrines of Anubis on the so-called windowsills, in the Hathor Shrine (although there are no remains of an altar there), and also, or perhaps, most of all, in the Main Sanctuary of Amun, even though no direct evidence has been found there either.

In the Old Kingdom the place for making offerings was located in the courtyard of the upper temple, called wsht, ${ }^{707}$ where an altar was situated in the north-western corner. ${ }^{708}$ Di. Arnold ${ }^{709}$ and Pawlicki ${ }^{710}$ would be inclined to indicate the place of cult in the western part of the temple after the period of the Old Kingdom.

The tradition of making offerings in courtyards remained unchanged and the wsht hbjjt ${ }^{711}$ served this purpose throughout the Pharaonic Period. ${ }^{712}$ Therefore the Upper Courtyard, described in the dedicatory inscription as wsht hbjjgt seems to be the appropriate place to make offerings for Amun in the Dsr-d$s r w$ temple (Fig. 82). ${ }^{713}$ The north wall of the Courtyard displays scenes of a feast taking place precisely in the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. ${ }^{714}$ They include a scene of an offering in front of the bark of Amun resting on the pedestal. There is not enough space for offerings in front of the Bark in the rooms of the Sanctuary, hence the concept to find such space in the Courtyard. The Courtyard was framed with a colonnade which featured

[^100]Fig. 90. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, representations which mention tp-jtrw: butchery scene, Upper Courtyard, east wall, northern part, upper register (drawing and digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

representations of fecundity figures delivering offerings, ${ }^{715}$ exactly like in the other rooms associated with offerings made i.a. in the course of the daily ritual or feasts. ${ }^{716}$

The suggested function of the wsht habjjt explains the location of other rooms, whose ritual function raises doubts. There are two chambers in the southern part of the Courtyard, which can be interpreted as storage rooms: the Southern Room of Amun and the Room with the Window. The scenes represented in the former depict the king offering oils and textiles while the two registers situated above the door display chests with textiles and containers with oils, ${ }^{717}$ hence the conclusion that the room functioned as a storeroom for textiles and oils, combining the function of two rooms, $\underline{d} b 3 t$ and $p r d w 3 t,{ }^{718}$ as it has already been mentioned. The location of such a storeroom in relation to the mortuary cult chapels is derived from the temples associated with pyramids and private tombs from the Old Kingdom. ${ }^{719}$ The function of the other room, the Room with the Window, ${ }^{720}$ is much more difficult to establish. The images carved over the window ${ }^{721}$ could serve as certain suggestions - they show butchery scene, killed bulls, and the offering of bull's foreleg carried to Hatshepsut seated on the throne. The scenes are supervised by a person standing in front of Hatshepsut, depicted in a small scale, who can be identified on the basis of analogies as a lector-priest. ${ }^{722}$ It seems that the preparation of meat dishes could not have taken place in the temple itself, the animals were slaughtered and their meat processed outside the temple in slaughterhouses $(s h w)$ within the $\check{s k n}^{\prime}$. It is obvious ${ }^{723}$ that ritually impure activities could not have been performed in the closest vicinity of the Sanctuary. It has been confirmed that in Ancient Egypt apart form šn' there were also "pure šn" ( $\check{s} n^{\prime} w^{\prime} b$ ), ${ }^{724}$ as well as "pure slaughterhouses" (shw w'b). It can be concluded from the analysis made by Ben J.J. Haring that shw w'b were the places where the ritual dishes, made prior to the ceremony, were taken from and delivered to altars. Thus the Room with the Window might be interpreted as a type of ritually pure storeroom for food items, probably prepared in a proper $\breve{s n}^{\prime}$. Analogies from a later period seem to confirm this interpretation: the temple of Seti I at Qurna, temple of Seti I in Abydos, and temple of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu ${ }^{725}$ accommodated rooms in their southern parts, which were identified as slaughterhouses on the basis of their decoration. However, animals could not have been killed there due to the impurity of the action as well as too narrow doors which would not admit the animals in. ${ }^{726}$

An ostracon discovered at Deir el-Bahari attests a 't hankt, which was probably a department of the temple šn ${ }^{\text {. }}{ }^{727}$

[^101]It should be emphasised that the offerings made in the temple were of varied nature. The temple was a venue for the daily ritual, ritual of ancestors, as well as feast rituals. The diversity of offering procedures is confirmed by the representations of offerings and the offering lists found together with the images. Each occasion required items which had to be prepared and stored nearby in order to be brought to the tables. Judging from the information incribed on ostraca, the offerings were simple, mostly different types of beer, bread, incense and fowls. ${ }^{728}$

While the animals sacrificed in the course of the daily ritual practices were killed in the slaughterhouse, probably in the economic area, the situation might have been different during feasts. Scenes of the Beautiful Feast of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ on the east wall of the Upper Courtyard display a series of representations of butchery, which took place during the water procession. ${ }^{729}$ In two cases the scenes are associated with explanatory inscriptions, which refer to sacrifice offered on portable altars in the place called " $n$ tp $j t r w$ " (Fig. 90). The bulls are arranged in a manner which indicates that the scenes should be situated on the West Bank of the river, both when the procession headed towards Deir el-Bahari and when it returned. It is unclear, however, where on the West Bank the " $t p j t r w$ " was located. ${ }^{730}$

Written sources, mainly ostraca, incorporate some documents which mention offerings and list the people who brought them or refer to offerings alone. ${ }^{731}$ The offering parties include institutions (i.a. the domain of the Divine Adoratrice, the domain of the royal wife, the domain of the overseer of the treasury) and individuals. ${ }^{732}$ In one case, it is reported that offerings were deposited near the channel, ${ }^{733}$ i.e. a convenient place to collect offerings for further transport, although it is equally likely that it was a place for welcoming the bark, where the offerings were meant to be used for cult. Pascal Vernus and Barwik suppose that these ostraca are records of offerings brought on the days preceding various feasts. ${ }^{734}$ The festive context of these offerings is also implied by type of objects, which comprised various types of bread, beer, ducks, cattle, and which usually appear on feast lists but are absent from lists of the offering ritual and cult of ancestors. ${ }^{735}$

A note found on an ostracon stored in the Cairo Museum, which mentions the relationship between the $\underline{D} s r$ - $\underline{d} s r w$ temple with the temple of Thutmose II is exceptionally interesting. It literally names the "list of the things which are brought to $\underline{D} s r w$ from the temple of Thutmose II" and then mentions thick bread (as many as a 1000 loaves!), wdnt bread ( 10 loaves), $s^{\prime} j j t$ cakes ( 11 khar), fruit ( 30 baskets), wine ( 2 ), beer (2) and cattle (2). ${ }^{736}$ The supply was not small and its extraordinary nature is confirmed by i.a. the delivery of two cattle and fruit. It seems that this information shows economic interdependencies between temples of the West Bank.

## Priests of the temple

A moderate number of priestly titles is attested for the reign of Hatshepsut. Senenu fulfilled the function of the first priest of Amun in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w(h m-n t r ~ t p j ~ n ~ J m n ~ m ~ D s r-\underline{d} s r w)$ and first priest of Hathor in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ (hm-ntr tpj $n H w t-H r$ hrt-jb $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ ). At the same time, he was the person in charge of the economic provision for the cult. ${ }^{737}$ His tomb has not been identified so far, although a stela which stated his titles has been found. ${ }^{738}$

The second priest of Amun in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, Amun-em-hat, is known from an inscription in a tomb located over the temple of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{739}$

[^102]The $h m$ - $n t r r$ of Amun in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, Mery-Maat, son of vizier User, is mentioned on a funerary cone. ${ }^{740}$
Sources also refer to a few $w^{\prime} b$ priests of Amun from $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ : Amun-hetep, son of Tjembu, ${ }^{71}$ another Amun-hetep, who at the same time bore the title of the overseer of the priests of hours [of the House] of Amun in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w,{ }^{742}$ another Amun-hetep ${ }^{743}$ as well as a $w^{\prime} b$ priest of an unknown name, who fulfilled the same role in the temple of Mentuhotep II. ${ }^{744}$ Perhaps one of these $w^{\prime} b$ priests was also active later since a $w^{\prime} b$-priest called Amun-hetep is attested in the times of Thutmose III. ${ }^{745}$

Djehuty, the owner of tomb TT 110, fulfilled the function of the offering bearer ( $w d n$ ) in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{746}$
A sitting statue carved in grey granite displays the title of the supervisor of the altar of Amun in $\underline{D} s r-[\ldots]$ (hrj hawt $n(w)$ Jmn $m$ Dsr-[...]). ${ }^{747}$ The statue is dated very imprecisely to the 18 th dynasty, and the remaining part of the text does not help to indicate more precise chronology. The individual also bore priestly titles associated with other temples.

Although it seems that such a great undertaking as the temple of Hatshepsut would require a high number of scribes, scholars are aware of only one, Amun-hetep, who could be related to the temple, possibly only to the period of its construction. He signed his name several times in the relieving structure situated above the Bark Hall. ${ }^{748}$

It seems intriguing that most of these people fulfilled functions of priests, mostly the same ones, in the temples located in the vicinity. ${ }^{749}$

Sources which would attest certain positions important for the functioning of the temple, such as a lec-tor-priest, have not been discovered so far. It seems that the temple must have been managed by a large group of people, the representations preserved on the walls of the Upper Courtyard, in the Second Hypostyle Hall of the Hathor Shrine, and in the Obelisk Portico clearly show $w^{\prime} b$ priests, butchers, offering bearers, and also the participants of the festival processions: cheetah tamers, bearers of the throne and portable bark of Amun, ${ }^{750}$ as well as soldiers. The inscriptions on the walls of i.a. Chapel of Hatshepsut and Chapel of Thutmose I mention the titles of $\underline{h r j}-\underline{h b t}, s m, \underline{h m}-n t r r^{751}$ The ceremonies must have also involved participation of the bearers of statues of royal ancestors, which were taken to meet the bark of Amun.

[^103]
# Temple of Thutmose I- $\underline{\text { Hnmt- 'nh }}$ 

| Name: | $\underline{H} n m t-n h$ (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 229) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dedicatory incription: | see: Appendix 1: Dedicatory inscriptions, p. 218 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location: | h | 80 m a.s.1. |  |  | La | $25^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 49 \mathrm{~N}$ |  | Lo | $32^{\circ} 36$ ' 55 E |  |
| Orientation: ${ }^{1}$ | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ}\right.$ ) | not known |  | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | not known |  | not known |  | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | not known |
| Dimensions: | H | not known |  |  | W | not known |  | L | not known |  |
| Material: | 1. limestone, 2. sandstone |  |  |  | Quarry: |  |  | 1. probably local; 2. probably Gebel es-Silsileh |  |  |
| Type of the temple according to written sources: |  |  | $h w t^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Arch <br> 1970 <br> Docu <br> since | Archaeological work: 1970-1973, 1977-1978 - Abu el Youn Barakat |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

## The temple discovered at east Asasif

In the course of rescue excavations in 1970, Abu el Youn Barakat ${ }^{4}$ discovered a building whose fragments featured a decoration which seemed to have been made during the reign of Hatshepsut.

The temple, which was erected at the border of farming land, was flooded with Nile waters every year. It affected badly its state of preservation. Barakat published two markedly different plans of the temple, therefore the question of its reconstruction should be approached with caution. On the basis of his description, it is possible to make an attempt at a reconstruction of the most notable features of the edifice. It is difficult to find much on the plan (Fig. 91). It shows the Hypostyle Hall or a courtyard framed with a portico, as well as a hall with a ceiling supported with columns, situated transversely to the one just mentioned. The threshold which has been preserved indicates that another transversely oriented hall should be located there.

The research which is now underway in the storeroom 4 in the tomb MMA 828 at Qurna, where the blocks discovered by Barakat have been stored, might contribute to the reconstruction. Two fragments of blocks bear the name of the temple: $\underline{H n m t-}$ 'nh, a detail which the scholar missed. ${ }^{5}$ One of the fragments came from the decoration of walls, the other from an architrave (Fig. 92).

[^104]Fig. 91. Hnmt-'nh temple, plan of the temple (based on Barakat, The Temple of Kha'`Akhet, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).




Fig. 92. Hnmt-'nh temple, fragment of architrave with the name of the temple (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
solely attested at Deir el-Medineh ${ }^{10}$ and have not been found in the northern portion or the vicinity of Asasif.

## Architectural structure

The temple was built of limestone and sandstone blocks. The limestone employed for the construction of this edifice is not the same as the one used by Hatshepsut to build $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$. Barakat's description implies that there was no regularity in relief decoration: sandstone blocks are decorated with both the sunken and raised reliefs while limestone blocks featured decoration made in raised relief. He suggests that this might indicate the external walls were constructed from sandstone and the internal ones from limestone. Further study of the material discovered by Barakat resulted in identification of an assemblage of limestone blocks decorated with sunken relief, used for the decoration of the external walls of the temple.

It should also be added to the observations made by Barakat that sunken relief on sandstone blocks was used for architraves and not fragments of walls. The research led to a conclusion that all load-bearing elements which needed to retain certain flexibility were made of sandstone. These included the aforementioned architraves, as well as lintels, ${ }^{11}$ columns, column bases, and pillars. The flat roof of the temple, painted blue with yellow stars, was also built of sandstone slabs.

## Rooms ${ }^{12}$



Fig. 93. $\underline{H n m t-}$ 'nh temple, brickes stamped with the names of Hatshepsut and Thutmose I, found on the area of the Hnkt- $n h$ temple: a) LD III, Pl. 25bis [i]; b) LD III, Pl. 26 [4]; found in the area of the Valley Temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ : c) Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple, 40, Pl. XXXII [4].

The Hypostyle Hall was clearly visible on the plan (Fig. 91). The excavations resulted in unearthing its corner with 10 bases of protodoric columns which measured 1.50 m in diameter. One of the bases can still be seen in situ (Fig. 94). They were built of sandstone and, as stated by Barakat, planted approx. every

[^105]

Fig. 94. $\underline{H n m t-}$ 'nh temple, base of the column in situ (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
$2.50 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{13}$ It could be concluded from the description that the same proportion grid was used in this temple as in all other buildings erected by Hatshepsut $-1.5 \times 1.5$ cubits. ${ }^{14}$ The columns bear i.a. royal titulary and a fragment of dedicatory inscription has also been preserved. Among other things, a fragment with the Horus name of Hatshepsut was found.

Barakat mentions that the southern border of the Hypostyle Hall was marked by a sandstone wall which was 1.20 m thick, ${ }^{15}$ and its preserved fragment was approx. 7.00 m long, although it is not clear whether the wall or the foundation was found. Sandstone foundation does not prove that the wall itself was built of sandstone. ${ }^{16}$

The material unearthed by Barakat and stored in the tomb MMA 828 contains a large group of blocks with decoration in the same scale which belonged to niches. ${ }^{17}$ They might have been exploited to decorate the west wall of the Hypostyle Hall, following the example of the $D s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple at Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{18}$

The Hypostyle Hall opened to another room and featured a small ramp, approx. 0.80 m long, which led to that chamber. ${ }^{19}$ The layout of other rooms is impossible to establish. However, the material collected in the "Mummy Storeroom" incorporates remains of the chapel of the cult of Thutmose I. Elements of wall decoration which have been preserved, i.a. an offering list, offering ritual, and offering table represented in a large scale clearly indicate the nature of that room. The most important element of the decoration of the offering hall is an assemblage of badly-fragmented blocks from the false door of Thutmose I, made of limestone and only slightly painted to imitate the colour of granite, with patches. ${ }^{20}$

Both during the construction work and after the completion of the decoration, certain changes of the architectural design were introduced. A corner block with marks left by an addition of a wall (Fig. 95) as well as a reused block (Fig. 96) have been preserved. Barakat also mentions traces of alteration of the width of a door. The expansion of the entrance can be dated to the late reign of Thutmose III with a high degree of certainty, however, chronology of other changes is impossible to establish.

[^106]The temple seems to have been built in a hurry as the material contains a lot of patches.

The decoration was made in relief, although some details were only painted, and not carved (e.g. elements of the throne). The finish of the architrave decoration is extraordinary. It was made in polychrome sunken relief, with pigments applied directly on the stone, without a layer of whitewash (Fig. 97).

The material shows images which were made in a variety of scales, from scenes in a large scale, through decoration with two registers, to scenes in a very small scale. The external walls were bordered with a torus moulding, the decoration of internal walls was framed with dado or geometric friezes (different scales), as well as friezes: khekers (different scales) and cryptogram frieze (two types) (Fig. 98). The background was painted a unique dark grey colour (almost black). It does not appear to be a discoloration, the colour is preserved in different state on most wall blocks.

## Equipment

The description published by Barakat implies that a certain group of sculptures, both royal and private statues, has been preserved in the temple. The fill near the brick wall contained a statue of Thutmose III together with a statue of Neb-Amun, and a statue of Ken-Amun was unearthed in the Hypostyle Hall. ${ }^{21}$

On the other hand, the "Mummy Storeroom" housed a fragment of an Osiride statue (Fig. 99), ${ }^{22}$ fragments of stelae, granite, quartzite, and calcite elements of statues, as well as a indurated limestone base of a statue published by Barakat. ${ }^{23}$ Most of the private possessions from the storeroom cannot be dated to the


Fig. 95. Hnmt-nh temple, corner block with marks left by an addition of a wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 96. $\underline{H n m t-}$ ' $n h$ temple, reused block (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk). times of Hatshepsut.

Apart from the statues, the equipment of the temple also included wooden door, painted red and plated with metal, which was purchased in 1922 in Luxor for the Metropolitan Museum of Art. ${ }^{24}$ The inscription on the door, originally gilded, at present only covered with whitewash, mentions the name of the temple. The inscription listed two royal names, the name of Thutmose I, ' $3-h p r-k z-R$ ', on the left, the name of Thutmose II on the right, but this one was obviously re-carved. The preserved fragments of the original decoration displayed feminine word endings, which indicates that initially this section bore the name of queen Hatshepsut. The same placement of names is known from the stamp marks preserved on bricks. ${ }^{25}$

[^107]

Fig. 97. $\underline{H n m t-}$ 'nh temple, fragment of architrave with pigments applied directly on the stone (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 98. Hnmt-'nh temple, fragments of blocks with cryptogram frieze (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Perhaps the granite head of a royal statue discovered near the Valley Temple, now stored it the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, could be associated with the Hnmt- 'nh temple. ${ }^{26}$

## Texts concerning the construction

In year 11 of the reign of Thutmose III, an expedition headed by Ah-mes, the mayor of Thebes, was sent to Khenenu (Gebel es-Silsileh) in order to transport sandstone blocks. ${ }^{27}$ This information was recorded on an ostracon left at the temple of Maat at Deir el-Medineh, ${ }^{28}$ which might suggest that it was related to a construction of a building on the West Bank of the river. The record is important due to the fact that so far such an early building from the times of Hatshepsut, erected on the West Bank and made of sandstone, has not been documented. It also seems too early for installation of sphinx statues along the processional alley.

[^108]
## Chronology

It is unclear whether it was Thutmose I himself who commenced the construction of his mortuary temple. Nevertheless, in view of the material discovered by Barakat, it appears certain that the decoration was finished by Hatshepsut. It is corroborated by the use of the cryptogram frieze, which topped the walls, and the presence of names of this ruler in the decoration of the walls. It is evident that some architectural changes were introduced, ${ }^{29}$ however, it is impossible to establish the chronology of these changes without reconstruction of the decoration. It seems significant that the building material was different from the one used for the construction of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, particularly the sandstone, the same as it was in the case of the temple of Thutmose III, $\underline{D} s r-3 h t$. Both the limestone and the sandstone appear to be the same as the ones employed for $D s r-3 h t$, but it cannot be confirmed without a detailed petrographic analysis. This might suggest fairly late chronology of that edifice, which seems likely in the light of other facts.

Hnmt- 'nh does not appear in the list of temples compiled by Ineni, who was, i.a., the builder of the tomb of Thutmose I, a fact which he describes in his autobiography. ${ }^{30}$ It is an important piece of information as it would suggest that the temple did not function in the lifetime of that trusted official of Thutmose I, who most probably died during Hatshepsut's regency.

Neither is the $\underline{H} n m t-n h$ temple mentioned by Djehuti, who managed finishing works in Theban temples during the early reign of Hatshepsut, and especially fitting of precious materials on different elements inside the temples: gates, doors, naoi. ${ }^{31}$ Some elements in $\underline{H n m t}-{ }^{-} n h$ were definitely subjected to this procedure, which is confirmed by the above-mentioned door with perforations drilled for fastening a metal sheet, found at Asasif.

The name of the temple was recorded in the Chapelle Rouge, ${ }^{32}$ which might confirm a relatively late period of its construction.

The title of Pen-iaty as a supervisor of the works of Thutmose I, which was recorded at Shatt el-Rigal ${ }^{33}$ could indicate that the work on the temple, even if it was not commenced under Hatshepsut, was in progress during her reign.

The basic issue is connected with the question about the end of the functioning of the temple. The marks left on the blocks evidently indicate that the building was still in use during the sole reign of Thutmose III. The cryptogram frieze was erased, the names of Hatshepsut were replaced with the name of Thutmose II, officials of Thutmose III (Ken-Amun or Neb-Amun) left their statues there.

It appears that a part of the structure was dismantled before the Amarna Period. Some fragments which were not erased feature decoration which depicts legs of a goddess painted yellow (Fig. 100), ${ }^{34}$ names of Amun and Behdeti, as well as most likely the hand of a god resting on king's shoulder and the crown of Amun. On the other hand, there are restored images and names of Amun. Priests from $\underline{H n m t}$ - $n h t$ were attested in the Ramesside Period, ${ }^{35}$ which means some rooms of the temple were still in use. Last mention of $\underline{H n m t-}$ - $n h$ comes from the reign of Ptolemy VI. ${ }^{36}$

[^109]Fig. 100. Hnmt- 'nh temple, block with feet of goddess (Phot. D. Dąbkowski).


The temple was abandoned and within a short period of time it became a quarry of the material used for the manufacture of stone bowls. The surface covered with relief was chiselled off, the blocks were roughly shaped into bowls and such semi-finished products were transported to workshops. A lot of damaged semi-products were found in the temple by Barakat and are now stored in the storeroom no. 4 in the tomb MMA 828 at Qurna. The exploitation of the temple as a source of stone for bowls must have transpired shortly after the building had been abandoned, the blocks practically escaped acts of stealing for reuse in neighbouring structures. Probably the only evidence ${ }^{37}$ for reuse of blocks can be seen in the ones found by B. Ockinga in tomb TT $148 .{ }^{38}$

## Functioning of the temple, people connected with the temple

It is difficult to discuss the function of the $\underline{H n m t}$ - $n h$ temple before the material unearthed by Barakat is completely researched. ${ }^{39}$ It definitely fulfilled the role of the memorial temple of Thutmose I, as there was a false door of that ruler, it also served as a type of bark station. During the reign of Hatshepsut, the procession to the $\underline{H} n m t-n h$ temple was one of the stages of a festival procession, which was confirmed on the north wall of the Upper Courtyard in the temple of the queen at Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{40}$ It did not change in the times of the sole reign of Thutmose III, which might be proven by the scene from the tomb of Iamu-nedjeh, which reports sending flowers for Amun in $\underline{H n m t-}$ ' $n h$ during the Feast of the Valley. ${ }^{41}$

The priests of the cult of Thutmose I are mentioned in preserved inscriptions more frequently than the priests of this particular temple. ${ }^{42}$ It is worth noting that their connections with the $\underline{H} n m t$ - 'nh temple seem fairly likely, as there are no records of priests of Thutmose I's cult from $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, where another offering chapel of that ruler was located. Notes on the temple of Thutmose I itself can also be found. ${ }^{43}$ The titles of

[^110]priests associated with that temple suggest that it was not involved in cult before the period of co-regency of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. There is no evidence for any priests active during the reigns of preceding kings: Thutmose I and Thutmose II. The titles of priests from the times of Hatshepsut are typical, they concern solely the cult of Amun from this temple as well as functions normally fulfilled in each temple: jmj-r


[^111]
## $\boldsymbol{H}^{-}-3 h t$ temple

| Name: | $\mathrm{H}^{\text {c }}$-3ht (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 230) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dedicatory incription: | none |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location: | h | uncertain |  |  | La | uncertain |  | uncertain |  |
| Orientation: ${ }^{1}$ | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ}\right.$ ) | no data |  | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data | $\delta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | no data |
| Dimensions: | H | no data |  |  | W | no data |  | no data |  |
| Material: | local limestone |  |  |  | Quarry: |  | Qurna ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| Type of the temple according to written sources: |  |  | st-wrt nt Jmn, ${ }^{3}$ hewt-ntrr ${ }^{\text {'3t }} n(t)$ ḥhw $[\ldots]^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | Archaeological work: <br> Marquis of Northampton <br> 1990s - Egyptian Antiquities Organisation <br> Documentary work: <br> since 1996 - Janusz Karkowski <br> 1997-2002 - Guy Lecuyot <br> 2010-2011 - Christian Leblanc |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - Difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

The $H^{\prime}-3 h t$ temple has been a subject of scientific debate for a long time. Its location, architectural form, or particularly its function have not been established conclusively.

## Remains of the temple

Since the beginning of the 20th century, researchers have been discovering blocks made of local limestone in an extensive area from Dra Abu el-Naga to the Ramesseum. This type of limestone was exploited only on the West Bank and solely by queen Hatshepsut, ${ }^{6}$ however, these blocks could not have come from $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s$ $r w .{ }^{7}$ They were i.a. fitted into the walls of the Ramesseum, whose builder, Ramesses II, boasted of having restored the temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ in his inscriptions on walls of this temple. ${ }^{8}$ Restoration work was in conflict with stealing blocks from $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, which happened at that time. Furthermore, the iconography of the

[^112]

Fig. 101. Fragment of block with the cryptogram frieze (based on Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. 47; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
$\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple has been researched so well that it is not possible to add large scenes to its decoration, and blocks i.a. in such a scale have been found in different places of West Thebes. ${ }^{9}$

The blocks are characterised by a minor degree of restoration of the erasures and damage of the Amarna Period. ${ }^{10}$ This might imply that the structure which the blocks came from did not play a prominent role in cult in the post-Amarna times. ${ }^{11}$ The blocks represent a variety of architectural elements (columns, ${ }^{12}$ architraves, ${ }^{13}$ niches, ${ }^{14}$ gates, ${ }^{15}$ torus mouldings, ${ }^{16}$ corners of the walls ${ }^{17}$ ) and belong to different portions of walls, from dado to friezes which enclosed the scenes from the sides and the top. The top parts of walls with the cryptogram frieze ${ }^{18}$ (the later version, ${ }^{19}$ Fig. 101) have been preserved in particularly high numbers, however, there are no blocks with kheker friezes. ${ }^{20}$ Many blocks bear representations from the middle portions of walls as well as from the lower parts finished with dado. ${ }^{21}$

A number of blocks with decoration dated to the reign of Hatshepsut, not connected with any building from the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ complex, were employed for the construction of the walls of the so-called small Rames-
and Anthropology, Philadelphia E 1823; Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés, 83-109, Pls XXV-XXIX; Leblanc, Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés, 47-59, Pls VIII-XIII; Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, 61-108, Pls VILVII. Blocks from structures dated to the times of Hatshepsut are also found in tombs of certain people: they were used for the tomb of Djehuty-mes, TT 32 (Kákosy, Bács, Bartos, Fábián, Gaál, The Mortuary Monument of Djehutymes, 14, Fig. on p. 14, n. 60, Pl. XIX [upper left]); this type of blocks were also discovered in the tomb of Amun-mes TT 373 (Seyfried, Thebanischen Kaleidoskop, 116, Fig. 21; Seyfried, Zweiter Vorbereit, 274, Pl. 40 [a]; Seyfried, Das Grab des Amonmose, 231-235, Pls 52/82-83). A big group of blocks cut from characteristic limestone, associated with the times of Hatshepsut, can still be found in the area from Birabi to the ramp of Thutmose III (author's own observation). Some blocks are in possession of different museums all over the world: Manchester Museum, Manchester 1888 (unpublished, http://harbour.man.ac.uk/mmcustom/Display.php?irn=365143\&QueryPage=\%2Fmmcustom\%2FEgyptQuery. php, accessed November 22, 2016); Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 26.7.1399 (Roehrig, Dreyfus, Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut, 156, Fig. 86; Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt II, 118, Fig. 60); 36.3.271 (Roehrig, Dreyfus, Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut, 153, Fig. 81; Lansing, Hayes, The Museum Excavations at Thebes, 4, Fig. 4; Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt II, 89); Oriental Institute Museum, Chicago E 1366 (unpublished, http://oi-idb.uchicago.edu/\#D/ MC/2185/H/1454270850371, accessed November 22, 2016); Petrie Museum, London UC 28748 (Stewart, Egyptian stelae, reliefs and paintings, 2, Pl. 2 [3]); UC 16802 (ibidem, 2, Pl. 2 [4]).
${ }^{9}$ Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari II, Pls XLVI-L, LII; Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI, Pls CLII, CLVII-CLIX, CLXI.
${ }^{10}$ Karkowski, Hatshepsut Temple, Epigraphic Mission 1996, 57; see above, n. 4.
${ }^{11}$ Personal communication from Karkowski and author's own observation, see also: Leblanc, Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés Pls X [A], XI [B], XII [A/B]; Karkowski, el-Bialy, Qurna, 239, 241, Figs 1, 3.
${ }^{12}$ Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés, 84-85, 88, 103, Fig. 2 [R-BC.215, R-BC.232]; Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pls XXI [A], XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX [C], XLII.
${ }^{13}$ Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pls XXXIV, XLIII [A].
${ }^{14}$ Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés, 85, 92, 98, Fig. 3 [R-BC.97]; Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. XXXVIII [C, E].
${ }^{15}$ University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia E 1823 (see n. 6); Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pls XXXVII [B], LVI.
${ }^{16}$ Author's own observation.
${ }^{17}$ Bickel, Tore, Pls 52 [e], 95 [e]; Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. XXXVII [C].
${ }^{18}$ Kákosy, Bács, Bartos, Fábián, Gaál, The Mortuary Monument of Djehutymes, Fig. on p. 14, Pl. XIX [upper left]; Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés, 89, 97-98, 103-104, Figs 1 [R-BC.31, R-BC.206], 3 [R-BC.166], Pls XXVII [B] and XXVIII [A]; Leblanc, Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés, 51-52, Pls 12 [A], 12 [B]; Bickel, Tore, Pls 52 [a], 95 [a]; Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pls XXI [B], XXIII [A], XXV [A], XL, XLVII.
${ }^{19}$ Sankiewicz, Cryptogram Uraeus Frieze, 204-209, Figs 4-5.
${ }^{20}$ Kheker friezes, if they are preserved, represent the small "pointed" type (Kołodko-Dolińska, Studies on the Kheker Frieze, 32-34) and belong most probably to the niches' decoration.
${ }^{21}$ Leblanc, Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés, Pl. 9 [A]; Jaritz, Der Totentempel des Merenptah, 166, Fig. 11; Karkowski, el-Bialy, Qurna, 240, Fig. 2.

Fig. 102. Fragment of block with the name of the temple (based on Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. 57; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

side temple at Qurna. The blocks found there mention the name of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and apart from that, the name of the $H^{-}-3 h t$ temple (Fig. 102). ${ }^{22}$

The largest assemblage of blocks, including the one which bears the name of $\mathrm{H}^{\prime}-3 h t$, was discovered over the whole area of the Ramesseum (Figs 101 and 102). ${ }^{23}$ The biggest concentrations of blocks were located in association with structures used for economic applications and warehouses around the temple, nevertheless, blocks from the times of Hatshepsut, though in lower numbers, were also discovered in the proper temple. ${ }^{24}$ Leblanc additionally supposes that the temple of Ramesses II was erected over the ruins of an older building. This is indicated by the fact that original foundations in the area of the sanctuary were not respected, foundation blocks were missing in some places, and in some other sections, blocks were not inserted into existing foundation trenches, most likely because they did not fit the builder's intentions and the new orientation of the edifice. ${ }^{25}$ Perhaps the original orientation corresponded with the chapel of Wadjmose, located nearby. ${ }^{26}$ Leblanc believes that the oldest Hatshepsut's structure on the grounds of the Ramesseum was constructed from limestone and was located in the area of the future temple of Tuya-Nefertari, different elements of that building were made of reused blocks. ${ }^{27} \mathrm{He}$ situates the building erected by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, made of limestone and sandstone, in the Hypostyle Hall. The scholar supposes, on the basis of the presence of columns, that it was architecturally close to $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .^{28}$

[^113]
## Texts

The coexistence of the names of the two temples, $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and $H^{-}-3 h t$, seems to be significant. These two names appear together on an artefact, a carnelian bead in the collection of MacGregor, which bears the following inscription: "life (for) Perfect God $M_{3}{ }^{'} t-k z-R^{\prime}$ ', beloved of Amun, who is foremost of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and


The list of incense offerings, the distribution of which to different Theban temples was managed by Hatshepsut's official, the second priest of Amun - Pui-em-Ra, is a source of high importance. ${ }^{31}$ The list contains the name of the $J m n-H^{\prime}-3 h t$ temple, found between $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and $H n k t-n h$, with the (O49) sign as the determinative, like all the temples on this list. The inscription which describes the scene in Pui-em-Ra's records announces that "the weighing of the incense for temples which serve the house of Amun, in the treasury of the temple" (... sntr $\left.n r w-p r w^{32} j m j w-h t ~ p r-J m n ~ m p r-h \underline{d} n h w t-n t r\right)$ is supervised. It means that the temple must have somehow depended economically directly on the temple of Amun at Karnak as the main distributor of goods. It could be supposed that this cult place was treated as equal to other temples in the area recorded by Pui-em-Ra. ${ }^{33}$

The representation of the procession of nomes in the Chapelle Rouge mentions $H^{\prime}-3 h t$, just like Pui-em-Ra's list, directly after $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, and the $W^{\prime} b-k b b$ canal follows. ${ }^{34}$ This implies that when the Chapelle Rouge was decorated, the canal next to $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ did not exist. It might have been a consequence of a slowdown of construction work on the temple of Hatshepsut, as it poses no doubt that the canal reaching the Valley Temple had been planned by queen's architects. It is possible that the Valley Temple had not been completed by then, and the building materials, as well as the bark of Amun had to be stored somewhere else. This would mean that the canal which belonged to the $H^{\prime}-3 h t$ temple was located close enough to become a convenient route for transportation of building materials.

The most thorough description of $H^{\circ}-3 h t$, which contains certain clues concerning the nature of that structure, has been preserved on the so-called Northampton stela from the tomb of Djehuti (TT 11): " $H^{\text {' }}$ -$-3 h t$, the great throne of Amun, his horizon which is in the west, and all door wings were of genuine cedar and worked with bronze" ( $H^{-}-3 h t$ st wrt nt Jmn 3 hht.f jmj $(t)$ jmntt ' 3 w.s nbw m 3 š m弓' bzk $k$ (w) $m$ hsmn). ${ }^{35}$ Two elements of the statement appear to be exceptionally important for the understanding of the character of the temple. One of them is the information specifying the location of $\mathrm{H}^{-}-3 h t$, namely, it was "the horizon of Amun who is in the west". Furthermore, the name itself, Jmn- $H^{c}-3 h t$, seems meaningful: "Amun that appears on the horizon". The word 3 ht (horizon) was highlighted and must also have been reflected in topography.

The stela of Djehuti defines $H^{-}-3 h t$ as the st-wrt of Amun. The term was used to refer to a sanctuary ${ }^{36}$ as well as a bark station. The Chapelle Rouge was called with that name, both on the walls of the chapel itself, ${ }^{37}$ and by Thutmose III on the external wall of the Palace of Maat at Karnak. ${ }^{38}$

## The interpretation of $\boldsymbol{H}-3 \boldsymbol{h} t$ so far

## $\underset{-}{C}-3 h t$ as a part of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$

The discussion of the function fulfilled by $H^{〔}-3 h t$ included certain suggestions which associated the edifice with particular elements of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple.

Edward Brovarski agreed that $H^{c}-3 h t$ described by Djehuti could be identified with a bark chapel, however, he considered it certain that the chapel was the Bark Hall in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{39}$

[^114]Brovarski was not the first one who wanted to see $H^{-}-3 h t$ as a part of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. Eberhard Otto also treated it as a component of that structure, yet he did not explicitly specify which fragment. ${ }^{40}$

When Norman de Garis Davies described the scene from the tomb of Pui-em-Ra which depicts the record of temples, he suggested that $H^{-}-3 h t$ should be regarded as an element of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple, most probably one of the chapels of the Middle Terrace - Lower Anubis Shrine or the Hathor Shrine, although at the same time he was surprised by the absence of the name in all the chapels. ${ }^{41}$

On the other hand, Hayes proposed that $H^{c}-3 h t$ should be associated with another portion of the temple at Deir el-Bahari, namely the bark station unearthed by Winlock, located halfway between the Lower and Upper Temples. ${ }^{42}$ Di. Arnold treated the hypothesis as absolutely certain. ${ }^{43}$

## $\boldsymbol{H}^{〔}-3 h t$ as an independent building

It seems, however, that there is a number of reasons for not identifying $H^{-}-3 h t$ as a part of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ but rather treating it as an independent structure. Above all, no part of the temple bore its own proper name: the foundation deposits of the Valley Temple only bear the name of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{44}$ The aforementioned blocks which feature the name of $\mathrm{H}^{\prime}-3 h t$, discovered in the area of the so-called Ramesside small temple, cannot come from the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple, according to Karkowski. ${ }^{45}$

The interpretation of $H^{`}-3 h t$ as in independent structure located between $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and $H n k t$ - $n h$ is corroborated by the research of other scholars. ${ }^{46}$

Wolfgang Helck believed, on the basis of the analysis of Pui-em-Ra's list, that $H^{`}-3 h t$ was possibly not a chapel at Deir el-Bahari but a detached structure, devoted to Nefrura as a successor to the throne. ${ }^{47}$ Pierre Lacau and Henri Chevrier also treated $H^{\prime}-3 h t$ as an independent edifice near Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{48}$

Barakat interpreted the temple he had discovered as $H^{-}-3 h t$ on the basis of written sources and the location. ${ }^{49}$ However, the study of the material he had collected implies that this theory cannot be justified, and two blocks feature the name of the temple of Thutmose I, $\underline{H n m t}-\mathrm{n} h \mathrm{~h}^{50}$

The observations made by Christine Meyer seem to be essential for the identification of the function fulfilled by $H^{\circ}-3 h t$. She noticed that in more recent lists the $H^{\circ}-3 h t$ temple had been replaced with the $\underline{D} s r^{-}$ $3 h t$ temple, ${ }^{51}$ situated at Deir el-Bahari, erected by Thutmose III, and that both temples had never appeared together on any list of temples. In addition to that, a statue of Sen-en-mut, dedicated to Amun from the $H^{\circ}-3 h t$ temple, was found on the grounds of the $\underline{D} s r-3 h t$ temple. Thus she concluded that $H^{\circ}-3 h t$ had been re-dedicated as $D s r-3 h t .{ }^{52}$ The interpretation authored by Meyer, as a completely satisfactory one, was supported by Peter F. Dorman. ${ }^{53}$

Martina Ullmann ${ }^{54}$ was convinced that the $H^{〔}-3 h t$ temple was a free-standing building, not connected with any part of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. She emphasised that a cult relationship between the two sacred places existed, which could have been related to the annual visit of Amun during the Beautiful Feast of the Valley. She also noted the role of Hathor in the cult in the $H^{-}-3 h t$ temple. Ullmann associated this temple with a block found at Asasif, which featured an incomplete inscription with a cartouche of Hatshepsut (re-carved into a cartouche of Thutmose II) and a phrase $h w t-n t r r^{\prime} 3 t n(t) h ̣ w[\ldots]$, which, if indeed it comes from that temple, would mean that Egyptians themselves categorised $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-3 h t$ as the Temple of Millions of Years. This conclusion seems even more likely due to the fact that the structure of the name of the temple (hwt $M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k_{3}-$ $\left.R^{\prime} H^{\prime}-3 h t-J m n\right)$ was characteristic for this type of temples.

[^115]

Fig. 103. Pebble with inscription which mentions Dsr-d $d s r w$ (based on Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. 52; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

## Builders

The only person who could certainly be associated with the construction of the $H^{〔}-3 h t$ temple was Djehuti. The cedar door plated with sheet bronze was the result of his work. ${ }^{55}$

## Foundation deposit

Leblanc found an object which probably belonged to the foundation deposit in a secondary context within the grounds of the Ramesseum, where the largest assemblage of blocks from $H^{-}-3 h t$ has been found. ${ }^{56}$ It is a polished stone with an inscription which mentions $\underline{D} s r-d s r w$ instead of $H^{-}-3 h t($ Fig. 103). This is fairly surprising and impossible to account for at the present stage of research.

## Functioning

Despite the essential indications recorded on the Northampton stela, very little can be concluded in regards to the functioning of the $H^{-}-3 h t$ temple. It seems that a close ritual relationship with the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple was an important trait of $H^{-}-3 h t$, even though they remained independent entities.

It is obvious that the temple was devoted to Amun-Ra, ${ }^{57}$ but Hathor was venerated there as well, as it is announced on the statue of Sen-en-mut: "[3] the steward of Amun, Sen-en-mut, he praises [4] Amun-Ra and Hathor, Who Is Upon Thebes, Who is Among $H^{\prime}-3 h t^{\prime \prime}$ ([3] jmj-r pr n Jmn Sn-n-mwt dwz.f [4]) Jmn-R‘ Ḥwt-Hrw hart-tp W${ }^{3} s t$ hart-jb $\left.H^{\prime}-3 h t\right) .{ }^{58}$

The $H^{〔}-3 h t$ temple definitely had its own priests, however, the name of only one, Senenu, has been preserved up to this day. ${ }^{59}$ That man fulfilled the function of the first priest of Amun in $H^{\circ}-3 h t$, as well as the first priest of Amun in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, the first priest of Hathor in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, and the overseer of $m r w$ people ${ }^{60}$ of Amun. His example again indicates close relationships between $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and $H^{-}-3 h t$.

In economic terms, the $\mathrm{H}^{-}-3 h t$ temple depended on the donations delivered from the temple of Amun at Karnak, ${ }^{61}$ at least if it comes to the delivery of incense.

## Summary

Summing up the discussion, the significance of observations connected with the similarities and chronological relationships between $H^{\prime}-3 h t$ and $\underline{D} s r-3 h t$ temples, made by Meyer, should be emphasised. It can be

[^116]

Fig. 104. Temple of Hatshepsut - $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, name of the gate leading to the Complex of the Solar Cult, east jamb (Phot. and drawing J. Iwaszczuk).
further added that there is a certain similarity in the names of both temples, and in both sanctuaries, apart from the cult of Amun, the cult of Hathor was also practiced. In connection with that, the decoration of the northern part of the east wall as well as the north wall of the Upper Courtyard of the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari is worth closer attention. It represents the proceedings of the Beautiful Feast of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$. The east wall depicts the initial scenes of the festival, offerings made at Karnak, as well as the crossing of the river bark of Amun Userhat and accompanying royal barks from the East Bank to the West Bank of the Nile. Another episode of the festival, represented on the north wall, was the journey made by the river bark of Amun on the shoulders of priests in the direction of the bark station which was situated halfway between the Valley Temple and the Upper Temple. ${ }^{62}$ However, these scenes are separated by the door installed in the north wall, which led to the Solar Cult Complex. The name of the door is as follows: $s b_{3} M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k z-R^{\prime} J m n$ $\underline{d} s r^{3} h t\left(\right.$ Fig. 104). ${ }^{63}$ This similarity of names does not seem to be accidental. It could be supposed that when Thutmose III decided to build a new bark station, he used the name which already functioned in the cult, and after the new building had been constructed, the name of the gate was chiselled off.

The reconstruction of events seems to be as follows: the next stage of the development of Hatshepsut's plans, perhaps after expansion of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{-} s r w$ temple, was an introduction of a new bark station, a temple which would function as a harbour, where the river bark of Amun would land. It is not clear where the bark had stopped before, the canal had probably been located there from the very beginning and that is why the place was selected for the new temple. Perhaps a certain building had been erected there earlier, possibly a platform, ${ }^{64}$ situated directly upon the waterway and built rather as a temporary structure, of less durable

[^117]materials. Eventually, a large bark station was constructed - a temple whose layout is difficult to establish today. It was finished with a high degree of accuracy and built of precious materials. The temple was completed in Hatshepsut's lifetime and actively participated in cult practices.

## Chronology

The only indication scholars suggest for establishing the time of construction of the $H^{c}-3 h t$ temple is the inscription situated on a statue of Sen-en-mut, published by M. Marciniak. ${ }^{65}$ That author claimed the title of Sen-en-mut, $h r p j 3 t n b(t) n t r t$, stated on the stela and also known only from Gebel es-Silsileh, ${ }^{66}$ is dated to an extremely early period - it probably comes from the reign of Thutmose II. ${ }^{67}$

Such an early chronology of the temple itself is contradicted by the presence of the throne name ${ }^{68}$ as well as the cryptogram frieze of Hatshepsut in its relatively late form, also featuring her throne name. ${ }^{69}$

All circumstances suggest that the $H^{\top}-3 h t$ temple was not the earliest building erected by Hatshepsut in Thebes, although it was not the last either. Its construction was completed and its walls were covered with reliefs. This seems to be indicated by the cryptogram frieze of Hatshepsut as well as the fact its name does not appear in the representation of the Beautiful Feast of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ on the walls of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, probably decorated in Nefrura's lifetime, ${ }^{70}$ i.e. before year 11 of Thutmose III's reign. ${ }^{71}$ Nevertheless, it is present in the decoration of the Chapelle Rouge, which was decorated not earlier than in year 17 of his reign, and $H^{〔}-3 h t$ was already involved in cult practices. ${ }^{72}$

Although the time of construction of $H^{〔}-3 h t$ is uncertain, it is possible to attempt to reconstruct the end of its functioning.

Despite the fact that the temple is not mentioned in any sources after the reign of Hatshepsut, ${ }^{73}$ it is known that it functioned during the sole reign of Thutmose III. This can be confirmed by the erasure of cryptogram friezes ${ }^{74}$ of Hatshepsut and names of the queen. ${ }^{75}$

It is evident that the structure was still intact in the Amarna Period as erasures from that time have been preserved on the blocks. Due to the fact that the Amarna erasures were restored only to a minor degree, it seems that $H^{c}-3 h t$ must have existed later on, in post-Amarna period. Perhaps it was Horemheb ${ }^{76}$ who began the restoration, yet he did not complete it.
one. The alley extended at a right angle to the axis of the tribune. Hayes would be inclined to perceive that structure as the complex which was intended to serve as a landing place for the bark of Amun in the course of the procession from Karnak, built by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III (Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt II, 175-176, Fig. 97). It is not an image of the temple $H^{\prime}-3 h t$ itself, as tentatively suggested by Barakat (Barakt, A New Temple of Queen Hatshepsut in Qurna, 106), since certain architectural elements attested in field research are missing, above all, the Hypostyle Hall. However, the painting could possibly represent an earlier building which had been constructed there.
${ }^{65}$ Marciniak, Une nouvelle statue de Senenmout, 201-207.
${ }^{66}$ Caminos, James, Gebel es-Silsilah I, Pls 42, 43. However, M. Marciniak was mistaken in this case, the title appears on another statue of Sen-en-mut ("Sheikh Labib"): Berlandini-Grenier, Senenmout, 119, 121, Fig. 1, Pl. XVIII; Meyer, Senenmut, 309.
${ }^{67}$ Marciniak, Une nouvelle statue de Senenmout, 204-205.
${ }^{68}$ Barakat, The Temple of Kha'-'Akhet, 31, Pl. 5 [a].
${ }^{69}$ E.g. on the blocks from the so-called Ramesside temple, but also in the Ramesseum, temple of Merenptah, or private tombs (cryptogram friezes, see above, nn. 16-17; cartouches of Hatshepsut: Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés, Figs 1-2; Leblanc, Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés, Pl. X; Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pls XXXVIII-XXXIX; Quibell, Ramesseum, Pl. XIII [2]).
${ }^{70}$ After the death of her daughter, Hatshepsut replaced them with images of her mother - queen Ahmose. Thus the representations of princess Nefrura on the walls of the temple at Deir el-Bahari must come from the period when she was still alive (Białostocka, Alterations to the Relief Representations of Royal Family Members' Statues, 12; Pawlicki, Princess Neferure, 112, 118-119, 125).
${ }^{71}$ Stela from Sinai, Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo JE 38546 is dated to year 11 of the reign of Thutmose III (Gardiner, Peet, Černy, The Inscriptions of Sinai I, Pl. LVIII [197]).
${ }^{72}$ Lacau, Chevrier, Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout, 26; Legrain, Notes d'inspection, 283.
${ }^{73}$ Helck, Materialien I, 93.
${ }^{74}$ Kákosy, Bács, Bartos, Fábián, Gaál, The Mortuary Monument of Djehutymes, Fig. on p. 14, Pl. XIX [upper left]; as well as author's own observation.
${ }^{75}$ Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés, Fig. 2 (R-BC.232); Leblanc, Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés, Pl. 10 [A/B].
${ }^{76}$ The ruler was one of these kings who left their signatures on the restoration works in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ (the cryptographic record of his name can be seen on the restored processional barks of Amun, i.a. in the Bark Hall). Apart from Horemheb, the name of Ramesses II is featured on the walls of $\underline{D} s r-d s r w$, who, as it seems in the case of $H^{-}-3 h t$, could not have

It appears evident that $H^{-}-3 h t$ was demolished completely not later than under Ramesses II since the walls of the temple of that king contain blocks which most likely came from the former. The stealing of blocks was further continued - the example of Ramesses II was followed by his officials and successive ruler, Ramesses IV.

[^118] III, Pl. 199 [b], PM II², 356 [75]).

## Temple of Thutmose III - Hinkt- 'nh

| Name: | [Mn-hpr-R'] Hnkt-'nh (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, pp. 231-232) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dedicatory incription: | none |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location: ${ }^{1}$ | h | no data |  |  | La | $25^{\circ} 43.28^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ |  | Lo | $32^{\circ} 36.28^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ |  |
| Orientation: ${ }^{2}$ | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | 127 |  | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | 0 | $\delta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | -33,1 |  | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 99 |
| Dimensions: ${ }^{3}$ | H | no data |  |  | W | 85 m |  | L | 148 m |  |
| Material: | 1a. local limestone, 1b. local limestone; 2. sandstone |  |  |  | Quarry: |  | 1a. no data, 1b. Qurna ${ }^{4}$, 2. probably Gebel es-Silsileh |  |  |  |
| Type of the temple according to written sources: |  |  | hewt[.f] n jmntt, ${ }^{5}$ hwt nt ḥhw m rnpwt, ${ }^{6}$ hwt-ntr, ${ }^{7}$ h hwt ${ }^{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: |  |  | 1898 - Eugène Grébaut <br> 1905 - Arthur E.P. Weigall <br> 1934, 1936-1937 - Herbert Ricke <br> 2008 till today - Miriam Seco-Álvarez |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - Difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

The temple of $H n k t-{ }^{\text {' }} n h$ is first reported on the external south wall of the Chapelle Rouge, in the so-called geographic procession list ${ }^{9}$ and in Pui-em-Ra's list of temples. ${ }^{10}$ The Chapelle Rouge records it right after the name of the canal located next to the temple of Thutmose I. The list also states the name of the canal which ran directly next to the temple in question: mr nswt Mn-hpr-R'st jb Nwn. It appears on Pui-em-Ra's list in the context of deliveries of incense from the temple of Amun at Karnak. Its presence on the walls of both structures unequivocally indicates that it was involved in an active performance of cult, and the appearance of its name in the decoration of the Chapelle Rouge implies that it took place before year 17 of Thutmose III's reign. ${ }^{11}$

[^119]The name of that temple is also mentioned twice in the tomb of Benia (TT 343) from the times of co-regency of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III as a destination of Amun's pilgrimage, the name of the festival was not stated, nevertheless, it is known that offerings were made to Amun on the occasion. ${ }^{12}$

The statue of Nefer-peret from the times of Thutmose III describes it as the temple of millions of years (hwt nt ḥh [m] rnpwt Hnkt- $n h$ ). ${ }^{13}$ Its function as the temple of royal cult is also emphasised by the presence of the cult chapel of the king with a false door. ${ }^{14}$

It poses no doubt that the first phase of its construction and the decoration of at least a part of the edifice should be dated to the reign of Hatshepsut. It is unquestionably proven by bricks bearing her name found in the northern portion of the enclosure which surrounds the temple complex, ${ }^{15}$ bricks stamped with the name of $M n-h p r-k 3-R{ }^{〔},{ }^{16}$ as well as the decoration of the temple, including, above all, the cryptogram frieze designed on the basis of Hatshepsut's frieze with the throne name Mn-hpr-k3-R. ${ }^{17}$

## Orientation of the temple

It is difficult to state anything about the orientation of the temple of Hnkt- 'nh. Situated on the east-west axis, it was definitely aligned with solar phenomena, however, no research related to the subject has been conducted. It is known that its orientation differs significantly from the orientation of the temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, therefore, probably it was not connected with the winter solstice. ${ }^{18}$

Nonetheless, it should be noted that the location of the offering chapel is not accidental, and the entrance to the tomb of Thutmose III, KV 34, was situated in line with the axis of the false door installed in the west wall of the chapel. ${ }^{19}$
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Fig. 105. Hnkt- ' $n$ h temple of Thutmose III, foundation deposit under the north-western corner of the third Osiride pillar (based on Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses' III., Pl. 12 [upper right]; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 106. Hnkt-' $n h$ temple of Thutmose III, adze blade from the foundation deposit (based on Schmitz, Zwei Gründungsbeigaben, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


## Construction works

## Foundation ritual

The only thing known about the foundation ritual is that it definitely took place. The stretching of the cord was mentioned on three artefacts from the foundation deposits. ${ }^{20}$ It should be emphasised that the foundation ritual was performed on behalf of Thutmose III, Hatshepsut did not participate in the construction of that temple, her name does not appear on the objects from the foundation deposits or in the decoration of the temple.

## Foundation deposits

The only certain foundation deposit discovered in situ had been partially looted before archaeologists arrived. ${ }^{21}$ It was a pit of a rounded cross section, unearthed under the north-western corner of the third Osiride pillar, counting towards south from the main axis of the temple (Fig. 106). The pit was 1.33 m deep, it had a diameter of 1.2 m , and a recess, 0.75 m long, closed with mud bricks, was dug in its lower portion. The contents were typical of foundation deposits of that period, the only undisturbed elements were discovered in the lower part of the deposit, where a cattle head and leg had been laid on the bottom, probably wrapped in a mat, and on top of that two small vessels for incense were placed. The recess accommodated 166 carnelian beads. ${ }^{22}$ Other objects: 25 vessels, a copper chisel, brick, coal, pieces of sandstone, were not carefully arranged but probably mixed up in the course of looting. ${ }^{23}$

It seems that the excavation works conducted by M. Seco-Álvarez resulted in unearthing remains of another foundation deposit located under the first Osiride statue situated in the north of the axis of the temple. Unfortunately, it is difficult to interpret the assemblage conclusively as the height at which she found the relics of the structure, identified by her as a silo, was not provided. ${ }^{24}$ However, the round cross-section, diameter of approx. 1.5 m , a characteristic lining around the pit built of mud brick, and the location under an Osiride statue ${ }^{25}$ might suggest that this is where the looted foundation deposit was situated.

Other objects which could be associated with the deposits of that temple come from museum collections ${ }^{26}$ or have been purchased on the antiquarian market. ${ }^{27}$

## Architecture of the temple

The canal listed in the Chapelle Rouge led to the quay, however, no traces it might have left have been found. ${ }^{28}$ Thus the reconstruction of this part of the temple is purely theoretical.

The site selected for the construction of this enormous structure, which was the temple of Thutmose III, had been previously exploited as a Middle Kingdom cemetery. ${ }^{29}$ The first action which had to be performed was the preparation of the grounds. Since that was the place where construction work had been conducted and tombs carved in earlier epochs, the area had to be strengthened in such a manner that the rooms should
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Fig. 108. Ḥnkt-'nh temple of Thutmose III, stamped mud bricks (LD III, Pl. 39 [f-k]).
be prevented from collapsing under the heavy weight. The next task which the builders faced was the levelling of the surface, which resulted in the formation of an area which was 80.0 m wide and 100.0 m long, designed in terraces at two levels. ${ }^{30}$ The rock in the north-western part was trimmed in such a manner that enough space was made for the execution of the plan. ${ }^{31}$

## Rooms

## Enclosure wall

The building in its original shape (Fig. 107) was surrounded with an enclosure wall constructed from mud brick, erected along the rock wall trimmed on the west side. ${ }^{32}$ The wall featured the same thickness in the upper portion, but at the base it was 4.60 m thick in the front part and 4.00 m thick in the part based on the rock. It was smoothed on both sides, and the external upper part was adorned with a torus moulding made of specially shaped bricks. ${ }^{33}$ Perhaps a similar decoration was also made on the internal surface, yet no such fragments have been found there. ${ }^{34}$

The main entrance to the temple grounds was situated in the centre of the east enclosure wall, although it was not shaped like a pylon in the initial stage of the construction. ${ }^{35}$ At a later stage, a pylon was built and filled with decorated sandstone and limestone blocks. ${ }^{36}$ A foundation deposit of Thutmose III was discovered next to the gate of the pylon. ${ }^{37}$ An additional side entrance, which led to the dwelling area, was planned in the north-eastern wall. Remains of the limestone gate associated with the entrance have been preserved. ${ }^{38}$ The opposite end of the temple featured a ramp or staircase in the south-eastern enclosure wall that led onto the wall, which then led to a platform built on a rock mound. The space framed by this wall was slightly narrower than in the west. ${ }^{39}$

Herbert Ricke supposed that the unsymmetrical shape of the temple enclosure was a consequence of certain changes in the construction design and that the original plan differed from the version which was eventually built. It would be proven by the outline of the edifice, parallel to the oldest, north-eastern enclosure wall - this axis was not the same as the one which was actually formed. ${ }^{40}$ The axis originally aimed directly at the entrance to the tomb of Thutmose III (KV 34). ${ }^{41}$

[^122]The enclosure wall was built of stamped bricks marked with a variety of stamps (Fig. 108). The north-eastern enclosure wall of the original temple contained i.a. bricks that bore double stamps of Hatshepsut and Thutmose I, which, according to Ricke, might have been used to mend the wall there. ${ }^{42}$ Apart from these, the enclosure which surrounded the original temple incorporated bricks with two other types of stamps which included the name of the queen: a stamp with the name $M_{3} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$ in an oval, ${ }^{43}$ with the feather of Maat instead of an image of the goddess, ${ }^{44}$ as well as stamps with the name $M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k 3-R^{2}-m r j t-J m n$ in an oval. ${ }^{45}$ In this case, Ricke also suggested that they had not been there from the very beginning, as the bricks in this place do not fit in properly and the joints between them are too big. According to him, this is where a gap was made to transport building materials to the construction site. ${ }^{46}$ Bricks with the name Mn $h p r-R^{\prime} m r j J m n H n k t-n h$ inside a rectangle with an oval top edge were placed in the south-eastern portion of the enclosure of the original temple. ${ }^{47}$ Similar bricks with the name Mn-hpr-R' mrj Jmn m Hnkt-'nh were discovered in the rubble above dwellings. ${ }^{48}$

## Main building

It is not possible to provide details concerning the architecture as only general information has been published so far (Fig. 105). The main building of the temple was elevated to a height of 2.75 m in relation to the surrounding terrace. It was 50.92 m long and 33.6 m wide. ${ }^{49}$ A retaining wall ( 1.25 m thick) connected with the ramp was erected on the eastern side, strengthened with four pillars (side length 1.30 m ) on the northern side. It supported the fill of the terrace formed in this manner. ${ }^{50}$ The fill was built of a layer of sand with fragments of quartz, and was deeper in the south-eastern part, where it was 1.40 m thick. A layer of bricks was laid on top of that. ${ }^{51}$ In the eastern section, the edifice was based on a limestone foundation laid on a layer of sand, in the western part it rested directly on the bedrock covered with a layer of plaster ${ }^{52}$ and a thin layer of sand. ${ }^{53}$ The proper temple was removed from the enclosure wall only by a cubit in its back part. ${ }^{54}$ A brick ramp, 12.5 m long, led from the lower terrace to the building of the proper temple. ${ }^{55}$

The space inside the main building of the temple was organised in three rows, arranged transversely to the axis of the temple. ${ }^{56}$ The first row was a pillar portico, the second row - a courtyard framed with a single line of columns with a passage leading around it. The staircase was built on the south-western side. The third row featured walls, the preserved fragments of which helped Ricke to partially reconstruct this part of the temple. The first room was a courtyard surrounded with a single row of columns. Three pairs of doors led from there to other chambers. From the south, a narrow passage reached the colonnade hall which led further into the area which served for the royal cult. The central door opened to a large hypostyle hall which led to the Bark Hall. The door installed on the northern side led to a cluster of two narrow rooms. The northern one featured the ceiling supported on four columns, however, column bases have not been preserved in the southern one, therefore, Ricke does not reconstruct a colonnade there. ${ }^{57}$ It is unclear whether it was possible to move from that chamber to the portion of the temple situated further inside, according to Ricke, it might have led to the vestibule of the area destined for the solar cult. ${ }^{58}$ The final row was the sanctuary which consisted of chambers with vestibules topped with ceilings supported by columns, including the only preserved one, situated in the vestibule of the solar area. ${ }^{59}$

[^123] Fig. 18.
${ }_{56}$ Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses' III., Pls 5-6.
${ }^{57}$ Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses' III., Pls 5-6.
${ }^{58}$ Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses' III., 12.

The area of the royal cult consists of a set of rooms, the first of which was a long hall, reconstructed by Ricke as the column hall with two entrances: one, which opened to the hypostyle hall, situated in the centre of the north wall, and the other, located in the centre of the west wall, which led further into the space devoted for the royal cult. ${ }^{60}$ That other entrance led to a small hall, which might have been supported by two columns. It was possible to move from that room to two long halls. The function of the northern one has been identified as that of an offering hall. It features a barrel vault which is 3.67 m wide and 10.7 m long. ${ }^{61}$ The size of that room was established by Ricke on the basis of the proportions noted for the offering hall of Hatshepsut in the temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .^{62}$ Blocks from the ceiling with mortar on the external surface were found in the south-western part of the hall, which indisputably confirms that yet another room was located on the southern side. ${ }^{63}$ A false door was installed in the west wall of the offering hall. It was transported from there to Medinet Habu at a certain moment, where it was found by Uvo Hölscher. ${ }^{64}$

The centrally located Bark Hall was 5.25 m (10 cubits) wide, and the rooms on its sides -3.75 m ( $7 \mathrm{cu}-$ bits) each; the length of these rooms remains unknown. ${ }^{65}$ Ricke suggests two possible reconstructions: one which assumes the lateral rooms were as long as the Bark Hall, the other which proposes that following the example of i.a. the temple at Amada, the rooms were separated with a wall in such a manner that it was possible to enter the two chambers located in the west by issuing from the Bark Hall while the two situated in the east were accessed from the east, from the column hall. ${ }^{66}$

The reconstruction of the western portion on the northern side of the edifice is uncertain, due to the low level which the remains came from. Ricke refers to the temple of Hatshepsut as an analogy and reconstructs rooms related to the solar cult with a solar altar there. ${ }^{67}$

Sparse floor blocks based on a thin layer of sand were preserved in rather few places of the western part. ${ }^{68}$ These blocks featured outlines which suggested the layout of the rooms. ${ }^{69}$ The ceiling of the temple was most probably constructed from sandstone, which is implied by the presence of a high number of fragments of sandstone ceiling blocks, painted blue and bearing a decoration of stars. ${ }^{70}$

## Other buildings

## Dwelling structures and buildings used for economic purposes

Dwelling structures on the temple grounds were located on both sides of the main temple building (Fig. 105). Ricke supposes that the portion situated in the south, near the Hathor Shrine (constructed under the sole reign of Thutmose III), was built in the second half of the 18th dynasty and later. ${ }^{71}$ There was a $20-$ metre-wide area of structures used for housing and economic applications in the northern part, between the enclosure wall and the main building of the temple. ${ }^{72}$ As the enclosure wall was a prominent element of the complex and bricks bearing Hatshepsut's name were used for its construction, it could be assumed that the area was intended for exploitation from the very beginning. Nevertheless, it is not possible to confirm whether that plan actually materialised. So far, houses dated to the 19th and 20th dynasties have only been documented in this portion of the complex. ${ }^{73}$ The artefacts found within that space do not indicate the chronology of any elements of the structure to the period of Hatshepsut's reign.

[^124]To the same degree as it is not possible to locate housing structures next to the temple of Hnkt- $n h$ in the times of Hatshepsut with confidence, it is also unclear whether buildings for purely economic applications, $\check{s} n^{\prime}$, already existed then. Although it has been confirmed that later on a $\check{s} n^{\prime}$ existed as part of the complex, as its officials are mentioned in sources, ${ }^{74}$ it is not certain that it functioned as early as under Hatshepsut's reign.

## Chronology and phases of construction

The construction work on the grounds of the Hnkt- $n h$ temple must have commenced relatively early. Ricke believed ${ }^{75}$ that the construction of the temple should be dated to the early years of the reign of Thutmose III, however, it is not possible to establish the chronology precisely. ${ }^{76}$

The appearance of the name of the temple on the wall of the Chapelle Rouge in the representation of the so-called geographic procession confirms that $H n k t-\AA h$ was already involved in cultic practices in year 17 of Thutmose III's rule. ${ }^{77}$ It corroborates the early chronology of the temple, yet it does not indicate the beginning of its construction in any way. The fact that the frieze which adorns one of the rooms, ${ }^{78}$ as well as the bricks ${ }^{79}$ and even priest titles ${ }^{80}$ feature the early name of Thutmose III $-M n-h p r-k z-R^{81}-$ is not a precise indication, but it merely implies that the work was conducted during the co-regency with Hatshepsut.

The initial stage of the works, according to Ricke, appears to be the establishing of the axis of the temple and construction of the original version of the enclosure wall. The construction of the central part of the temple took place after the alteration of the axis. ${ }^{82}$

The temple was enlarged during the second phase of construction, a courtyard with a pylon and a new ramp were added, the Hathor Shrine, with a separate entrance and ramp, was built in the southern part. ${ }^{83}$ These actions, however, were undertaken during the sole reign of Thutmose III. It is indicated by the presence of bricks stamped with late names of the ruler associated with brick structures. ${ }^{84}$ It seems that not all elements of the temple were completed under Thutmose III and certain works were conducted there by Amenhotep II. ${ }^{85}$

## Artefacts from the temple

It is impossible to establish precise chronology of the artefacts found in the temple which are inscribed with Thutmose III's name. ${ }^{86}$ There are no artefacts associated with the complex which could be conclusively dated to the times of Hatshepsut.
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## Functioning of the temple <br> Cult

It is unclear what the original function of Hnkt- $n h$ was. The name of the temple: "the temple of the west" ( $h w t[. f] n j m n t t)^{87}$ was recorded in the foundation deposits, although already in the early years of the sole reign of Thutmose III the temple was described as: "the temple of millions of years" (hwt nt hḥw m rn$p w t) .{ }^{88}$ The cult of the royal kJ seems to have been very important in the times of Thutmose III, mentioned in sources repeatedly ${ }^{89}$ and practiced by dedicated priests. ${ }^{90}$ It should be emphasised that there was no other temple of millions of years in Thebes where the cult of the royal $k 3$ would occupy such a prominent place.

## People associated with the functioning of the temple

It seems that the Hnkt- $n h$ temple functioned already during the reign of Hatshepsut, its name appears on the wall of the Chapelle Rouge and on Pui-em-Ra's list. ${ }^{91}$ Most probably Ah-mes, who was active in the times of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, was the earliest first priest of Amun in the Hnkt- 'nh temple, he bore the title of hm-ntr tpj n Jmn $m$ Hnkt- $n h .{ }^{92}$ Another title of a priest dated to the times of Hatshepsut and related to the cult of Thutmose III was $w^{\prime} b n M n-h p r-R^{\prime}$, associated with Sen-Amun, preserved on the funerary cone of that official. ${ }^{93}$ The function of the $w^{\prime} b$ priest in $H$ thkt- $n h$ was also fulfilled by Amun-hetep, son of Tjambu, ${ }^{94}$ who also bore two other titles connected with the cult of Thutmose III: $\mathrm{hm}-\mathrm{kz} \mathrm{n}$ twt n nswt bjtj Mn-hpr-R' $m \underline{h} n t . f$ and $h m-k z n$ twt $n$ nswt bjtj Mn-hpr-kz-R‘m hnt.f. 95 These titles might indicate a processional festival which involved the presence of royal statues.
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## Temple of Thutmose II - Šspt- 'nh

| Name: | Šspt-'nh (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 321) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dedicatory incription: | none |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location: ${ }^{1}$ | h | 80 m a.s.l. |  | La | $25^{\circ} 43.2{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ |  | Lo | $32^{\circ} 36.28^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ |  |
| Orientation: | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data | $\delta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data |  | D ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ | no data |
| Dimensions: ${ }^{2}$ | H | 3.68 m |  | W | 23.5 m |  | L | 40.0 m |  |
| Material: | 2 types of limestone, sandstone |  |  | Quarry: |  | no data |  |  |  |
| Type of the temple according to written sources: |  |  | $h w t^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | 1926 - Bernard Bruyère <br> 1936 - Clément Robichon, Alexandre Varille |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

The Šspt- $n h$ temple was dedicated to Thutmose II, ${ }^{5}$ which does not mean that he was the builder. The data related to it are very sparse as it was not mentioned in any written sources. It was erected on the edge of the desert and farming land, not far from the temple at Medinet Habu (Fig. 109), and it appears that the location had not been selected by accident. It should be noted that a fragment of a wall of an earlier structure has been preserved below the temple. ${ }^{6}$ Scholars have been trying to understand the reason for such location of the edifice, far from $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and $H n k t-\quad n h$. Bernard Bruyère supposed that the situation was connected with the cult of Ptah-Sokar, ${ }^{7}$ based nearby, however, as correctly observed by Luc and Marc Gabolde, ${ }^{8}$ the cult was much more recent than the functioning of the temple. According to them, the situation of the temple does not correspond with the general location pattern of 18th dynasty temples, from the north to the south. ${ }^{9}$ Cabrol believed that such position of the temple could have been related to the statue ritual, which was practiced every 10 days, ${ }^{10}$ with the rituals performed in $\underline{D} s r-s t,{ }^{11}$ situated only 230 m away. ${ }^{12}$

The first phase of the construction work definitely took place during the reign of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{13}$ It is indicated by building techniques employed for the construction of the temple and above all, by the pres-
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Fig. 109. Šspt-' $n h$ temple of Thutmose II, aerial view (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

ence of the cryptogram frieze $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t$ -$k_{3}-R^{\prime}$, which topped the walls (Fig. 110), preserved on fragments of blocks. ${ }^{14}$ These blocks imply the completion of decoration, at least in some rooms, under the reign of the queen.

The second phase of construction is attributed to Thutmose III. ${ }^{15}$

Fig. 110. Šspt- 'nh temple of Thutmose II, fragments discovered in the temple, fragments with the cryptographic frieze discovered in the temple of Thutmose II (based on MMS Bruyère 1945-1946, 7, 10; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

## Construction work

The title of Ah-mes of Pen-iaty, $j m j-r$ k3t $n(t)$ ' $3-h p r-n-R$ ', recorded at Shatt el-Rigal, is the only source which could confirm the construction work in $\dot{S} s p t$ - $n h$ h under Hatshepsut. ${ }^{16}$

## Foundation deposits

There have been no foundation deposits found at the site, however, Bruyère discovered a concavity of a diameter of 1.5 m and depth of 1.5 m outside the border of the temple in the north-east. The scholar supposes it could be a relic of the foundation deposit. ${ }^{17}$
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Fig. 111. Šspt-'nh temple of Thutmose II, plan of the temple of Thutmose II with marked outlines of walls (based on Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II, Pl. I; Varille, Le temple du scribe royal Amenhotep, Pl. I; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 112. Šspt-' $n h$ temple of Thutmose II, reconstruction of phases of the construction: a) phase I (times of Hatshepsut); b) phase II (times of Thutmose III) (based on Varille, Le temple du scribe royal Amenhotep, Pl. VII; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

## Architecture (Figs 111-112)

The reconstruction of the two aforementioned construction phases from the reign of Hatshepsut and the sole reign of Thutmose III was made by Bruyère ${ }^{18}$ as well as Varille and Robichon. ${ }^{19}$

The first task the builders faced was the levelling of the soil surface, which sloped towards east by $38 \mathrm{~cm} .{ }^{20}$ The next assignment involved digging of the foundation trenches, putting a layer of sand on the bottom, and planting limestone foundation blocks inside. ${ }^{21}$ The whole area was then sprinkled with sand to form a layer of a few centimetres, and floor slabs were based on top of it, while in the western part they were placed directly on the rock. The floor slabs were made of sandstone blocks, fairly irregular in shape, up to 2 m long and approx. 1 m wide. They constituted a type of socle which supported the walls of the temple. ${ }^{22}$ The temple was initially surrounded with a brick enclosure, whose eastern side was thickened to create an entrance pylon, where a sandstone gate dedicated to Thutmose II was installed. ${ }^{23}$ The temple was originally

[^129]

Fig. 113. Šspt- $n h$ temple of Thutmose II, sixteen-sided column rebuilt in the entrance of the temple (based on MMS Bruyère 1945-1946, 7; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 114. Šspt- $n h$ temple of Thutmose II, gargoyle (based on Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II, 33, Fig. 17; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
17.5 m long and 12 m wide..$^{24}$ The edifice was divided into two connected parts - northern and southern one. ${ }^{25}$ The southern portion featured an entrance through a door placed in the centre of the façade. The door led to the Hypostyle Hall, which was topped with a ceiling supported by four columns. Outlines of three of them have been preserved. Judging from the outlines, the diameter of the columns reached 81 cm . Three fluted abaci (Fig. 113) and two drums of columns of such sizes were found inserted into the threshold of the enclosure wall. ${ }^{26}$ It should be emphasised that the spacing of the columns was 1.6 m and seems to be typical of Hatshepsut's buildings. ${ }^{27}$ Another door in the northern part of the Hypostyle Hall opened to the transversely oriented vestibule, topped with a ceiling supported by two columns, according to Varille and Robichon. ${ }^{28}$ It must be stated, however, that the outlines of these columns have not been preserved. ${ }^{29}$ Three pairs of doors in the west wall of the vestibule led to three narrow chapels. The northern chapel was situated on the axis of the whole complex and was the widest of the chapels, it reached a width of 1.9 m while others were only 1.1 m wide. ${ }^{30}$ The outlines of the east walls of these chapels together with outlines of the doors were not marked on the floor, thus Robichon and Varille suppose that this part of the temple was built on a higher level and the outlines were marked in a higher layer. ${ }^{31}$ Yet another door, located in the north wall of the vestibule, led to the separated northern part, where there were two rooms, situated one after another along the east-west axis. ${ }^{32}$

Bruyère ${ }^{33}$ as well as Varille and Robichon ${ }^{34}$ believe that the second phase of construction was undertaken by Thutmose III. This is due to the attribution of decorated blocks to particular phases in regard to the change of the stone material, suggested by Varille and Robichon: in the first phase, blocks of good quality limestone were used and they featured cartouches with the name of Thutmose II, in the second phase, the cartouches contained the name of Thutmose III and the limestone was of a much poorer quality. ${ }^{35}$ On the other hand, Bruyère notices that cartouches with names of Thutmose II and Thutmose III can be found on both types of limestone. ${ }^{36}$ The area was enlarged in the second phase by enclosing it with a stone wall and after expansion it was 23.5 m wide and 40 m long. ${ }^{37}$ The foundation of that wall was built of much smaller limestone blocks than those found in the central portion, and of inferior quality. ${ }^{38}$ The paving slabs laid there were made of smaller fragments of sandstone blocks, less regular than the ones in the eastern part. ${ }^{39}$ The walls in the rebuilt portion of the temple as well as the enclosure were built of

[^130]Fig. 115. Šspt-'nh temple of Thutmose II: fragment of stairs (based on Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II, 30, Fig. 15; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

sandstone. ${ }^{40}$ The original socle was framed with a passage reaching a width of 2.75 m on three sides (south, west, and north). In front of the socle, in the east, the edifice was expanded by 11.0 m . That area formed a courtyard lined with a column portico, it was probably also paved with slabs. ${ }^{41}$ The courtyard was 10.55 m long and 16.10 m wide. ${ }^{42}$ It is unclear which phase of construction should be associated with the gargoyle found in the course of excavations (Fig. 114). That block, apart from a fragment of a rain gutter, held a piece of the cornice, which, as supposed by B. Bruyère, framed the perimeter of the courtyard. ${ }^{43}$ Its untypical shape is worth noting, the same was used to top the wall of the Solar Cult Courtyard in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s$ $r w{ }^{44}$ The columns were planted in two rows on the western side and in one row on the northern and southern sides. They were sixteen-sided, had a diameter of 76 cm , ${ }^{45}$ were made of sandstone, and their bases were made of poor-quality limestone. ${ }^{46}$ The columns were spaced at 2.20 m in the central portion and the intervals were smaller than between the lateral columns - $2.50 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{47}$ Such spacing evidently diverts from the convention used under Hatshepsut. The columns were placed in such a manner that each row formed an alley which led to one of the five doors located in the west wall at regular intervals. The northern and southern doors led to the passage which surrounded the central part. Three rooms from the central part underwent reconstruction during the second phase. The hall with four columns was replaced with three rooms. The northern, long one led to the vestibule, and the location of its door had not been changed. The south-eastern square room could be accessed from the east, where a new entrance was carved in the west wall of the courtyard. According to B. Bruyère, the north and west walls as well as the door are more recent than the south and east walls. ${ }^{48}$ A depression of a regular shape was carved in the floor at a certain angle, it was 50 cm long, 30 cm wide, and 10 cm deep. Its edge was slanted and it probably served for ablutions. ${ }^{49}$ The south-western part of the original Hypostyle Hall was converted into a staircase, a decorated limestone fragment of the staircase was discovered in the course of excavations (Fig. 115). ${ }^{50}$ This block helped to establish the angle of the handrail $\left(45^{\circ}\right)$ and its width ( 35 cm ), as well as the size of the steps ( $20-23 \mathrm{~cm}$ high, 25 cm deep). The fragment also served for reconstruction of the height of the room, which, according to B. Bruyère, was 3.68 m from the floor to the top of the roof, and the sandstone ceiling slabs were 45 cm high. ${ }^{51}$ The stairs wound clockwise along three walls (Fig. 112b). The presence of the stairs suggests that in the second phase the building was used at two levels and either had a top floor, or the roof was used for certain rituals. It is also possible that a two-floor structure was planned from the very beginning since the central part of the building was based on a socle, which might have provided the necessary support for a heavier construction.

[^131]Summing up, it appears that during the first phase of construction, the main building and the enclosure were erected since they both fit the module grid used by Hatshepsut. ${ }^{52}$ The enclosure wall together with the floor of the passage surrounding the building display the features of the first phase and it was constructed from larger sandstone blocks in the south-western part. ${ }^{53}$ On the basis of the characteristic construction techniques and decoration mentioned above, it can be supposed that Thutmose III built the enclosure wall located in the east, installed the columns in the courtyard, and probably rebuilt the room with four columns as the fragments of these columns were discovered inserted in the threshold of the door in the east wall of the enclosure.

The reuse of fragments of columns which belonged to the first phase in the threshold of the structure formed in the second phase might indicate that the first phase had been completed before the plans were changed.

It is worth noting that outlines and marks which could imply relocation of door sockets, which might suggest that the door to the central part had been enlarged are absent. The doors in the rebuilt and new-ly-constructed parts were equally narrow $\left(1.25 \mathrm{~m}^{54}\right)$, which might indicate that the bark of Amun was not supposed to enter the temple grounds. Cabrol believes that the hall for the bark of Amun was not planned in the first phase and only in the times of Thutmose III the building was re-shaped to accommodate the bark. ${ }^{55}$ However, it seems unlikely that when Thutmose III was in the process of re-arranging the area he would not adapt the space for admission of an enlarged bark of Amun.

## Artefacts from the temple

The only artefact which seems to come from the beginning of the functioning of the temple is a sitting statue of Thutmose II wearing the nemes, made of crystalline limestone. Its fragments were discovered near the door which led to the sanctuary. Bruyère calculated that the silhouette of the king alone could reach a height of approx. 1.5 m , and the pedestal should also be taken into consideration to estimate the full height. ${ }^{56}$

Bruyère found a stela dated to year 12 on the temple grounds, ${ }^{57}$ Gabolde proposes to perceive the date as year 12 of Thutmose III's reign. ${ }^{58}$ Nevertheless, it would be an unusually early date due to the fact that the temple is not mentioned in the records of temples from the reign of Hatshepsut. Therefore, it is likely that it referred to one of the rulers who followed Thutmose III.

## Officials

There are only two officials who were involved in the cult of Thutmose II in the times of Hatshepsut. Their titles do not include the name of the temple. Each of them had more than one function, and combined the duties of a priest with the duties of overseer of granaries. One of them was Sen-Amun, probably buried in tomb TT $252 .{ }^{59} \mathrm{He}$ was a $w^{\prime} b$ priest and overseer of granary(?) under Mentuhotep II, Ahmose, Amenhotep I, Thutmose I, Thutmose II, as well as the priest of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III at the same time. ${ }^{60}$

Another official who i.a. was in charge of the granary of already deceased Thutmose II and fulfilled the function of his lector-priest was the owner of tomb -286-, Nedjem. ${ }^{61}$

[^132]
## Chronology

The absence of the Šspt- 'nh temple among the buildings listed in the Chapelle Rouge could be explained (just as other buildings which were not recorded there) with a lacuna or the fact that it had not been completed before year 17, when the Chapelle Rouge was erected. ${ }^{62}$ Its dating to the late period of Hatshepsut's reign seems to be confirmed by the fact that it was not mentioned on other lists of temples, particularly the one from the tomb of Pui-em-Ra. Lacau and Chevrier believed that the building is absent from records of temples because it was destroyed by Hatshepsut herself. ${ }^{63}$ However, it seems unlikely. The temple of Thutmose II must have been in use for some time after the reign of the queen as the blocks bear marks of damage both by Thutmose III ${ }^{64}$ and from the Amarna Period. ${ }^{65}$ Nevertheless, it should be noted that the last priests and officials associated with the cult of Thutmose II, whose activity can be dated with certainty, come from the times of Thutmose III. ${ }^{66}$

The architecture also seems to imply a relatively late construction of the temple within the span of Hatshepsut's reign. The load-bearing elements of the temple, columns and their bases, the door (only the one which led to the enclosure), floor, and the ceiling built in the first phase were made of sandstone, ${ }^{67}$ just like in the case of the $\underline{H} n m t$ - $n h$ temple ${ }^{68}$ and temples erected by Thutmose III. ${ }^{69}$ Moreover, the use of two types of limestone, one from the quarry located in the north of the Valley of the Kings, and the other, also local, but of much lower quality, ${ }^{70}$ is another argument suggestive of the final stage of Hatshepsut's reign. This is when the supply of limestone in the quarry near the Valley of the Kings finished and it was necessary to find another, cheap material.

It appears likely that the temple of Thutmose II was not finished under Hatshepsut. The eastern part of the enclosure wall had not been build, even though it had probably been planned. ${ }^{71}$ The decoration of at least some parts had been completed but the temple probably did not begin to fulfil its cultic function or its use for this purpose was very limited. The finishing works carried out in the times of Thutmose III resulted in providing the right conditions for performing rituals. ${ }^{72}$

It seems that the $\check{S} s p t-\AA h h$ temple was not the mortuary temple of Thutmose II as there was no space for the chapel of the royal cult, neither was the false door found. Therefore, Gabolde describes this temple as "sanctuaire mémorial" to distinguish this type of building from mortuary temples. ${ }^{73}$

[^133]
# Temple at Medinet Habu - $\boldsymbol{D}_{\boldsymbol{r}}$-st 

| Name: | $\underline{\underline{D}}$ r-st (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 233) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dedicatory incription: | See: Appendix 1: Dedicatory inscriptions, pp. 218-218 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location: | h | no data |  | La | $25^{\circ} 44^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ |  | $32^{\circ} 35^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ |  |
| Orientation: ${ }^{1}$ | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 143 | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right.$ ) | 0 | $\delta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | -46.4 | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | 115 |
| Dimensions: | H |  |  | W | 13.0 m |  | 28.8 m |  |
| Material: | sandstone |  |  | Quarry: |  | Gebel es-Silsileh ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| Type of the temple according to written sources: |  |  | no data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Documentary work: <br> 1844 - Carl Richard Lepsius <br> since 1972 - Epigraphic Survey of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

## The first phase of work

By the time Hatshepsut began her rule, a lot of old buildings had deteriorated after years of use, the temples erected during the Middle Kingdom were in poor condition. That was also the case with the temple at Medinet Habu. This justified renovation works, whose objective was to return it to its glory, which is explained by Thutmose III, who continued the works of Hatshepsut, on one of the architraves of that edifice. ${ }^{4}$ It seems that Hatshepsut originally only planned to build a wall around the small temple, ${ }^{5}$ which had probably been constructed over ruins of a building from the Middle Kingdom by Thutmose I (Fig. 116). ${ }^{6}$ A very limited portion of this wall had been preserved until the excavations headed by Hölscher, which began in the 1930s. ${ }^{7}$ It was 2.7 m thick at the base and approx. 57 m long, the northern end of the wall finished abruptly. It was constructed from two types of bricks: larger ones ( $40.0 \times 19.0 \times 11.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), which formed its external
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Fig. 116. $\operatorname{Ds} r$-st temple at Medinet Habu, plan of the temple (based on Hölscher, The Excavations of Medinet Habu II, Pl. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Fig. 117. Dsr-st temple at Medinet Habu, foundation of the temple (based on Hölscher, The Excavations of Medinet Habu II, Pl. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
surfaces, and smaller ones ( $33.0 \times 16.0 \times 9.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), which filled its centre. Some externally located bricks were stamped with the cartouche of the queen's throne name $-M_{3} t-k 3-R^{c} .^{8}$ Due to the fact that the land surface was uneven and lowered towards the east, the foundations in the west were laid 60.0 cm deeper than in the east, which might mean that the wall closed the area from the east (Fig. 117). There are two more brick walls situated within the enclosure wall, constructed parallel to each other, which are dated to the period of works commissioned by Hatshepsut. ${ }^{9}$ Both were thinner, 1.3 m thick, built of larger bricks stamped with the $M 3{ }^{\prime} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}$ cartouche.

## The second phase of work

It appears that at a certain moment queen Hatshepsut began to consider a new project devoted to Amun, as she had announced in the dedicatory inscription. ${ }^{10}$ It was an undertaking which required a new organization of the area, already exploited by her predecessors and sanctioned by tradition. The whole temple at Medinet Habu was constructed from sandstone transported there from Gebel es-Silsileh. ${ }^{11}$

The original wall enclosing the place of cult was demolished and moved 3 m to the west. ${ }^{12}$ The new one was 2.7 m thick and its foundation reached 1.5 m below the surface of the floor. It was built on a thin layer of sand ( $10.0-30.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) of two types of bricks: larger bricks ( $40.0 \times 19.0 \times 13.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), many of them stamped with the $M 3^{'} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}$ cartouche, were laid on the outside while the centre was filled with smaller ones ( $33.0 \times 16.0 \times 9.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), which did not bear the stamp marks. Hölscher unearthed 13 quartzite stones (so-called name stones) bearing the $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$ cartouche and $j n b t\left(\right.$ ?) $W_{3} s t^{13}$ inscription in the sand below the lower layer of bricks on the northern and western sides (they were discovered fairly accidentally and Hölscher was not able to establish whether they had been placed at regular intervals ${ }^{14}$ ). A faience plaquette which displayed a cartouche with the throne and proper names of Hatshepsut was also found in the mortar between the second and third courses of bricks in the west. ${ }^{15}$ The new wall was detected on three sides around the temple but Hölscher failed to find it in the south. ${ }^{16}$

[^135]This wall was erected to limit access to the newly-constructed temple. In order to build the temple, Hatshepsut had to demolish the structure raised by her predecessor and used its elements for her edifice. The new temple was partially based on the oldest foundation, probably laid as far back as in the Middle Kingdom. The final form was situated on a rectangular platform measuring 28.8 m by 13.0 m . Its height ranged from 60.0 to nearly $80.0 \mathrm{~cm},{ }^{17}$ which was related to the shape of the soil surface. ${ }^{18}$ The contemplated temple consisted of two parts: a cluster of six chapels with an adjacent portico and a chapel surrounded on three sides with a pillar portico. The roof of the edifice was constructed from large stone slabs of a thickness of approx. 60 cm . Its walls were vertical, framed with a torus moulding and topped with a cornice. The external surfaces of the temple walls were not decorated and it is unclear whether that resulted from the general state of the finishing works or such was the intention from the very beginning (Thutmose III also left external wall surfaces undecorated, they were covered with reliefs only under Ramesses $\mathrm{III}^{19}$ ). All rooms were of the same height and only room $L$ (see plan and section) was approx. 1 m taller than the others. Its roof was fitted with a small window, which let in the light that illuminated the statue planted in this chamber later. ${ }^{20}$

## The structure of the temple

The western part of the temple, which consisted of six chapels, was mostly finished during the reign of Hatshepsut. However, the decoration was not completed in all rooms. ${ }^{21}$ Judging from the images and cartouches of the queen carved on the walls of these rooms (subsequently re-carved into the names and figures representing Thutmose I, II, and III or into offering tables ${ }^{22}$ ) and from the presence of the cryptogram frieze, it seems that the whole decoration of rooms $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{Q}$, west and south walls of room P , as well as the west wall and fragments of the south and north walls and the door in the south wall of room L can be attributed to Hatshepsut. ${ }^{23}$ The queen's artists did not manage to finish the reliefs on the walls of room M (the whole of which was decorated by Thutmose III). Hölscher suggested that initially the external walls of rooms L and M were not installed due to the intended planting of statues in these rooms, ${ }^{24}$ which, however, were not placed there before the unexpected disappearance of the queen. The statue in room L was installed by Thutmose III, and possibly so was the statue in room M. The plans included the aforementioned transverse hall measuring 4.30 by 11.10 m , whose roof was probably intended to be supported by four columns. ${ }^{25}$ That project was not completed either - the east wall of the hall was only slightly marked on the foundation wall.

The works on the eastern side of the temple were not finished during the reign of Hatshepsut. The workers laid foundations for a chapel with a square floor, which was intended to measure ten by ten cubits $(5.25 \times 5.25 \mathrm{~m})$. The foundation was slightly shallower than the foundation of the transverse hall, it reached a depth of 1.6 m . It was based on the wall from the Middle Kingdom in the eastern part. The work ceased before the walls had been erected and covered with a roof - only $3-4$ courses of stone blocks were laid. ${ }^{26}$ The decoration of the walls of this portion of the temple did not even begin. ${ }^{27}$

Thus Hatshepsut was not able to finish the construction and decoration of the temple at Medinet Habu. The works were resumed by Thutmose III after a certain period of suspension. He modified the original plan of Hatshepsut and completed the decoration in the areas where it was interrupted by the queen.

[^136]
## Epigraphic sources

Unfortunately, epigraphic sources from the times of Hatshepsut are much less abundant than archaeological data. It appears that information about the small temple at Medinet Habu is absent from these sources. Scholars state that the name of $\underline{D} s r-s t$ is known from later sources and was first confirmed on the portico surrounding the Bark Hall ${ }^{28}$ and on one of the architraves ${ }^{29}$ decorated during the sole reign of Thutmose III, however, it was not mentioned in any inscriptions of Hatshepsut. For this reason, M. Cozi ${ }^{30}$ implies that the name should be treated as a secondary one. He suggests the area was originally called $H f t$ - $h r$ - $n b$.s. This name was definitely corroborated in written sources, but the temple itself had never been indicated in the vicinity.

In this context, it seems crucial to report that the name of Dsr-st appears in yet another part of the temple. The south jamb of the door which leads from room $L$ to room $O$ bears the following inscription within the titulary of Hatshepsut: [...] $M 3^{i} t-k 3-R^{c}$, beloved of Amun-Ra, who is present in $\operatorname{Dsr}$-st ([...] $M_{3}{ }^{\circ} t-k z-R^{c}$


That door jamb was undoubtedly decorated during the queen's reign, and her name was later replaced with the name of her husband, Thutmose II. ${ }^{32}$ The inscription is partially damaged, but its state of preservation is good enough for reconstruction with a high degree of certainty. The information announced by the queen is absolutely essential. Each temple venerated the form of Amun associated with that particular temple, e.g. the temple of Deir el-Bahari was a home of Amun from $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w,{ }^{33}$ and Amun from Jpt-swt resided in the temple at Karnak. ${ }^{34}$ It seems perfectly natural that Amun from $\underset{D}{ } s r$-st is mentioned in his own temple - there is no reason to conclude that the temple at Medinet Habu refers to Amun from another sanctuary. This would imply that the name of the temple was in use prior to the sole reign of Thutmose III, as it has been assumed up to this day. ${ }^{35}$

It seems that the inscription from the door jamb concludes the debate concerning the name of the small temple at Medinet Habu. In view of this inscription, there are no arguments in favour of the claim that the name Dsr-st was introduced by Thutmose III and the original name of the sanctuary was $H f t-h r$-nb.s, as suggested by Massimo Cozi. ${ }^{36}$

## Functioning of the temple

There is no information related to the use of this building for religious purposes due to the fact that the work on the construction and decoration of the small temple at Medinet Habu was not completed. Very sparse material from the times of its construction and exploitation was discovered in the course of excavation works. ${ }^{37}$ It is possible that the absence of the temple from Medinet Habu on the list of temples from the tomb of Pui-em-Ra, where deliveries of incense to particular temples are described, is a consequence of the fact that it did not function yet at the time of the compilation of the list.

[^137]Spiegelberg identifies the temple of Amun (pr-Jmn) recorded on Northhampton stela with the small temple at Medinet Habu. ${ }^{38}$ The owner of the stela, Djehuty, conducted certain finishing works in a rather imprecisely identified pr-Jmn - the text mentions that he had the floor of the structure paved with silver and gold. This type of revetment should leave perforations for the installation, however, no traces of that can be found at Medinet Habu.

A number of issues could be solved by foundation deposits, which frequently bear the name of the building, nevertheless, in the case of the small temple at Medinet Habu, they have not been found. It is possible that some elements of the foundation deposits have been preserved in the form of sparse artefacts from Medinet Habu which feature the name of Hatshepsut and are now stored at the Oriental Institute Museum in Chicago. ${ }^{39}$

The presence of the statue of the third priest of Amun, Nefer, discovered at Medinet Habu, is an intriguing fact. ${ }^{40}$ The activity of that priest dates to the reigns of Hatshepsut as well as Thutmose III.

## Chronology

There are not enough data to establish the period of construction of the small temple at Medinet Habu with certainty. No data, graffiti, or ostraca from the time of its development have been preserved. Biographies of the officials who fulfilled their functions during the reign of queen Hatshepsut do not mention the temple either. Therefore, the date of the construction of the temple could only be deduced on the basis of indirect evidence.
M. Cozi proposes that the moment when the building process commenced should be shifted to the period after year 17 of the reign of Thutmose III. This date does not appear in any source, nevertheless, the fact that the temple at Medinet Habu is not listed on the walls of the Chapelle Rouge might indicate that it had not been built when the Chapelle Rouge was decorated. ${ }^{41}$ On the other hand, it does not seem to be the ultimate argument as there are some blocks missing from the decoration of Chapelle Rouge. There is enough space for at least three structures among the temples listed in the geographic procession. ${ }^{42}$

There are, however, several arguments which indicate that Hatshepsut indeed began the actual construction of the temple rather late - so late that she did not manage to complete it before the unexpected termination of her rule. One of the arguments in favour of this hypothesis is the presence of the late type of cryptogram frieze in the decoration of the walls. ${ }^{43}$

Another hint which could be useful in an attempt to establish the time of construction of the small temple at Medinet Habu might be the fact that there are no representations of Sen-en-mut behind any door of that building. That official was granted the right, confirmed by a decree recorded on the wall of the temple at Deir el-Bahari, to place his images in all temples of gods in Egypt. ${ }^{44}$ In addition to that, he was the overseer of construction works of a number of Hatshepsut's buildings, yet he does not write about any activity at Medinet Habu in any text. It seems extremely strange as Hatshepsut's steward generally boasted of the he works conducted for the queen. All that seems to indicate that the construction of the small temple at Medinet Habu started when Sen-en-mut fell out of queen's favour, which probably happened after year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{45}$

Summing up, it appears that the small temple at Medinet Habu was erected fairly late, in the final period of the reign of queen Hatshepsut. It was dedicated to Amun-Ra, and its name was $\underline{D} s r$-st from the very beginning. Hatshepsut did not succeed in completing its construction and it is possible that the building did not serve for religious practices during her reign.

[^138]
# Buildings mentioned only in texts Hr.j--hr-Jmn temple 

| Name: | Hr.j-hr-Jmn, Hrj-hr-mrjj-Jmn (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 234) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of the temple <br> according to written sources: | $p r^{1}$ |

## Sources

The name of $H r \cdot j-h r-J m n$ temple is first mentioned in the tomb of Ineni, ${ }^{2}$ which means that the temple was probably built in the times of Hatshepsut's predecessors. It should be noted that it was not a small temple considering the amount of incense which was assigned to it. It received twice as much incense as temples of Mut, Khonsu, Ptah, or the one in Luxor. ${ }^{3}$ This might mean that it was involved in a different type of cult from other temples.

The times of Hatshepsut are a source of only one report concerning finishing works in that edifice. Dua-er-neheh writes on the stela from his tomb TT 125 that he managed(?) "all the works in the august house of $H r j-h r-m r j-J m n$. Its walls, columns, and doors were of ivory, ebony, and $s s n d m$ wood, worked with gold and that which is the best from foreign lands as a tribute from the southern country, the favoured place of her father, Lord of Gods, numerous were the houses on its both sides, and their furnishings were similar. ${ }^{,{ }^{4}}$

The name of Hr.j-hr-Jmn is again noted in Pui-em-Ra's record of temples, ${ }^{5}$ therefore it could be supposed that supplies of incense from the warehouses in Karnak were also delivered there during the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.

A small calcite vessel for oils was found in the course of excavation works in front of the 9th Pylon in Karnak (Fig. 118). ${ }^{6}$ The inscription preserved in its central panel lists the names of Thutmose III, beloved by [Jm]n hrj-jb Her.j-hr-Jmn. Only the final part of the text: [..] $m$ jnr $j r . f \underline{d} t$ is preserved in the horizontal line of the inscription along the top part of its body. ${ }^{7}$ The presence of the name of Amun Who Is Present in Hr.j-hr-Jmn on the artefact discovered at Karnak might be evidence for relationships between the temples and might show not only that the Karnak temple sent goods to the temples on the West Bank but also that the temple of Amun received contribution from across the river.

The sacral nature of this edifice is also implied by the titles of priests associated with the Hr.j-hr-Jmn. The function of the first priest was fulfilled by Amenhotep in the times of the reigns of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II, the title is recorded in the tomb of Amun-em-heb, TT $85 .{ }^{8}$ The inscription preserved on the stela of Neferu, from the times of Amenhotep III, also records the title of jmj-st- ' $n$ Jmn $m$ Hr.j-hr-Jmn, which belonged to that official. ${ }^{9}$

## Location

The location of the Hr.j-hr-Jmn temple is unknown. Sethe suggested in his translation of the name that it was situated opposite the temple of Amun. ${ }^{10}$ Davies believed that the $H r . j-h r$-Jmn could have been the temple erected by Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari in the valley of Deir el-Bahari, possibly on the Lower Terrace of the temple, and suggests that Hatshepsut initially used this name, which was later replaced with

[^139]$\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{11}$ Such interpretation is contradicted by at least two facts. Above all, the foundation deposits indicated the name of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ for the temple of Hatshepsut from the very start, moreover, the temple built in that area by Amenhotep I was completely dismantled around year 16 of the reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{12}$ However, the names of the Hr.j-hr-Jmn temple and Amun with $H r_{r} . j-h r$-Jmn, as well as the names of its priests appear sporadically ${ }^{13}$ in written sources even in the times of Ramesses IX (tomb of Imi-seba, TT 65). ${ }^{14}$

Otto suggests that the term of Hr.j-hr-Jmn should include the whole temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ or even the northern portion of the necropolis. ${ }^{15}$ For Alan H. Gardiner, Ḥrj- $\mathrm{h} r$-Jmn was a place on the West Bank, facing the temple at Karnak ${ }^{16}$ while Pierre Montet would be inclined to locate the building in the vicinity of the temple


Fig. 118. Hr.j-hr-Jmn temple, vessel for oils discovered at Karnak (based on Traunecker, Un vase dédié à Amon, 307, Fig. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk). of Seti I at Qurna. ${ }^{17}$ Helck proposes that it was situated near the Valley Temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w^{18}$ whereas Andrzej Niwiński believes that it could have been established within the Hathor Shrine in the temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w .{ }^{19}$ All these suggestions are derived from the assumption that the name of the building could indicate its location.

Indeed, the name of $H r \cdot j$ - $h r$-Jmn is rather an argument in favour of locating that temple in the northern portion of the area developed in the times of Hatshepsut. It means that it must have been situated near the $H f t-h r-n b . s .{ }^{20}$ As observed on the map, ${ }^{21}$ apart from the temple of $M n$-st erected by Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari, no building attested for the reign of Hatshepsut has been preserved in the north. Analysis of the distances between the preserved edifices indicates that the most likely location is the area near the temple of Seti I at Qurna. Another hypothesis connects Hr.j-hr-Jmn with the temple associated with the cult of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari, possibly even built by them. The floor in the temple of Seti I concealed a New Kingdom sculpture which represented Nakht-Amun worshipping Ahmose Nefertari and Amenhotep I. ${ }^{22}$ Its presence in this very temple is essential for the interpretation of texts from two stelae stored at the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge, recording adoration of Ahmose Nefertari of $\mathrm{Hr} \cdot \mathrm{j}-\mathrm{h} r$ - Jmn ${ }^{23}$ and Nefertari $H r j-J m n$, which confirms the cult of the queen at the temple of $H r, j-h r-J m n$.

The artefacts mentioned above imply that the Hr.j-hr-Jmn temple, related to the cult of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari, could have been situated near the temple of Seti I, however, its location must remain a speculation due to the absence of more conclusive evidence.

Perhaps the function of the temple as a destination for pilgrimages increased the number of ritual activities, which would justify the high demand for incense.

[^140]
# Hnmt-mn temple 

| Name: | Hnmt-mn (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 234) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Type of the temple <br> according to written sources: | no data |  |

## Sources

The Hnmt-mn temple appears only once in written sources, on the list of temples from the tomb of Pui-em-Ra, as a destination for deliveries of incense from the temple at Karnak. ${ }^{1}$ It is not attested on the list of temples represented in the tomb of Ineni, or Rekh-mi-Ra, and is also absent from the Chapelle Rouge, even though that could be a consequence of incompleteness of the two latter documents.

## Interpretation

Davies, followed by Otto, suggests that Thutmose II built the $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ temple, yet he puts a question mark there. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{He}$ admits the hypothesis that the Pui-em-Ra's list was compiled according to the chronology of buildings and not on the basis of topography. At the same time, he notes that such attribution of $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ leads to a certain incongruity and thus further considers Amenhotep I as its founder.

Helck believed that $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ belonged to the group of mortuary temples (Totentempel). ${ }^{3} \mathrm{He}$ concludes that if temples of other rulers are recorded on Pui-em-Ra's list, then the Hnmt-mn temple was the temple of Amenhotep I's cult. As a result, he regards the priests involved in this cult as officials of $\underline{H n m t-m n}$. This conclusion is supported by Franz-Jürgen Schmitz ${ }^{4}$ and Stadelmann, who additionally indicates that $m n$ in the name of the temple was erased, which could imply that it possibly replaced the word Jmn, placed there originally. ${ }^{5}$

Haring believes that it belongs to the group of temples of royal cult (royal memorial temples). ${ }^{6}$
It seems there is no reason to attribute the construction of the temple to earlier rulers than Hatshepsut since the only information about $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ comes from her reign.

## Location

The location of the temple is unknown. It could, however, be supposed that it was built on the site of the temple of Merenptah. There are important arguments in favour of that view.

Above all, it should be noted that other conclusively identified Theban temples from the reign of Hatshepsut were located along the line of farmlands. ${ }^{7}$ The distances separating them were roughly even, and appear to have been calculated in such a manner that the priests carrying the bark on their shoulders could walk from one temple to another. Such a row of buildings stretches from the north as far as the $\mathrm{H}^{-}$$3 h t$ temple, then there is a longer gap, which is followed by the Šspt- $n h$ temple. A much later temple of Merenptah is situated halfway between these two. ${ }^{8}$

Six fragments of blocks, undeniably dated to the reign of Hatshepsut, have been discovered on the grounds of the temple of Merenptah, in the first courtyard (Fig. 119). ${ }^{9}$ Thus a tentative hypothesis could

[^141]a.
d.

b.

c.


Fig. 119. $\underline{H} n m t-m n$ temple, blocks found in the area of the temple of Merenptah (based on Bickel, Tore, Pl. 95; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
be put forward: they could belong to the building of $\underline{H n m t-m n, ~ l o o k e d ~ f o r ~ b y ~ s c h o l a r s . ~ T h e ~ u n c e r t a i n t y ~ i s ~}$ justified by the fact that the blocks could come from the $H^{c}-3 h t$ temple as the closest edifice constructed by Hatshepsut. It appears that the building which they belonged to must have been dismantled quite early. There are preserved traces of Amarna-related erasures (blocks nos 157, 153, 95), however, none of the blocks had been restored, which is opposed to what was noted for $H^{-}-3 h t$ blocks. It is worth emphasising that the cryptogram frieze on block no. 94 had not been chiselled off. The limestone for the construction of the edifice had been sourced in the same quarry as the building material for the temples of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w, H^{-}$ $3 h t$, or partially Hinkt- $n h .{ }^{10}$ For this reason, it should be supposed that the blocks discovered in the temple of Merenptah came from an early structure founded by the queen.

The final argument which could confirm the theory of the existence of an earlier temple in that place is the foundation deposit discovered by William Matthew Flinders Petrie (Fig. 120). ${ }^{11}$ It was found at the back of the temple of Merenptah in a pit containing sand. The deposit accommodated small pottery vessels ${ }^{12}$ devoid of any royal names, dated by Petrie to the times before Amenhotep II. ${ }^{13}$ In view of the absence of inscriptions, the chronology of the feature is uncertain.

## Identification

The discussion cannot omit identification of the $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ temple as the mortuary temple of Ahmose. The source material which could suggest such identification is the titulary of Sen-Amun, Senenmut's brother, noted on his funerary cones. ${ }^{14}$ They include titles associated with king Ahmose. It is fairly unlikely that Sen-
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Fig. 120. $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ temple, vessels from the foundation deposit discovered by Petrie (based on Petrie, Six Temples, 4, Pl. IV [1-8]; digitising Fig. 121. Hnmt-mn temple, Sen-Amun's funerary cones (LD III, Pl. 39 [e]). J. Iwaszczuk).

Amun fulfilled any official function during his reign. When Hatshepsut gained power, the rule of Ahmose had been over for nearly 50 years. Considering the function of $w^{\prime} b$ priest and overseer of granaries of kings Ahmose, Amenhotep I, Thutmose I, Thutmose II, it could be concluded that these granaries belonged to the foundations related to their mortuary cult. The temples of Amenhotep I, Thutmose I, Thutmose II are known, yet there is no data concerning the sanctuary of king Ahmose. Since no place of worship related to that ruler has been attested in Thebes, the complex which encompassed the granary could have been associated with an edifice erected after the king's death. The location among the temples mentioned on the list from Pui-em-Ra's tomb suggests it was the $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ temple that was devoted to the cult of Ahmose.

# Hwt-kz of Ahmose Nefertari 

| Name: | $h w t-k 3 n(t) J^{\prime} h$ - $m s-n f r t-j r j$ (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 235) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of the temple <br> according to written sources: | $h w t-k 3^{1}$ |

The cult of queen Ahmose Nefertari, very popular in the Ramesside Period, seems to have its roots in the times of Hatshepsut. It should be mentioned that there is a vessel inscribed with the name of queen Ahmose Nefertari among the vessels sacrificed to Amun on the south wall of the niche in the Upper Anubis Shrine in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ (Fig. 122), regarded as the chapel of ancestors. ${ }^{2}$ Apart from the cult of Ahmose Nefertari practiced in $M n$-swt, the $h w t-k z$ of the queen is also attested.

The $k 3$ chapel of queen Ahmose Nefertari is found in sources only once, among other buildings mentioned on Pui-em-Ra's list. ${ }^{3}$ No evidence which would confirm the cult of Ahmose Nefertari in the times earlier than the reign of Hatshepsut has been preserved. Thus it could be concluded that it was Hatshepsut who initiated the construction of a chapel dedicated for the cult of that queen.

The location of the structure is unknown. Davies believed that it constituted one of the chapels of Mn swt temple. ${ }^{4}$ The hypothesis seems to be unjustified as the temple was obviously an economically separate edifice. ${ }^{5}$ There are solely two buildings known to have been constructed in West Thebes under Amenhotep I: Mn-swt and the temple erected at Deir el-Bahari. Nevertheless, identification of the hwt-k3 temple of Ahmose Nefertari with the edifice from Deir el-Bahari is unlikely. The former was attested in a late source from the end of the reign of Hatshepsut and the beginning of the sole reign of Thutmose III, the latter was disassembled between years 10 and 16 of Thutmose III's rule. ${ }^{6}$

When the schematic plan of the layout of buildings situated along the cultivation is analysed, ${ }^{7}$ it is difficult to indicate the location of yet another temple. Thus the chapel should perhaps be looked for in the area of Deir el-Medineh. It appears that Deir el-Medineh was a cult place already in the times of Thutmose II as a fragment of a stela commissioned by that ruler has been found. ${ }^{8}$ Additionally, it is confirmed that Hatshepsut showed her interest in that area. A group of tombs dated to her reign, ${ }^{9}$ and vessels stamped with her name ${ }^{10}$ have been found at the settlement. There are also some artefacts associated with Sen-en-mut and Hapu-seneb from that locality. ${ }^{11}$

Moreover, there exist important arguments which indicate an early connection of that region with Ahmose Nefertari. ${ }^{12}$ The cult of that queen at Deir el-Medineh was practiced in a brick chapel. Despite the fact that the chapel was most probably built in the Ramesside Period, ${ }^{13}$ it accommodated some much earlier features. ${ }^{14}$ Therefore, it could be speculated that the Ramesside chapel was erected in the place previously occupied by an older building.

[^143]

Fig. 122. Vessels represented on the south wall of the niche in the Upper Anubis Shrine in $\operatorname{D} s r-\underset{d}{ } d s r w$ (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

This hypothesis seems highly likely if the nature of Ahmose Nefertari cult is taken into consideration. It displays aspects of a popular cult, which could have developed in association with the edifice dedicated to her. By evolving that hypothesis further, it could be supposed that the $h w t-k 3$, a structure attributed to Hatshepsut, was a place of popular cult of that queen.

# Hft-hr-nb.s 

| Name: | Hft-hr-nb.s, Hftt-hr-nb.s (see: Appendix 2: Names of temples, p. 235) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of the temple <br> according to written sources: | - |  |

In 1994, Cozi expressed a suggestion, ${ }^{1}$ which he sustained four years later, ${ }^{2}$ that Medinet Habu originally bore a different name from $\operatorname{Dsr}$-st which is known from written sources, introduced only in the times of Thutmose III. According to Cozi, the original name was Bft-hr-nb.s, mentioned in texts, yet not corroborated by archaeological sources. It seems too radical, bearing in mind the low number of sources which mention $H f t-h r-n b . s$.

The term, translated literally, means "the one that is before the face of her lord", even though the phrase $h f t-h r$ is understood as "on the axis" when referring to the beginning of the 18 th dynasty, and Wörterbuch translates this phrase as "being in front of"3 or "the front part of a building". ${ }^{4}$ In a later period it signified dromos or the forecourt of a temple, ${ }^{5}$ therefore "the one that is on the axis of her lord" should be situated on the axis of the temple at Karnak.

Most authors were engaged in the question of $H f t$ - $h r$-nb.s solely as a marginal part of their works. Sethe supposes that the term Hft-hr-nb.s described not only a part of the city on the West Bank, but also whole Thebes. ${ }^{6}$ Winlock would be inclined to locate Hft-hr-nb.s directly opposite Karnak, as a type of harbour paved with stone, and the name of the crossing would signify whole Thebes. ${ }^{7}$ Otto in his "Topographie des Thebanischen Gaues" puts forward a hypothesis that Hft -hr-nb.s might refer to a quay lined with stonework, nevertheless, it was also the name of the whole necropolis and the temple at Medinet Habu. ${ }^{8}$ Charles F. Nims believes that the original term Hft-hr-nb.s was later replaced with the phrase "Theban settlement" (grg W3st), yet he doubted that it referred to the walled place near Medinet Habu. ${ }^{9}$ Suzanne Ratié understood $H f t-h r$-nb.s as a district located next to the river but also a quay or a fort. She associated stone blocks, the so-called "name stones" with that Theban fort and thus with $H f t-h r-n b . s .{ }^{10}$ Blocks of that type are found in foundations of many structures from the reign of Hatshepsut, both on the eastern and western sides of the river, and there are no data which would account for connecting them with any Theban building, particularly on the western side of the Nile. When Christiane Wallet-Lebrun studied the meaning of $h f t-h r$, she argued that it meant "on the axis" in the times of the 18th dynasty. She noticed that it described both the city of Thebes and the necropolis. Taking that into consideration, she tried to explain that the objects defined with this name, located at Medinet Habu and Deir el-Medineh, were at the same time "on the axis" of the temple at Karnak, which the term Hft-hr-nb.s referred to according to her opinion. She believed that the temple at Karnak constituted the apex of a fictional pyramid, from which the sides of the pyramid issued and encapsulated an area which was identified as located "on the axis". ${ }^{11}$ An important piece of information, which was indicated by Hans Goedicke, was the parallel nature of the names $W_{3} s t$ and $H f t$-hr-nb.s. ${ }^{12} \mathrm{Ag}-$ nès Cabrol writes that the phrase hft-hr in the New Kingdom should be interpreted on a more abstract level than in terms of topography, and if in terms of topography, than as the space in front of a temple, in the case of Hft t hr-nb.s - in front of the temple of Amun at Karnak. ${ }^{13}$ Finally, James P. Allen was of the opinion that "the valley [Deir el-Bahari] itself was part of the region known as Facing Its Lord." ${ }^{14}$
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## The oldest artefacts associated with the construction and renovation of $\boldsymbol{H} f t-h r-n b . s$

The number of artefacts referring to the times before the reign of Hatshepsut, as well as the period of her rule and slightly later is rather low and the name $H f t$ - $h r$-nb.s is merely mentioned there, which is enough to form some hypotheses, but unfortunately too little to draw definite conclusions. Most words which describe $H f t-h r-n b . s$ are either ambiguous or simply incomprehensible.

The first inscription connected with $H f t-h r-n b . s$ was found in Lower Nubia at Nag el-Girgawi. The owner the stela comments on himself: "I am an amiable warrior from Hft-hr-nb.s." ${ }^{15}$ The inscription comes from the times of Senwosret I, and was written down by a scribe called Ren-iker when he was travelling with vizier Antefoker and killing rebels in Nubia. The determinative of $\underset{\text { Hft-hr-nb.s was not preserved, Z. Žaba }}{ }$ reconstructed the determiner of a city on the basis of the empty space. ${ }^{16}$

The example which chronologically came second is the name $H f t-h r-n b . s$ carved on a rock of Tombos island. It refers to the second year of the reign of Thutmose I, when the king "was seated on the throne of Horus to expand the borders of Thebes and hanbwt Hft-ḥr-nb.s." ${ }^{17}$ The word hanbwt is extremely rare, apart from this one case, it is known solely from texts dated to the Ptolemaic Period, where it signifies "surveyed crop fields", ${ }^{18}$ thus its translation as "Bezirke" suggested by Sethe ${ }^{19}$ seems rather impossible to prove. Hans Goedicke comments on this inscription assuming the meaning which is confirmed later and suggests that the lines should be translated in the following manner: "he ascended the dais of Horus, concerning the widening of the borders of Thebes and the measured plots of the West Side., ${ }^{20}$

It poses no doubt that Thutmose I was a great builder of Thebes and he was the one to commence the construction activity, later continued by his daughter, the results of which have been preserved in a very limited number up to this day. Therefore, his building projects on both Theban banks are not surprising. It appears that this fragment should be perceived as a description of the first task of intentional development of the area of West Thebes. It is supposed that the bank had been populated since the times of the Old Kingdom, when the first tombs at the Theban necropolis were shaped. Settlement activity is also corroborated for the Middle Kingdom, which can be observed on Ren-iker's stela, however, it probably did not function in an organised system and Thutmose I decided to change it. His decision seems important as he mentions it in connection with taking the throne. Goedicke accentuates the parallel nature of both cities: Thebes and $H f t-h r$-nb.s, which appears also in another text.

Ineni began his career as an official during the reign of Thutmose I. He writes in his biography that he "reached old age in the southern city, dignity in $H f t-h r-n b . s .{ }^{" 21}$ The word jm3hw, ${ }^{22}$ which appears there translated as dignity, although it is used to describe noble elderly people, it mostly refers to the noble dead. Perhaps this is how it should be understood in this case.

Another use of $H f t-h r-n b . s$ in the context of building activity is noted on the stela of Hatshepsut, at the moment stored in Vatican. ${ }^{23}$ The location where it was discovered is unknown, Luisa Bongrani Fanfoni states that it comes from Karnak. ${ }^{24}$ The upper portion of the stela features a ritual scene - Hatshepsut accompanied by Thutmose III offers $n w$ vessels to Amun-Ra. The goddess who stands behind Thutmose III, described as $W_{3} s t-h f t-h r-n b . s$, is turned in the same direction as Amun. She bears the sign of the Theban Nome on her head and holds a bow with arrows in her hand. Personification of Thebes was represented in the same manner. ${ }^{25}$

Hatshepsut announces on the stela Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vatican 22780 (Fig. 123) that she "made (it) as her monument for her father Amun, lord of the thrones of the two lands, i.e. erecting $H f t-h r-n b . s$ for him anew, as work for eternity, and its banks were strengthened with stone. ${ }^{.26}$ The phrase $m$ mzwt means that $H f t-h r$-nb.s had existed before, but Hatshepsut decided to create it "from the start", and its "edges/

[^145]Fig. 123. Stela Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vatican 22780 (based on Botti, Romanelli, Le sculture, Pl. LIX [128]; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

banks" were strengthened (dnj) with stone. The word recorded there was "edge/bank", not "border" or "wall", which should be expected in this place. The word jhmt, as stated in Wörterbuch, is: a bank (of a river) or an edge (of a valley). ${ }^{27}$ Another word connected with water is the aforementioned $d n j$ translated as strengthen in this case. This word normally means to build a floodbank, line with an embankment, and again it refers to a river, not a land surface. ${ }^{28}$ It could be concluded from the above that Hatshepsut strengthened the river banks or edges of the canals along $H f t-h r-n b . s$ with stone, or it could be an allusion to the harbour. Unfortunately, this type of activity is not possible to detect in archaeological material at present.

On the other hand, the word Hft-hr-nb.s was inscribed inside a representation of rectangular walls, which would suggest that it was surrounded with a wall. The wall might not have been built of stone, as it seems more likely to have been constructed from mud brick.

It is possible that the original location of the city corresponded with the meaning of its name and indeed the initial settlement activity was concentrated in the area "on the axis" of the temple at Karnak, in the vicinity of emerging tombs at el-Tarif or Dra Abu el-Naga. ${ }^{29}$ When the later grounds of Hft-ḥr-nb.s are investigated, both the necropolis and the temple at Medinet Habu should be taken into consideration. It could be imagined that the space which was supposed to be enclosed was vast, even if it is evident that the

[^146]enclosure would not have to be erected along the gebel, which itself formed a boundary difficult to cross. It is unclear whether the project incorporated the farming land, perhaps it was only applied to the necropolis, temples, and dwelling areas. Delivery of such an enormous amount of stone would not be left without any comment in written sources. It does not seem that local stone was used, the quarry was fairly small and the number of construction projects which that limestone was employed for was remarkable. The building of such a structure would require an immense investment of labour and resources, and its relics would have survived a long time after the reign of Hatshepsut. However, neither texts nor the area in question indicate any traces of this type of stone structure.

Another artefact which refers to Hft-hr-nb.s is a granite stela founded by Thutmose III. It was discovered at Karnak, next to the 6th Pylon, in the northern courtyard in front of the Palace of Maat. ${ }^{30}$ It describes events from year 24 of the reign of Thutmose III, which means times of his sole rule. The king announces: "My majesty formed a desire to create a monument for my father Amun-Ra at Karnak, i.e. construction ( $s ' h($ ) of a sanctuary, consecration ( $s d s r$ ) of the horizon, decoration ( $s m n h$ ) of Hft-hr-nb.s for him, the beloved place from the beginning of my father Amon-Ra, the lord of the thrones of the two lands. ${ }^{{ }^{31}}$

This is one more case which leaves the scholar faced with a dilemma, yet this time it involves an excess, not a lack of meaning. The word smnh rendered as decorate also means equip, embellish, place, establish, ${ }^{32}$ and practically every translator translates it differently, at the same time changing the essence of the sentence - James Henry Breasted: adorn, ${ }^{33}$ Sethe: Einrichtung, ${ }^{34}$ Paul Barguet: construire, ${ }^{35}$ Jürgen von Beckerath: verschönern. ${ }^{36}$ It is difficult to grasp what action Thutmose III actually undertook. The matter is additionally complicated by the fact that the stela does not bear the date of its foundation, and only further part of the text refers to year 24 as the year of the foundation ceremony of 3 h - $\mathrm{mnw} .{ }^{37}$ It is possible, therefore, that Thutmose III, even though he claims in the text later on to have never attributed to himself any structures erected by other rulers, in fact comments on the same event which transpired in the times of Hatshepsut and regards it as his own project.
$H f t-h r-n b . s$ appears once more on the poetic stela of Thutmose III, which depicts the personification of Hfft-hr-nb.s. It was represented in the same manner as on the stela from Vatican, and its name is inscribed within the circle of walls in the same way as on that stela, which refers to the building of the structure from the start.

## Interpretation

The necropolis at $H f t-h r-n b . s$ in the times of Hatshepsut is not directly reported, nevertheless, Ineni's inscriptions should possibly be understood as an allusion to a cemetery. The tomb of Neb-Amun (TT 65) from the reign of Hatshepsut also accommodates an unpublished inscription which says that: "the spirit of the dead walks out to see the sun at $H f t t-h r-n b . s$ as it goes to rest. ${ }^{338}$ Cozi states that the tombs which report the necropolis at $H f t-h r-n b . s$, dated to the times of Amenhotep I on to the Roman Period, are scattered over the range from Dra Abu el-Naga, to Sheikh Abd el-Qurna, el-Khokha, Deir el-Bahari, up to Deir el-Medineh. ${ }^{39}$

The name $H f t$-hr-nb.s appears repeatedly in the Ramesside Period, mostly referring to the necropolis ${ }^{40}$ but also to the city. ${ }^{41}$ The royal epithet was recorded with the determinative of the city in the temple of Seti I at Qurna, where the king was described as the one who renovated (sm3) Hftt-hr-nb.s. It could be supposed that the walls erected by Hatshepsut were still preserved under this ruler, although they required repairs.

[^147]Rolf Gundlach states, alluding to i.a. the stela from Vatican, that $H f t-h r$-nb.s was situated "Regierungspalast" together with the hearing hall $\left(d_{3} d w\right)$ in the times of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{42}$ This information was later referred to by Karin Stephan. ${ }^{43}$ Unfortunately, this statement seems to be unjustified in view of the present state of research. Spiegelberg ${ }^{44}$ used the term palace for the wall unearthed on the northern side of the Valley Temple of Hatshepsut, in the spot he described as Birabi. ${ }^{45}$ However, mud brick was not only employed to build palaces, but also buildings for economic applications, which can be shown with the example of the structure discovered by the French mission at the Ramesseum. The preliminary report informs that it had a barrel vault, which would indicate its function as a storeroom. ${ }^{46}$ The palace of Hatshepsut has not been found yet.

Summing up, it seems that $H f t-h r-n b . s$ was a big area on the western side of Thebes. It was surrounded with a wall built of mud brick and its quay was paved with stones. That space accommodated dwelling structures, and possibly also farming land as well as the necropolis.
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# Royal tombs <br> Tomb at Wadi Gabbanat el-Qurud, Sikket Taqet Zeid A1 

| Location: | h | 310 m a.s.l. |  | La | $25^{\circ} 44^{\prime}$ |  | $32^{\circ} 35^{\prime}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orientation: | a ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ ) | no data | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data | $\delta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | no data | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | no data |
| Dimensions: | H | 6.7 m |  | W | 20 m | L | 24.3 m |  |
| Archaeological work: |  | 1916 - Earl of Carnarvon, Howard Carter 1921 - Émile Baraize |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

The region of the Southern Valleys is still difficult to access and rarely visited (Fig. 124), and in the times of the early 18 th dynasty it was an excellent location to conceal a tomb. It seems that Hatshepsut was the first to exploit the potential of the Valleys. She had a tomb carved in rock to hold her body as a royal wife, before she assumed royal titles. ${ }^{1}$

The badly cracked and fissured rock massif of the first valley in the south of Wadi Gabbanat el-Qurud, today called Sikket Taqet Zeid, reached a height of $112.0 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{2}$ The place selected for the creation of the tomb was a natural fissure, which was slightly expanded (Fig. 124b). The tomb remained almost invisible from the outside, the chiselled lower portion, shaped into a stepped niche at the bottom of the rock face under the entrance of the tomb (Fig. 124c, 125), was the only trace left by the works. It should be remembered that other tombs carved in the Southern Valleys also showed that trait. Perhaps the rock was chiselled to form a contraption for a structure used to lift a heavy sarcophagus, or to dispose of the rock material removed from the inside. It is also possible that this chiselled form was a type of false door, which served as a communication channel between the deceased and the world.

The layout of the tomb differed significantly from most tombs carved in the Southern Valleys, it bore closer resemblance to the tombs of Ahmose Nefertari and Meritamon (DB 358). ${ }^{3}$

The entrance to the tomb was situated in the lower part of a rock fissure, at a height of 70.0 m over the bottom of the valley. It was narrow - the width reached approx. $1 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{4}$ From the entrance, a steep staircase (see plan, Fig. $126[A]$ ) and then a descending corridor of a length of 17.0 m and a height of $2.2 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~B})^{5}$ led to a room with a square floor (C). The axis of the tomb turned south at an angle of $90^{\circ}$ in that room. Its south-eastern corner featured the entrance to another corridor (D), which was approx. 5.3 m long, and led down to the chamber ( E ) where the sarcophagus was found. That was the largest room of the tomb, it measured $5.4 \times 5.3 \mathrm{~m}$, and its height reached $3.0 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{6}$ The corridor (F) carved in the floor of this room, in its mid-length, opened to the last room (G). The final part of the corridor was narrower than the rest. The work on the last room had not been completed, the workers had begun carving the chamber in the rock, but the task had obviously been abandoned. ${ }^{7}$ The north wall is the only one which was shaped to its finished form. This layout of rooms, with a ramp leading to a chamber located below, is compared with some royal tombs by Roehrig. ${ }^{8}$

The sarcophagus, with its lid supported on its western side, ${ }^{9}$ was discovered abandoned by the workers in chamber E , over the entrance to corridor F . It was made of yellow quartzite, ${ }^{10}$ and reached, together with
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Fig. 124. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Southern Valleys: a) view of the Southern Valleys from the north-east; b) view of the tomb of Hatshepsut; c) tomb of Hatshepsut (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
the lid, a height of $90.0 \mathrm{~cm},{ }^{11}$ length of 1.99 m , width of $0.73 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{12}$ It had not been painted, and differed in that respect from other sarcophagi, which displayed remains of painted decoration. ${ }^{13}$ Four external walls bear preserved marks of contour lines painted red. ${ }^{14}$ There are five shallow oval depressions on the top surface of the lid. ${ }^{15}$

[^150]

Fig. 125. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Southern Valleys, section of the rock at the level of the tomb of Hatshepsut (based on Carter, A Tomb Prepared for Queen Hatshepsut, Pl. XX; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 126. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Southern Valleys, plan and section of the tomb of Hatshepsut (based on Carter, A Tomb Prepared for Queen Hatshepsut, Pl. XXI; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).


Apart from the sarcophagus, Carter reported a discovery of two necks of vessels, probably used by the workers who carved the tomb. ${ }^{16}$

The same room housed limestone slabs of various sizes, polished on one side, ${ }^{17}$ which were scattered in the front part of the chamber. They were interpreted in a number of ways. Their discoverer, Carter, supposed that they had been intended to serve as support for the sarcophagus or blockage of the room. ${ }^{18}$ Baraize believed that they were the frame of the platform for the sarcophagus, ${ }^{19}$ however, Elizabeth Thomas argued with Baraize and suggested that the slabs he had described and reconstructed could not have been the ones reported by Carter. ${ }^{20}$ Therefore, it would be another assemblage of artefacts found in chamber E.

Carter did not precisely describe the slabs he had discovered, but he compared them to the slabs found in another tomb of the queen, carved in the Valley of the Kings (KV 20) and in the tomb of Thutmose I (KV 38). In both cases, they were decorated with an inscription from the Book of Amduat. ${ }^{21}$

[^151]
## Tomb KV 20

| Location: <br> Orientation: ${ }^{1}$ | h | 197.51 m a.s.1. |  |  | La | $25^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}$ |  | Lo | $32^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{a}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | 274 |  | $\mathrm{h}\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}\right.$ | $20 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | $12^{1 / 4}$ |  | D ( ${ }^{\circ}$ | 91/2 |
| Dimensions: | H | 96.0 m |  |  | W | - |  | L | 213.5 m |  |
| Type of constr according to | sour |  | $h r t^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Archaeological work: ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | s of $\mathbf{t}$ oleon vanni - John <br> tion - Karl ping <br> ical w <br> s Bur <br> - How | lers: <br> edition <br> ista Be <br> rdner <br> ks: <br> chard L <br> ect <br> s: <br> Carter | ni kinson ius |  |  |  |  |

a - azimuth; h - angular height of the horizon; $\delta$ - declination; D - difference in degrees between the main axis of the temple and the average direction of the flow of the Nile at the temple location

KV 20 is the longest tomb in the Valley of the Kings and has no comparable counterparts. ${ }^{4}$ It is not certain when Hatshepsut commenced its construction as a new royal tomb, although it is likely that it took place soon after her coronation. ${ }^{5}$ Scholars differ in their opinions on that subject. It is also unclear who supervised the construction works. Some scholars believe that the task was entrusted to Hapu-seneb, who mentions on a statue stored in the Louvre that he supervised the building of the royal tomb. ${ }^{6}$ However, Luc Delvaux, who examined the statue of the official, notices that the royal cartouche recorded in this context is an original cartouche of Thutmose II. ${ }^{7}$

## Orientation of the tomb

The intentional topographic relationship between tomb KV 20 and the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir elBahari was already noticed by Winlock. ${ }^{8}$ Although he was wrong in his interpretation of the topography of West Thebes, as he had mistaken the precise location of the $\underline{H n m t}$ - $n h$ temple by situating it between the temple of Amenhotep I and the Valley Temple of Hatshepsut, ${ }^{9}$ it does not lessen the general validity of his

[^152]conclusions. He indicates the relationship between the removal of the body of Thutmose I to tomb KV 20 and the construction of the chapel devoted to his cult in the temple of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{10}$ Thomas ${ }^{11}$ and Polz ${ }^{12}$ seem to agree with these conclusions.

Peter Der Manuelian and Christian E. Loeben suggested that the builders intended to situate the tomb of Hatshepsut as an extension of the axis of her temple. ${ }^{13}$ Spence, on the other hand, states that the original design of the temple, marked by the arrangement and contents of the foundation deposits, shows that the original plan did not involve a connection between the temple and tomb KV 20, i.e. the construction of the temple preceded the beginning of work on the tomb. ${ }^{14}$

Friedrich Abitz undertook an analysis of tomb KV 20 as part of his study of the axes of tombs in the Valley of the Kings. According to him, the connection between the diversion of the axis and the sarcophagus chamber existed only in the first phase of construction. ${ }^{15}$ The bends were most probably forced by technical necessity, the alignment towards the temple of the queen at Deir el-Bahari was most likely a consequence of subsequent rebuilding of the tomb. ${ }^{16}$ The presence of large chambers in the tomb should, according to him, be explained with practical reasons associated with the construction works, as they were hewn for the workers so that they could breathe. ${ }^{17}$

Polz delivered a completely different interpretation. ${ }^{18}$ First of all, he emphasises a strong topographic connection between the tomb of Hatshepsut and her temple at Deir el-Bahari, which followed the example of the relationship of the nearby tomb of Mentuhotep II with his temple. ${ }^{19}$ According to that scholar, the tomb of the queen, together with her temple, was ideologically and theologically related to the temple of Amun at Karnak, and was also the venue of cultic events which originated there. ${ }^{20}$

## Foundation deposit

Carter discovered a single foundation deposit at a distance of approx. 2.5 m from the entrance to tomb KV 20. It was inserted in a recess carved in the rock which was 50 cm deep and had a diameter of $40 \mathrm{~cm} .^{21}$ The artefacts were separated with layers of sand and the contents were covered with limestone chips. ${ }^{22}$ Unfortunately, the deposit has not been preserved in an ideal state - a part was moved by water towards the entrance corridor, where an assemblage of calcite vases has been discovered. ${ }^{23}$ A small calcite vessel and a faience scarab, both signed with the name of Hatshepsut, which were found near the tomb of Thutmose IV (KV 43), most likely also belonged to that deposit. ${ }^{24}$ The artefacts discovered in the foundation deposit are comparable to the ones unearthed in the richest foundation deposits of the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple, both in regards to the variety of the objects and their number. Weinstein lists 185 objects altogether, such as: calcite vessels for oils, pottery vessels, brick moulds, trowels, axes, knives, adzes, chisels, pottery saucers, mats, baskets, linen sheets, nekhakha flail, tjes knot, mesekhtiyu instruments. ${ }^{25}$ In addition to that, "some hammers" ${ }^{26}$ and "lots of bread bits" ${ }^{27}$ are mentioned.
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Fig. 127. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Valley of the Kings (KV 20): plan and section of the tomb of Hatshepsut in the Valley of the Kings (KV 20) (based on http://www.thebanmappingproject.com/sites/browse_tomb_834.html, accessed November 22, 2016; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Two vessels, stored in the Oriental Institute Museum in Chicago, are also associated with tomb KV 20. ${ }^{28}$ Additionally, two hoes, now in the collection of the Czartoryski Museum in Cracow, most likely come from the tomb. ${ }^{29}$

## Architecture of the tomb (Fig. 127)

Tomb KV 20 is located in the easternmost part of the valley, with an entrance situated on the bottom of a crevice, ${ }^{30}$ at a height of 197.51 m a.s. $1 .{ }^{31}$ Some chambers were hewn in limestone layers, others in the Esna shale. ${ }^{32}$ The length of the tomb is disputable, after adding all the dimensions, without the double dimensions of the chambers and the adjacent staircases, it reaches 182.36 m (if staircases are counted) or 190.81 m (if the chambers are counted). The depth of the tomb, based on the plans of the Theban Mapping Project, is $92.5 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{33}$

There were steps, no longer visible, which led to the tomb. The entrance carved in the rock was 1.42 m wide, 5.02 m long, and led to the door which reached a height of 1.93 m and width of 1.36 m . Both the entrance and the door were finished, however, they were not decorated. ${ }^{34}$

A steep descending corridor (B) led from the door, and in the middle of its length bent clockwise at a small angle $\left(7.23^{\circ}\right)$. It was 23.58 m long, 1.65 m wide, and 2.15 m high. ${ }^{35}$ On the left side of the corridor, in the times of Carter, there were steps of a staircase which reached a width of 70 cm . Sjef Willockx believes

[^154]that the stairs could have extended along all the corridors of the tomb. ${ }^{36}$ Sockets for wooden beams were carved in the upper parts of the corridor walls.

The corridor finished with another door ( C 1 ) which was 1.86 m high, 1.36 m wide, 1.1 m thick, ${ }^{37}$ and opened to another corridor. The latter resembled corridor B: it featured a similar clockwise bend, as well as narrow steps, wider and wider towards the entrance to room C 1 , which have been preserved next to the left wall, and the upper parts of the walls also have sockets for wooden beams. However, corridor C 1 displayed different proportions, it was wider and shorter as it reached a length of 14.7 m , height of 2.03 m , and width of $2.32 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{38}$

Corridor C 1 led to room C 1 . The room was of a trapezoid shape and its dimensions were as follows: length 6.73 m , width 5.16 m , height $1.85 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{39}$ Its central part was occupied by a staircase which divided the room into halves and led down. The walls of the staircase had sockets for wooden beams.

The staircase closed with a door (D1) which was 2.12 m high, 2.63 m wide, 0.9 m thick. ${ }^{40}$ A straight corridor (D1) led from the door southwards, its dimensions were: length 23.41 m , width 2.05 m , height $2.08 \mathrm{~m} .{ }^{41}$ Another staircase was situated on the left section of the floor. Four sets of sockets for wooden beams have been preserved in the upper part of the walls. Corridor (D1) was separated with a narrowing, possibly a door to another corridor (C2). ${ }^{42}$ That corridor reached a length of 16.32 m , width of 1.66 m , and height of 1.88 m . At a distance of approx. 2 m from the beginning of the corridor the rock layer transitioned from limestone to the Esna shale. ${ }^{43}$ Stairs extended along the left side of the corridor. The corridor was straight and then at the end it bent clockwise and led to the next room (C2).

Corridor G led from room J1 to room J2, which functioned as the burial chamber. According to Carter, there were stairs hewn along the whole width of the corridor, still visible in the 1960s, ${ }^{44}$ but no longer possible to distinguish during the research associated with the Theban Mapping Project. ${ }^{45}$ That corridor was 6.11 m long, 1.93 m wide, 1.36 m high. ${ }^{46}$ Various elements of grave goods have been found within that space: fragments of stone vessels with the names of Ahmose Nefertari (Fig. 128), Thutmose I, and Hatshepsut. ${ }^{47}$

Room J2 was carved at a right angle to corridor G, along the north-south axis. The ceiling of the room was supported by three pillars, ${ }^{48}$ only the central one has been preserved, the other two cannot be seen anymore. ${ }^{49}$ The room was 11.1 m long, 5.45 m wide, 2.7 m high, ${ }^{50}$ and suffered the most serious damage of all chambers in the tomb. Its ceiling has almost completely fallen off, two of the three pillars have been destroyed, and the walls are also in a poor state of preservation. ${ }^{51}$ This is the room where two sarcophagi with separately situated lids and a canopic chest were discovered, together with 15 limestone slabs decorated with scenes from the Book of Amduat, fragments of a large wooden statue, slightly burned fragments of a wooden coffin and chests, fragments of vessels, faience and incrustations. ${ }^{52}$ The sarcophagus of Hatshepsut was deposited on its left side in the north-western section of the room, between the wall and the northern pillar, the sarcophagus of Thutmose I was also displaced and stationed on the other side of the pillar, and the canopic chest of Hatshepsut was placed between the sarcophagi, next to the same pillar. Carved con-
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Fig. 128. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Valley of the Kings (KV 20): (based on Davis, Naville, Carter, The Tomb of Hâtshopsîtû, 104, Fig. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
cavities were discovered in the south-western corner and under the sarcophagus of Hatshepsut, corresponding in size with her sarcophagus and the canopic chest. ${ }^{53}$ The concavities, however, could not be seen by the researchers involved in the Theban Mapping Project. ${ }^{54}$ Thomas estimates the concavity in the south-western corner as not proportional to the relatively small canopic chest and suggests it was a place where works were commenced on carving another niche for the sarcophagus of Thutmose I, which was aligned in the same direction as the sarcophagus of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{55}$ Nevertheless, it should be noted that this concavity differs from the one carved for the sarcophagus of the queen: while the concavity carved for her sarcophagus was slightly removed from the wall, the other one reached the wall. If the sarcophagi had been planned to be placed symmetrically, that concavity should have been situated away from the wall. In addition to that, this hypothesis is dubious due to the fact that the sarcophagus placed in the south-western corner would lack an adjacent storage room.

Three side rooms issue from room J2. They are interpreted as storage chambers and are closely related to the sarcophagi and their location. The entrances to the chambers were situated at the foot of each sarcophagus, thus J2a and J2b were associated with the sarcophagus of Hatshepsut while J2c - with the sarcophagus of Thutmose I. ${ }^{56}$ The rooms were fairly small and not very well constructed.

The state of preservation of the tomb is poor. When Carter unearthed subsequent rooms, he had to force his way through a layer of bound fill brought with water. ${ }^{57}$ Ceilings had fallen off in some rooms (e.g. rooms J1 and J2), walls were badly damaged, and stairs almost impossible to identify. Carter distinguished three sediment layers in room J1: ancient layer, material brought with water, and debris from the collapsed ceiling. ${ }^{58}$

## Artefacts associated with the tomb

There is an assemblage of artefacts which have not been found in the tomb itself, but associated with it on the basis of various arguments. The so-called royal box in tomb DB 320 at Deir el-Bahari accommodated a chest signed with the queen's name, which contained mummified liver or spleen. ${ }^{59}$ Other objects bearing inscriptions with the queen's names, the so-called throne and senet game with its pieces, were found, according to Greville Chester, in one of the side rooms in the tomb of Ramesses IX, under a loose stone. ${ }^{60}$ John Romer discovered wooden fragments of an anthropoid coffin with inscriptions which contained feminine endings in tomb KV 4, ${ }^{61}$ associated with Ramesses XI. Perhaps the sandstone fragment with the $M_{3}{ }^{2} t$ -$k_{3}-R^{\prime}$ cartouche found on a path by Carter in the course of his research conducted in tombs KV 6, KV 9, KV 11, KV 16, KV 17, and KV 35 should also be associated with tomb KV 20. ${ }^{62}$

[^156]This tomb was probably also the source of some objects which are now parts of museum collections: three small jasper leopard heads, ${ }^{63}$ two shabtis of Hatshepsut, ${ }^{64}$ kohl container, ${ }^{65}$ fragment of a magic wand,,${ }^{66}$ and knife handle. ${ }^{67}$

## The functioning and chronology of the tomb

## KV 20 as the original tomb of Hatshepsut

Carter admitted no doubt that tomb KV 20 was the original tomb of queen Hatshepsut. ${ }^{68}$ This hypothesis has been supported by other scholars. ${ }^{69}$ It was implied by the presence of the foundation deposit of the queen discovered near the entrance and of the two sarcophagi, canopic chest, and other artefacts inscribed with her name. ${ }^{70}$ Such a conclusion can also be drawn from the reconstruction of the slabs decorated with texts and images from the Book of Amduat. ${ }^{71}$ Another argument which indicates Hatshepsut as the one who commissioned the construction of the tomb in this place is its topographic relationship with the temple of the queen at Deir el-Bahari. ${ }^{72}$

If it seems very likely that tomb KV 20 was prepared for Hatshepsut, it should be assumed that the coffin with the body of her father, Thutmose I, was a secondary interment. It is suggested, above all, by the preparation of sarcophagus C for the king. It was initially planned for Hatshepsut as the king since the original decoration contained her throne name. Not only was the sarcophagus covered with a secondary decoration, ${ }^{73}$ but also re-carved when it was proven too small for the coffin of Thutmose I. ${ }^{74}$ This re-carving can be recognised by the damage of the parts of the decoration around the head and feet on the inner side.

Some artefacts which most likely came from the original burial of Thutmose I were moved together with his coffin. These artefacts included objects dedicated to the king by Thutmose II, by Hatshepsut as the queen, or by queen Ahmose Nefertari. ${ }^{75}$

[^157]
## KV 38 as the original tomb of Thutmose I

The discussion on the function and chronology of tomb KV 20 also concerns tomb KV 38. Ever since it was discovered, some scholars have argued that it had been carved for Thutmose I during his reign and it could be identified with the tomb whose construction was supervised by Ineni. ${ }^{76}$ Others believe that tomb KV 38 was carved under Thutmose III for the purpose of the secondary removal of the coffin of Thutmose I. ${ }^{77}$

There is no unquestionable evidence but only tentative arguments to support these hypotheses. One of the most convincing reasons in favour of the original location of Thutmose I in KV 38 is its first position in the sequence of tomb development: $:^{78}$ the tomb is relatively small in comparison to two other which display similar traits (KV 42 and KV 34), like the other two it has an oval burial chamber and features an anti-clockwise bend. However, it differs in regards to the number of additional chambers - there is only one, and possibly the number of pillars as well as the absence of a well, which first appears in the tomb of Thutmose III, KV 34. It seems that if tomb KV 38 had been carved under Thutmose III, it would feature, instead of curved corridors, turns at right angles, which seems to be the rule in tomb KV 42. In addition to that, the presence of the well in the tomb of Thutmose III, KV 34, which is also present in the tomb of Amenhotep II, KV 35, but absent in KV 38 and KV 42, suggests that KV 38 and KV 42 are older than KV 34.

The uninscribed foundation deposit seems to be another serious argument to date tomb KV 38 to the times of Thutmose I. ${ }^{79}$ No foundation deposits of Thutmose I or Thutmose II are known to be inscribed with their names. Nevertheless, it should be emphasised that two uninscribed foundation deposits were unearthed under two columns dated to the times of Thutmose I, situated in the courtyard of the 5th Pylon at Karnak. ${ }^{80}$ The foundation deposit discovered in the so-called Treasury of Thutmose I was not inscribed either. ${ }^{81}$ Since the foundation deposits of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were signed with their names, it seems likely that the uninscribed deposit, extremely rare one, comes from the times of Thutmose I.

The location of the tomb in relation to the temple of the king erected by Hatshepsut should also be mentioned. The relationship of these two structures seems to correspond with the relationship of tomb KV 20 with the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari or with the relationship of the tomb of Thutmose III, KV 34, with the Hinkt- $n h$ temple.

Romer is the scholar who does not believe KV 38 was the original tomb of Thutmose I. His theory is based on the notion according to which room J 1 in tomb KV 20 was much larger than burial chamber J 2 , and for this reason was initially prepared to be a burial chamber, while Hatshepsut only expanded the tomb by adding a staircase and room J 2 , i.e. the later proper burial chamber. ${ }^{82}$ The main arguments put forward by Romer were based on his studies of the architectural module employed in tomb KV 20. The research into the architectural module of temple buildings under Hatshepsut ${ }^{83}$ indicate that Romer's arguments concerning the module used in the temple of Hatshepsut ${ }^{84}$ are incorrect. Moreover, his studies on the shape of the tomb are based on the plan made by Carter, which seems to be merely a schematic drawing in the light of accurate measurements taken by the Theban Mapping Project team. Room J1 measures 7.18 m in its widest part as opposed to 5.45 m in burial chamber J 2 , however, it is irregular in shape and pear-shaped, therefore, it is difficult to compare it with the much more regular burial chamber. In addition to that, it should be noted that no traits of room J1 indicate that it could function as a burial chamber, e.g. it does not have a characteristic concavity for the sarcophagus.

Romer supposes that the foundation deposits were inserted after the tomb had been hewn as otherwise they would have been damaged by the workers. He estimates that Hatshepsut's foundation deposit found near the entrance was very moderate in comparison with the ones discovered at Deir el-Bahari. These are rather subjective arguments, and additionally it seems that the evaluation of the deposit is biased - it contains nearly 200 artefacts, some of them gilded, exceptionally varied - it is not inferior to the deposits from Deir el-Bahari. Moreover, it can be estimated that the deposit was inserted very early since it did not incorporate any scarabs, which are typical artefacts in late deposits at Deir el-Bahari. Romer believes that

[^158]the wooden cartouche of Thutmose I, found in the Valley between KV 34 and KV 20 could have come from the original deposit of that ruler. ${ }^{85}$ However, it should be noted that wooden cartouches did not constitute a standard element of foundation deposits and have not been found in any deposit from the early 18th dynasty. Therefore, it seems more likely that the wooden cartouche was a part of grave goods, perhaps a fragment of a piece of furniture. Romer also claims that deposits earlier than those dated to the times of Hatshepsut have not been attested, nevertheless, as it has been mentioned above, two anonymous foundation deposits have been found under columns planted by Thutmose I at Karnak, ${ }^{86}$ which might suggest that the anonymous deposit discovered in association with tomb KV 38 was placed there in the times of that king. The foundation deposits of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were signed with the names of the rulers. ${ }^{87}$

According to Romer, the arrangement of the sarcophagi in tomb KV 20 was designed from the start to accommodate two of them. However, the presence of only one concavity below the sarcophagus of Hatshepsut and one corresponding with the shape of a chest for Canopic jars implies that the two burials were not treated in the same manner.

The decoration on the limestone slabs seems to be second one made of prefabricated components, following the example of the Chapelle Rouge. It suggests, more than it would in the case of decoration carved directly on the walls, that the architectural construction of the tomb had been completed. It can be concluded so, regardless of Romer's theory of unfinished construction works in the tomb, ${ }^{88}$ as such works and associated pollution might have affected the state of the decoration. The slabs could have only been brought to the tomb after the work related to carving and only for the purpose of being mounted on the walls. It is difficult to establish how much of the mounting work was completed. It seems intriguing that similar slabs, although undecorated, have been found in the tomb of the queen at Sikket Taqet Zeid A1. ${ }^{89}$ Therefore, either this type of decoration of tomb walls was characteristic for Hatshepsut, or the slabs from the queen's tomb in the Southern Valleys were planned to be moved to her royal tomb. It could be supposed that only some of them were finished and transported, but the work, due to the disappearance of Hatshepsut was not completed. ${ }^{90}$ It seems surprising that despite the ultimate plan to hold two sarcophagi in the burial chamber, the builders carved a concavity for only one of them. It could be an argument in favour of the claim that the tomb decoration had been completed at the moment of the modification of the plan and that the second sarcophagus, destined for Hatshepsut, was added, as well as that the two sarcophagi changed their locations between each other.

There exists a contradiction between two opinions expressed by Romer, who identifies KV 20 as the original tomb of Thutmose I, but at the same time indicates its clockwise curvature, characteristic for tombs which accommodated women, while male burials were associated with tombs of anti-clockwise structure. ${ }^{91}$

Hartwig Altenmüller believes ${ }^{92}$ that the chronology proposed by Romer does not correspond with tomb KV 20, which typologically deviates from the scheme of royal tomb development of that period. He also expresses his doubts related to the interpretation of the sarcophagi discovered in tombs KV 38 and KV 20. He assumes Thutmose I was originally buried in a wooden coffin in tomb KV 38, and a tomb with sarcophagus A was carved for Hatshepsut as the great royal wife in the Southern Valley. After the coronation, the queen began to build her temple at Deir el-Bahari and at the same time to carve topographically related tomb KV 20, regarding the tomb in the Southern Valley as a cenotaph. Altenmüller accepts Romer's concept concerning the extension of the tomb without reservations - he believes that the queen intended the tomb only for herself and finished it with burial chamber J1, yet after the change of plans, she undertook the task of expanding the tomb, as well as preparation of the offering chapel of Thutmose I at Deir el-Bahari. Directly after taking the throne, Hatshepsut had two sarcophagi (C and D according to Hayes) made, to place them in the tomb and the cenotaph, where the royal sarcophagus C would replace sarcophagus $\mathrm{A} .{ }^{93}$ Next, due to the plan of incorporating the coffin of Thutmose I in tomb KV 20, another change transpired and sarcophagus C, intended for the tomb in the Southern Valley, was eventually placed in tomb KV 20. Nevertheless, it should be noted that it is a purely theoretical concept since no activity was detected in the tomb at Sikket Taqet Zeid A1 after Hatshepsut had assumed power. Altenmüller also supposes that it was

[^159]Hatshepsut who commissioned the preparation of sarcophagus E (found in KV 38), but the plan of placing it in KV 20 was not carried out: sarcophagus E was situated in tomb KV 38 as the cenotaph of Thutmose I. After the death of Hatshepsut, both cenotaphs ceased to function, and the mummy of Thutmose I was moved back to tomb KV 38, which had been restored for that purpose. Sarcophagus F (found in the tomb of Thutmose III) in connection with tomb KV 20 emerges rather unexpectedly in Altenmüller's hypothesis. According to that scholar, it was the sarcophagus of Thutmose I refurbished for Thutmose III and eventually moved to his tomb.

Aidan M. Dodson suggests ${ }^{94}$ that Romer's arguments against the identification of the tomb of Thutmose II as a royal tomb, and thus ignoring it in the sequence of tomb development, are incorrect. The notion advocated by Romer that the presence of the quartzite sarcophagus is not a trait characteristic for a royal tomb is contradicted by Dodson. He indicates that while in theory a non-royal tomb could have been built in the Valley of the Kings, the example of the quartzite sarcophagus of Sen-en-mut as a non-royal sarcophagus, referred to by Romer, is questionable. Sen-en-mut's position was exceptional, and so was his tomb, located next to the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. Dodson emphasises the similarity of the sizes of the two sarcophagi, noticed by Thomas: sarcophagus B (uninscribed, found in tomb KV 42) and sarcophagus E (found in tomb KV 38). He suggests that the unusually large sizes of these sarcophagi might have been related to the sizes of wooden coffins which, according to the original plan, were supposed to be deposited in large wooden sarcophagi.

## KV 38 as a secondary burial of Thutmose I

The view expressed by Romer that there are no certain data to establish the chronology of KV 38 could be accepted. ${ }^{95}$ However, there seems to exist a number of indirect clues which connect this tomb with Thutmose III. It was noted by Hayes that the decoration of sarcophagus E, found in the tomb, is stylistically closest to the one featured by the sarcophagus of Thutmose III. ${ }^{96}$ It is also reasonable to add the remark by Dodson referring to the similarities between sarcophagus E found in tomb KV 38 and sarcophagus B from tomb KV $42,{ }^{97}$ which might imply the sarcophagi were made in more or less the same period. Romer also notices that the fragments of glass found in tomb KV $38^{98}$ indicate the period not earlier than the times of Thutmose III. ${ }^{99}$ Another argument provided by Romer to support his hypothesis of dating KV 38 to the times of Thutmose III is the presence of quartzite blocks constituting the base of the sarcophagus, which were not known before the reign of this king. ${ }^{100}$ Carl Nicholas Reeves also suggests that the two external coffins of Thutmose I, ${ }^{101}$ found in DB 320, were constructed under Thutmose III, which could be indicated by the similarity of texts preserved on their surfaces to the texts from sarcophagus E. ${ }^{102}$ Another clue can be seen in the plaster with the decoration preserved on the walls of KV 38, which is similar to the decoration of the tomb of Thutmose III, KV $34 .{ }^{103}$ Decorated limestone slabs come from the times of Hatshepsut, the first tomb which bears decoration made on plaster dated with certainty, is the tomb of Thutmose III. It is true that very few artefacts found in KV 38 confirm the use of the tomb before the times of Thutmose III and could come from the original burial of Thutmose I. ${ }^{104}$ It seems that these artefacts might have been brought to the tomb from tomb KV 20 in the course of removal of the king's body. All of the above implies that tomb KV 38 was decorated and equipped again in the times of Thutmose III.

## Reasons for removal of the body of Thutmose I to KV 20

The removal of the coffin of Thutmose I to tomb KV 20 was most likely an act of legitimization of the queen's power. ${ }^{105}$ It transpired fairly late, definitely after year 11 of Thutmose III's reign, when the work on

[^160]$\underline{H n m t-} n h$ began. ${ }^{106}$ It was also the last year when Nefrura was mentioned ${ }^{107}$ - the queen was left without an heir and was obliged to modify internal and family policies. That led to her more frequent references to Thutmose I in later years of regency. ${ }^{108}$

The synchronisation of the construction works on the temple of the queen at Deir el-Bahari and her tomb is worth attention: as Hatshepsut removed the body of her father she prepared an offering chapel with a false door in her temple. ${ }^{109}$ Most likely there was no tradition of building temples with offering chapels in the times of Thutmose I, no New Kingdom offering chapel prior to the reign of Hatshepsut has been attested. This makes it even more extraordinary and significant that two chapels were prepared for Thutmose I, each furnished with a false door stela, both dated to the times of Hatshepsut. ${ }^{110}$ It can attest the connection of each of these chapels with a different tomb. ${ }^{111}$

## Works in tomb KV 20 - a summary

It seems that due to the profound discussion, analysis of the facts, and new information, it is possible to evolve the most logical reconstruction of the events associated with the functioning of the early 18th dynasty tombs. Thutmose I was the first king to be buried in the Valley of the Kings, and the preparation of his tomb, KV 38, was supervised by Ineni. The burial was conducted by Thutmose II together with his wife Hatshepsut. That tomb, despite the doubts expressed by Romer, can open the sequence of royal tombs. This is implied by the oval burial chamber, the shape of the tomb together with the curved corridors, low number of rooms, one storage room adjacent to the burial chamber, and the absence of a well. That king did not erect his temple of millions of years, which was later built by his daughter after year 11 of the reign of Thutmose III. All facts seem to show that it was located in a topographic relationship with tomb KV 38.

After her coronation, Hatshepsut commenced carving her second, royal tomb, KV 20. The tomb had probably been completed and decorated when the decision of moving the body of Thutmose I to tomb KV 20 was taken. The already finished sarcophagus (C), prepared for Hatshepsut, was remodelled and used to accommodate the coffin of Thutmose I while a new sarcophagus (D) was shaped for Hatshepsut and inscribed with her royal names. The work was conducted with urgency as instead of building a new sarcophagus to hold the body of Thutmose I the queen's sarcophagus was adapted for that purpose. Simultaneously with the work in the tomb, building activities were also in progress in the other part of the mortuary complex - the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple, where an offering chapel with the false door stela fitted in the west wall was under construction. The situation of the granite false door in that very temple seems to be extremely important. The other temple, $\underline{H n m t}$ - $^{〔} n h$, despite being equipped with an offering chapel, featured a false door carved in the limestone wall and painted in such a manner that it imitated granite. It might mean that at the moment of mounting the granite false door in the wall of the offering chapel at Deir el-Bahari the coffin of Thutmose I was in KV 20. It is not possible to establish the chronology of these events, however, if there were no plans to move the body of Thutmose I to tomb KV 20 and the construction of the $\underline{H n m t}$ - $n h$ temple commenced only after year 11 of the reign of Thutmose III, it seems that the removal of the body could not have taken place in the early years after the coronation and resulted from the search for solutions for the dynastic issues after the death of Nefrura. Sed festival of the queen could have been an appropriate occasion for such a procedure. Undoubtedly, the decision was fairly sudden and the preparations for it were short.

The act of moving the body of Thutmose I back to tomb KV 38 was an attempt to wipe Hatshepsut out from history, which was performed by Thutmose III, when her images and names were erased as well as reliefs and statues destroyed. Perhaps some other ideas of religious and political nature introduced by the queen were abandoned. The decision to move the body of Thutmose I back was carried through in a less hurried manner than in the case of the first removal. It seemed most natural to use the same tomb which had been employed for that purpose before: KV 38. Apart from other, already mentioned reasons, this solution is justified in economic terms: the tomb had already been carved, it was empty, and had been intended for such an objective by Thutmose I himself. It was prepared again to receive the body of the king, the walls were covered with plaster and decorated with Amduat texts. The resolution was not to move the sarcophagus from KV 20 (C) which did not fit the coffin accurately, but to carve a new sarcophagus (E), which would

[^161]accommodate the coffin of Thutmose I easily. The grave goods of the ruler from tomb KV 20 were partially moved, and Thutmose III added some new items.

It is possible that as a consequence of the repeated burial of Thutmose I and the changes introduced at the necropolis, Thutmose III decided to "modernise" the burial of his father, Thutmose II, which he did not manage to complete. This could be confirmed by the unfinished decoration of the walls and not even started decoration of the sarcophagus, as well as the stylistic traits of both of these elements, which are similar to the tomb and sarcophagus of Thutmose III. Moreover, the comparable sizes of sarcophagi E and B might suggest that they were formed to contain larger coffins, perhaps removed from wooden sarcophagi.

# Summary <br> - conclusions and arising questions in the studies on ritual topography of West Thebes in the times of Hatshepsut 


#### Abstract

When historical topography is presented and the list of temples connected with the building activity of queen Hatshepsut is reconstructed, the significance of ritual topography should be taken into consideration since it determined the order of construction as well as the location of these temples and is frequently exploited to assist the reconstruction of historical topography. Rituals and carefully designed processional routes associated with them dictated the locations of sacral buildings on both sides of the Nile. ${ }^{1}$ Recognition of rituals as one of the essentials factors in the location of religious complexes resulted in an attempt at reconstruction of the image of the West Bank, which is much richer than the one described in the scientific literature.


## Temples and their topographic and chronological sequence

When the needs of the ritual are taken into consideration, it can be concluded that the West Bank, where the temples were situated along the border of farming lands, seems to have been developed in such a manner that the priests who carried the bark of Amun on their shoulders in the course of a procession could cover the distances between particular complexes. It can be supposed so on the basis of the analysis of the processional alley at the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple, which was approx. 1 km (2000 cubits) long. The Bark Station was located in the middle of the alley, ${ }^{2}$ therefore it can be deduced that the distance between the points of rest were not longer than approx. 500 m ( 1000 cubits). The distances between the existing edifices and the structures planned in the times of Hatshepsut appear to be even shorter. The temple at Medinet Habu ( $\mathrm{D} s r^{-}$ $s t$ ) was the southernmost temple on the West Bank, on the other hand, the structures at the northern end of the processional route have not been identified conclusively.

It is evident that at least a part of the processional route on the West Bank was paved with mud bricks. Remains of that pavement have been discovered next to the chapel of Wadjmose, to the south of the Ramesseum. ${ }^{3}$ Georges Daressy also noticed a sandstone base, possibly preserved in situ, which served as a base for a sphinx. ${ }^{4}$ However, it is not clear whether this alley could be dated to the times of Hatshepsut.

The reconstruction of the northern part of West Thebes is theoretical to a great extent (Fig. 128). Hr.j-hr-Jmn seems to be the first temple marked on the processional route in the north. It might be supposed that a journey was made by water, along the Nile and further on along one of the canals, to Hft -hr-nb.s, located at the same latitude as the temple at Karnak. From there, it was possible to walk to the Hr.j-hr-Jmn temple and then to other temples, and next cross a canal to reach Luxor.

Hatshepsut's plan to build a complex of Theban temples was not an easy task, or a short-term project. It must be understood that the implementation of that project was spread over a considerable time span, and new construction ventures were commenced when the earlier ones had already been advanced to a certain degree. It should be emphasised that the designs of the temples were changed at different stages of the construction process. Research into the temples of the West Bank helps to attempt to establish the sequence of building of particular structures.

The information recovered from epigraphic sources indicate that the temples were erected in geographic order from the north to the south, although they were not recorded in this order on the lists compiled by officials. ${ }^{5}$ The list of Ineni, which most probably reflects the state of affairs at the beginning of Hatshepsut's reign, mentions three temples on the West Bank: Mn-swt, $3 h-s w t$ and $H r . j$ - $h r-J m n .{ }^{6}$ The list of temples

[^162]

Fig. 129. Schematic plan of West Thebes in the times of Hatshepsut (based on PM $\mathrm{II}^{2}$, Pl. XXXIII; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
carved on the walls of the Chapelle Rouge corresponds with year 17 of the reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{7}$ Personifications of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w, H^{\prime}-3 h t, \underline{H n m t-} n h, H n k t-' n h$, as well as $H r \cdot j-h r-J m n$ have been preserved there. ${ }^{8}$ The list preserved in the tomb of Puy-em-Ra should probably be dated to the end of Hatshepsut's construction activity or even the beginning of the sole reign of Thutmose III. ${ }^{9}$ That list has been preserved intact and it records 15 temples in Thebes. The ones on the West Bank include: Hrrj- $h r-J m n, \underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w, H^{〔}-3 h t, H n k t-~ ' n h, ~$ $\underline{H n m t-}$ 'nh, $\underline{H n m t-m n, ~ M n-s w t, ~} 3 h-s w t$ and $H w t-k z$ n J'ḥ-ms Nfrt-jrj. The chronology of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ can be established on the basis of the aforementioned information as well as the inscriptions which have survived on the ostraca discovered in the temple. ${ }^{10}$ Three ostraca are especially significant in this context. One of them indicates the beginning of the construction work in year 7 of Thutmose III's reign, ${ }^{11}$ while the other two imply that rituals were performed in that temple from year 16 of his reign at the latest. ${ }^{12}$ Epigraphic sources clearly show that when Hatshepsut assumed power, apart from the temples of earlier rulers, Mentuhotep II and Amenhotep I, the Hr.j-hr-Jmn temple had already been erected. The queen began her construction activity on the West Bank at the moment of coronation, by initiation of building of her own temple. It seems important to note that $\check{S} s p t$ - ' $n h$ and $D s r$-st, whose construction and decoration undoubtedly took place during the reign of Hatshepsut, did not appear on any list.

Epigraphic sources also provide the names of the people who were in charge of the construction work. It is clear that the royal tomb of Hatshepsut (or of her spouse) was carved under the supervision by Hapuseneb. ${ }^{13}$ Ah-mes Pen-iaty overlooked the building of the temples of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari (Mn-st), Thutmose I ( $\underline{H n m t-}{ }^{'} n h$ ) and Thutmose II ( $\left.\check{S}_{s p t-}{ }^{'} n h\right),{ }^{14}$ and the work in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ was supervised by Sen-en-mut. ${ }^{15}$

The conclusions drawn on the basis of analysis of epigraphic sources are confirmed by the data resulting from excavation work. The temples on the West Bank were at different stages of the construction process at the moment when Hatshepsut's names disappeared from texts. The temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, the most impressive work of the queen's architects, was largely completed: some tasks were still in prog-

[^163]ress in the Valley Temple and the Northern Portico. ${ }^{16}$ The construction of Hnkt- 'nh was very advanced. ${ }^{17}$ It could be supposed that the temple was finished according to its original design in the lifetime of the ruler. As far as $\underline{H n m t-}{ }^{〔} n h{ }^{18} \underline{H}^{-}-3 h t,{ }^{19}$ or $\underline{H n m t-m n^{20}}$ are concerned, it can be assumed that their decoration was completed. In the case of the temple of Thutmose II, $\check{S ̌ s p t}^{〔} n h$, it is impossible to state whether the construction work was finished, ${ }^{21}$ however, it is evident that the work in $\underline{D} s r$-st was abandoned once Hatshepsut had disappeared. ${ }^{22}$

In order to understand the system of building of temples, the manner of construction should be taken into consideration. $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w, H^{\prime}-3 h t$, and probably also $\underline{H n m t-m n}$ were built of limestone sourced in the quarries located to the north of the Valley of the Kings (the so-called Hatshepsut's quarry). ${ }^{23}$ Hnkt- $n h$ was constructed of limestone sourced in Hatshepsut's quarry and of another local limestone, which has not been examined, as well as of sandstone. On the other hand, the $\underline{H} n m t-n h$ and $\check{S} s p t$ - $n h$ temples were erected from the aforementioned local limestone and sandstone. $\underline{D} s r$-st was completely built of sandstone. Therefore, it seems that Hatshepsut's quarry situated to the north of the Valley of the Kings, was supposed to serve the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple above all, which is built solely of the limestone quarried there, and $H n k t-\quad n h$, where the work possibly progressed more slowly. The diminishing supplies from the quarry were probably sufficient to erect some more smaller structures, $\underline{H}^{\prime}-3 h t$ and $\underline{H n m t-m n . ~ I t ~ a p p e a r s ~ t h a t ~ t h e ~} \underline{H n m t}$ - 'nh temple was not incorporated in the original plan of development of the West Bank and was only added later, which might be indicated both by the type of building material and its location - it creates an impression of being "squeezed" between the Valley Temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and $H n k t$ - ' $n h$, which deviates from the roughly even distances between other edifices (cf. Fig. 128). Nevertheless, the Hnmt- 'nh temple was so important that the construction progressed at a high speed and at the same time, the quality of decoration work was preserved. The temple was completed, the decoration represents a good quality and the only detail which could indicate the urgency of the project is the absence of granite in the construction of i.a. the false door of Thutmose I.

The direction of the construction and finishing works in particular edifices could also be indicated by the manner of exploitation of bricks used for building the outer walls. It appears that the preparation of bricks was independent from the construction work to a certain degree and they were made in higher numbers than necessary. The bricks which were left after the building of one structure were used to erect another. This phenomenon can be observed in the case of the Hnkt- 'nh temple, where the north wall incorporated bricks stamped with the names of Hatshepsut and Thutmose I, definitely made for the $\underline{H} n m t$ - ' $n h$ temple, located to the north of the former one. ${ }^{24}$ Analogical situation can be noted in the case of $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-3 h t$ temple, which enclosure walls were built of mud bricks stamped with the name of $H n k t-n h$, located to the north of it. ${ }^{25}$

It should be mentioned that most temples attested in the times of Hatshepsut kept functioning during the reigns of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II, sources indicate: $3 h-s w t, M n-s w t, \underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w, ~ H n k t-' n h, \underline{H n m t-} n h$ and $D s r-s t .{ }^{26}$

## Artefacts from the temples built by Hatshepsut

The issue of the artefacts from the temples erected by Hatshepsut remains an open research question.
Museum collections incorporate many blocks from the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. ${ }^{27}$ However, there are no fragments which could be associated with other building projects commissioned by Hatshepsut. The only explanation for this fact seems to be a hypothesis that the buildings fell out of use soon after her reign and their elements can be found in the walls or pavements of later structures, which have not been examined

[^164]yet. The blocks discovered i.a. in the temples of Mut ${ }^{28}$ and Ptah ${ }^{29}$ on the east bank as well as the temple of Merenptah, ${ }^{30}$ and also: Ramesseum, the temple of Ramesses VI and the so-called small Ramesside temple ${ }^{31}$ on the West Bank seem to confirm that hypothesis.

Statues are another group of artefacts from Hatshepsut's temples. A question, not asked by scholars so far, arises - did a repertoire of statues exist on the east bank? Although many statues are known from the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, ${ }^{32}$ there are no statues which could be attributed to the queen with certainty at Karnak and Luxor. It could be supposed that the fill in the so-called Sen-en-mut quarry at Deir el-Bahari did not only contain fragments of statues from the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple but also those which came from other Theban temples of the West Bank. It seems likely that the destruction of statues during the reign of Thutmose III took place separately in each temple and then the rubble was transported to Deir el-Bahari and thrown into Sen-en-mut quarry. That would explain why not all statues discovered in the quarry with preserved inscriptions are dedicated to the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple. ${ }^{33}$

## Tombs and their chronological and topographic relationships with temples

When the relationships of the rituals performed in the area of West Thebes are researched, the discussion concerning the connections between temples of the royal cult which accommodated royal offering chapels and the tombs of rulers whose cult was observed in these chapels should be recapitulated.

The first thing to pay attention to is the location of royal tombs in relation to the temples which housed royal offering chapels. The issue of the relationship of the tomb of Hatshepsut, KV 20, with her temple at Deir el-Bahari, $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, has been widely discussed and over the recent years scholars have reached agreement that these two structures were planned as elements of one complex. ${ }^{34}$ Herbert Ricke observed the connection between the mortuary temple of Thutmose III, Hnkt- $n h$, and his tomb, KV $34 .{ }^{35} \mathrm{~A}$. Stupko states that the element which combined the temple and the royal tomb was the main axis of the offering chapel, which was parallel to the axis of the burial chamber. ${ }^{36}$ Nevertheless, it seems that in the case of the temples of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, it could be indicated that the entrance to the tomb, which corresponded with the extension of the axis of the royal offering chapel that contained the false door, was the essential feature. ${ }^{37}$ The orientation of the tomb planned for Thutmose I (KV 38) in relation to his temple, Hnmt- $n h$, erected by his daughter, cannot be established with certainty since the precise location of the king's offering chapel is unknown. ${ }^{38}$ The alignment of tombs in such a manner that they should correspond with the king's false door was important already in the Old Kingdom. It enabled the royal $k 3$ to move between the tomb and the royal chapel, where the ruler, after completion of $s 3 h w$ rituals, could participate in the ceremonies held inside the temple. ${ }^{39}$

[^165]It should be noted that such orientation of temples and tombs survived to the times of Thutmose IV, when the system of orientation changed. It is unclear whether the temples of that ruler and of his successors housed false doors, the last king who reigned when they were in use was Amenhotep II. ${ }^{40}$ False doors installed in the temples of Ramesside rulers differ from the royal false door known from the times ranging from the Old Kingdom to the early 18th dynasty. ${ }^{41}$ It should be mentioned that the false door in Ramesside temples differed from older structures as far as its location is concerned. One temple could have accommodated more than one double false door, it was installed not only in West Thebes, where the temples of the Ramesside rulers were located, but also at Luxor and Abydos, i.e. in temples of millions of years and temples of gods. On the other hand, the double false door was already known in the times when royal offering chapels were equipped with classic false door stelae. ${ }^{42}$ Thutmose III represents it on the wall of annals in the Palace of Maat, ${ }^{43}$ Amenhotep II places it in the $h b-s d$ temple at Karnak. ${ }^{44}$ It might be understood that the function of the double false door differed from the one fulfilled by the classic false door. ${ }^{45}$ Ramesside temples ceased to house royal offering chapels with classic false door fitted in the west wall, and it seems that as a consequence, it was no longer necessary to align the temple with the entrance to the royal tomb.

The relationships between the tombs and temples influence the chronology. If the tomb was planned together with the temple as one complex, it seems that the construction had to take place simultaneously. It could have been true for the complex commissioned by Hatshepsut, where soon after her coronation, two officials were employed to supervise work on both parts of the complex: Sen-en-mut in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and possibly Hapu-seneb in the tomb. ${ }^{46}$ Therefore, it could be supposed that similar work was conducted at the complex of Thutmose III, even though its details are unknown. It should be considered what significance this observation has for the tomb of Thutmose I. The temple of that ruler was not built during his reign, all evidence indicates Hatshepsut as the one who ordered the work to be done. ${ }^{47}$ For this reason, it should be assumed that his tomb was built at the same time. Nevertheless, this assumption seems incorrect since Ineni claims to have supervised the construction of the tomb in the times of Thutmose I, ${ }^{48}$ moreover, the body of Thutmose I must have been deposited in the king's tomb before it was transported to KV 20. Thus it appears that in this case, the tomb must have been hewn first. Perhaps there was not enough time to build his temple and this project was undertaken by Hatshepsut. It could also be believed that Thutmose I perpetuated the tradition of the 17th dynasty - construction of a small chapel next to the tomb, without building a large temple of the royal cult in a more distant location ${ }^{49}$ and it was Hatshepsut who returned to the tradition of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, which combined the tomb and the temple in one complex. ${ }^{50}$ Such sequence of work, with the tomb as the first element, resembles the manner of building pyramids. It happened relatively frequently that after the burial of the father, the son who succeeded him to the throne finished the construction of the complex, including the mortuary temple. ${ }^{51}$

[^166]The architecture of the tombs of Thutmose I, Thutmose II, and Thutmose III seems to imply a gradual development of funerary architecture during the early 18th dynasty. The tombs grow bigger and have an increasing number of annexes. The common trait is the shape of the burial chamber, which resembles the royal cartouche. ${ }^{52}$

The removal of the body of Thutmose I to the tomb of Hatshepsut is intriguing. It caused a disturbance of the topographic plan designed before. It seems that the natural consequence of that action was a change in the arrangement of the Complex of the Royal Cult in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ and incorporation of the chapel of Thutmose I with the granite false door into the complex. ${ }^{53}$ Perhaps the false door of Thutmose I installed in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ was originally planned for his temple, $\underline{H n m t-} n h$, however, the change of the burial place forced its installation in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$, and $\underline{H} n m t-\quad n h$ accommodated its replica (although it must be emphasised that it was not an ideal copy), carved in the limestone wall of inferior quality.

To recapitulate the discussion on the topography of West Thebes during the reign of Hatshepsut, it should be remembered that results of many excavations have not been published yet, and some remains of buildings founded during the regency of the queen are still to be discovered. The studies presented in this volume are solely an attempt at organising and summarising the current state of research, but they do not close the discussion on the sacral architecture of that glorious period in Egyptian history.

The main research question, which is the sacred landscape mentioned in the title of this work and its rituals, has merely been outlined since it is impossible to perform a profound analysis of the ritual topography of the West Bank without an analysis of the historical topography of the East Bank, which will be presented in the next volume. Therefore, the volume devoted to the studies of ritual topography itself will be the last in the series of works on the ritual topography of Thebes in the times of Hatshepsut and is planned as a combination of the analysis of historical topography with research on the religious policy of the ruler and religiousness during her reign.

[^167]Appendices

# Appendix 1 Dedicatory inscriptions 

## Temple of Hatshepsut - $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$

## Upper Courtyard, granite gate in the east wall

## References:

Grothoff, Die Tornamen, 213; Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXX; Urk. IV, 295
Hrw [Wsrt-kzw] nswt bjtj nbt jrt jht [M3't-k3]-R` jr.n[.s] m mnw[.s] njt[.s] [Jmn-R'nb nswt tzwj] jrt n.f sb3 ' 3 Jmn- $\underline{d} s r-m n w ~ m ~ m 3 \underline{t} j r . s ~ d j(. t j) ~ ' n h ~ m j ~ R ' d t ~$

Horus [Wsrt-kzw], King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of Rituals [ $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3$ ]- $R^{\prime}$, [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father [Amun-Ra, Lord of Thrones of Two Lands], i.e. making for him a great gate 'Amun [is] holy of monuments' in granite, what she does being given life like Ra forever.

## Upper Courtyard, column

## References:

Niwiński, Les colonnes proto-doriques avec inscriptions, 105, Fig. 19
[Hrw Wsrt-k3w ntrt nfrt nbt jrt jhht nswt bjtj M3't-k3-R`s3t R‘H3t]-š̌pswt-[hnnmt-Jmn] jr.n.s m mnw.s n Jmn$R$ ‘s ḥ’ n.f wsht ḥbjt sḥb.tj tzwj m nfrw.s jr.s dj.tj 'nh.t mj R' $\underline{d} t$
[Horus Wsrt-k3w, Perfect God, Mistress of the Rituals, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, $M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$, Daughter of Ra $H_{3} t$-] ${ }^{\text {sppswt-[hnmt-Jmn] (she) made (it) as her monument for Amun-Ra, i.e. building for him }}$ a festival courtyard, so that both lands would celebrate her beauty ${ }^{\text {a }}$, what she does being given life like Ra forever.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ The phrase shbt tzwj m nfrw.s appears in an analogical place of the dedicatory inscriptions preserved on the column of Thutmose I at Karnak (Gabolde, La «Court de Fêtes », 33; Larché, Nouvelles observations, Pl. XLIV [left]; Niwiński, Les colonnes proto-doriques avec inscriptions, 106), in the dedicatory inscription of Thutmose II on the wall of his festival courtyard at Karnak (Gabolde, La «Court de Fêtes», 33, Pl. VIII) and on column 30 erected by Thutmose III at Buhen (Caminos, Buhen I, 66, Pl. 79). Cf. discussion: Gabolde, La «Court de Fêtes », 32-33.

## Upper Courtyard, architraves

1. Architrave from the north side of the Upper Courtyard

## References:

Karkowski, The Arrangement of the Architraves, 149, Fig. 6
[...] st nswt bjtj [M3't-k3-R’ jr.n.s m] mnw[.s] n jt[.s] J[mn-R'nb nswt tzwj nb pt s'h] '.n.f hwt-ntr m m3[t] [...]
[...] King of Upper and Lower Egypt, [ $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}$, she made as her] monument for [her] father A[mun-Ra, Lord of Thrones of Two Lands, Lord of Heaven, i.e. build]ing for him a divine temple in grani[te] [...].
2. Architrave from the Upper Courtyard

## References: <br> Unpublished

[... nb nswt tzwj] s'ḥ'.n.f hawt-ntre '3t [...]
[... Lord of the Two Lands], i.e. building for him a great divine temple [...].
3. Two architraves from the Upper Courtyard

## References:

Budzanowski, Nisze kultowe, 272

$[\ldots]$ its gates of granite, its door leaves of Asian copper, and statues made of electrum, he made [...].

## Upper Courtyard, north part of the east wall

## References:

Unpublished
$m n w[\ldots] m s(w) m b j 3 b 3 k(w) m \underline{d}^{\prime} m r 3 w[\ldots]$ sw' $b$ m ḥd $\underline{d}[\ldots] p 3$ twwt $n w n s w w t[\ldots]$
[...] monument [...] made of copper completely worked with electrum [...] cleaned with silver [...] statues of kings [...].

## Upper Courtyard, niches of the west wall

## References:

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXXXIV; Urk. IV, 294; Ullmann, König für die Ewigkeit, 26-46

## Frame of niche A, two jambs

 $\left.k_{3}\right]-R^{\prime} s_{3}[t J m n] n[t] \underline{h t} . f m r j j[t] . f[\ldots] n j t[. s]$
${ }^{2}$ [Jmn-R' nswt ntr] $]$ jrt n.f ḥwt-ntrr '3t nt ḥhw m rnpwt ḥwt Desr-dsrw-[Jmn] m jnr ḥِ nfr n ['nw] m şḥt nbt 'nh jr[.s] dj[.tj] 'nh dd wzs snb mj R'dt
${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3 $\underline{d} t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h ${ }^{c} w$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Two Lands, Mistr[ess] of the Rituals, King of Upper and Lower Egypt [ $\left.M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3^{\prime}-R^{\prime}\right]$, Daugh[ter of Amun] of his body, his beloved [...] for [her] father
${ }^{2}$ [Amun-Ra, Lord of God]s, i.e. making for him the great divine temple of millions of years hawt Dsr-d $d s r^{2}$ [Jmn] in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in the vicinity of Mistress of Life, ${ }^{a}$ what [she] does being given life, stability, dominion and health, like Ra forever.
${ }^{a}$ Cf. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI, Pl. CLXIV. The phrase $m s 3 h n b w t 3-d s r$ appears twice in an analogical place of the dedicatory inscriptions in the temple of Seti I at Abydos (Grallert, Bauen - Stiften - Weihen I. Text, 454, 456 [S1/Wf016, S1/Wf043].

## Frame of niche C, two jambs



${ }^{2}$ [Jmn]-R'[nswt ntriw nb] pt jrt n.f ḥwt-ntrr '3t nt ḥhw m rnpwt ḥwt Dsr-dsrw-[Jmn] m jnr ḥ̣ nfrn 'nw m st.f 3ht nt sp tpj jr[.s] dj[.tj] 'nh hi.tj hr st Hrw mj R'd $t$
${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3 $\underline{d} t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h $\left.{ }^{i} w\right]$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Two Lands, Mistress of the Rituals, King of Upper and Lower Egypt [ $\left.M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k \beta_{3}-R^{\prime}\right]$, Daugh[ter] of Ra of his body, his beloved [H3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father
${ }^{2}$ Amun]-Ra, [Lord of God, Lord of] the Sky, i.e. making for him the great divine temple of millions of years hwt Dsr-dsrw-[Jmn] in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in his glorious place of the first time, what [she] does being given life, who appears on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche E, two jambs

${ }^{1} H r w[W s r t-k z w][\ldots]$ Hrw nbw [Ntrt-h'w] ntrr(t) [nfrt] [...] [M3 $\left.{ }^{\circ} t-k 3\right]-R^{\prime} s 3(t) R^{\prime}[\ldots][m r] j t\left[H 3 t-s{ }^{\prime} p s w t-h n m t-\right.$ Jmn] dj[.tj] 'nh jr.n[.s] m mnw[.s] njt[.s]

${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw] [...] Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h $\left.{ }^{\prime} w\right]$, [Perfect] God[dess] [...] [M3 $\left.{ }^{i} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}\right]$, Daugh[ter] of Ra [...] his beloved [ $H_{3} 3$ t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father ${ }^{2}[\ldots]$ of millions [...] in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in the vicinity of Mistress of Life, what [she] does being given life, who appears on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche G, two jambs



 $j r[. s] d j[. t j]$ 'nh ha $\left.{ }^{〔} . t j\right]$ hr st Herw mj R'd $d t$
${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3 $\underline{d} t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h ${ }^{\text {i }} w$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Two Lands, Mistr[ess] of the Rituals, King of Upper and Lower Egypt [ $\left.M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k z_{3}-R^{\prime}\right]$, Daugh[ter] of Ra of his body, his beloved [ $H_{3} t-s$ špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, she made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father
${ }^{2}$ Amun-Ra], [...], i.e. making for him the great divine temple of millions of years hwt-[D. $\operatorname{sr}$ - $\left.\underline{d} s r w-J m n\right]$ in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in his holy place of the first time, what she does being given life, who appears on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche I, two jambs

${ }^{1}$ [...] Nbtj [...] Hrw nbw [Ntrt-h'w] ntr $(t) n f r[t] n b[t] 3 w t-j b$ nswt bjtj nbt tzwj $\left[M 3_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3\right]-R^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} s 3[t] R{ }^{\prime} n[t]$ ht.f

 3ht nt sp tpj jr.s [jr.s dj.tj 'nh h'.tj] hr st Hrw mj R'd $t$
${ }^{1}$ [...], Two Goddesses [...], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h $h^{\prime} w$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Joy, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Mistress of Two Lands [ $\left.M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{\prime}\right]$, Daugh[ter] of Ra of his body, his beloved [H3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, she made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father
${ }^{2}$ [Amun-Ra, Lord of Two Lands, i.e. making] for him the august divine temple of millions of years $h w t$ [Dsr- $\underline{d} s r w-J m n]$ in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in his glorious place of the first time, [what she does being given life, who appears] on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche J, two jambs



 nt sp tpj jr[.s] dj(.tj) 'nh h h '. tj ) ḥr st Herw mj R' $\underline{d} t$
${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3dt-rnpwt], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h ${ }^{\text {' }} w$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Two Lands, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Mistress of the Rituals [ $\left.M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k{ }^{3}-R^{\prime}\right]$, Daugh[ter] of Ra of his body, his beloved [ $\mathrm{H} 3 \mathrm{t} t-\mathrm{s} p s w t-h n m t-J m n$ ], given life, [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father
${ }^{2}$ [Amun-Ra, Lord of Two Lands, i.e. making] for him the great divine temple of millions of years hwt Dsr$\underline{d} s r w-[J m n]$ in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in his holy place of the first time, [what she does being given life, who appears] on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche L, two jambs



 wrt mj $R$ ‘ $\underline{d} t$
${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3 $\underline{d} t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h ${ }^{\text {i }} w$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Two Lands, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Mistress of the Rituals [ $M 3^{'} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$ ], Daugh[ter] of Ra of his body, his beloved [ $H_{3} t$ t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, [she made it] as [her] monument for [her] father
${ }^{2}$ [..., i.e. making] for him the augu[st] divine temple of millions of years $h w t \underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w-[J m n]$ in beautiful limestone of 'Anu (for) the first time of $s d$ festivals, which [she] made in great number, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche $\mathbf{N}$, two jambs

 $\left.k_{3}-R^{\prime}\right] s 3[t][J m n] n[t] \underline{2} t . f m r j j[t] . f[H 3 t-s ̌ p s w t-\underline{-} n n m t-J m n] d j(. t j){ }^{\prime} n h(. t)[j r . n . s] m m n w[. s] n j t[. s]$
${ }^{2}$ [Jmn-R' nb nswt t3wj jrt].n.f hawt-ntrr '3t nt ḥhw m rnpwt hawt Dsr-dsrw-[Jmn] m jnr ḥ̆ nfr n 'nw m st.f 3 ht

${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3 $\underset{d}{ } t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h ${ }^{\text {i }} w$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Joy, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Mistress of the Rituals [ $M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}$ ], Daugh[ter] of [Amun] of his body, his beloved [H3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, [she made it] as [her] monument for [her] father ${ }^{2}$ [Amun-Ra, Lord of Thrones of Two Lands, i.e. making] for him the great divine temple of millions of years hwt Dsr-dsrw-[Jmn] in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in his glorious place of the first time, what [she] does being given life, who appears on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche $P$, two jambs



 $m j R^{\prime} \underline{d} t$
${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3 $\underline{d} t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h $\left.{ }^{i} w\right]$, Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Joy, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Mistr[ess of the Rituals $M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}$, Daughter of Ra of] his body, his beloved [ $H_{3} t$-špswt-hnmt-Jmn, given life, she made it] as [her] monument for [her] father ${ }^{2}$ [..., i.e. making for him] the great divine temple of millions of years $h w t[\underline{D} s r-d s r w-J m n]$ in beautiful limestone of 'Anu [in] his glorious place of [...], who appears on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Frame of niche R, two jambs



 $d j[. t j]\left[{ }^{\prime} n h\right] h^{〔}[. t j]$ hr st Hrw mj R ${ }^{\prime} \underline{d} t$
${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [W3 $\underline{d} t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h ${ }^{c} w$ ], Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Joy, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Misstr(ess) of Two Lands [M3't-kz]-R', Daugh[ter] of Ra of his body, his beloved [H3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father ${ }^{2}$ [..., i.e. making for] him the augu[st] divine temple of millions of years hwt $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w-[J m n]$ in beautiful limestone of 'Anu in his glorious place of the first time, what [she] does being given life, who appears on the throne of Horus, like Ra forever.

## Bark Hall, west wall, door frame

## References:

Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes (1932), Fig. 10

${ }^{2}$ [Jmn-R'nb nswt tzwj] jrt n.f sbz [Jmn] šsp(.w) mnw [H3зt-špswt-hnnmt-Jmn] jr[.s] 'nh[.tj] mj R'dt
Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Two Goddesses [ $W_{3} d t-r n p w t$ ], Gold Falcon [Ntrt-h ${ }^{\prime} w$ ], King of Upper and Lower Egypt, [M3 ${ }^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{\prime}$ ], [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father [Amun-Ra, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands], i.e. making for him a gate 'Amun receives the monument of $H 3 t$-špswt-h̆nmt-Jmn', what [she] does being given life like Ra forever.

## Statue Room, north wall, jambs of niche C

References:
Unpublished
${ }^{1}$ ' $n h n t r(t) n f r[t] n b[t] t 3 w j n b(t) j r t j h t\left[M_{3}{ }^{'} t-k 3\right]-R$ '
 ${ }^{\prime} n h[. t j] m j R{ }^{\prime} d t$
${ }^{1}$ Life. Perfect God[dess], Misstr(ess) of Two Lands, Mistr[ess of the Rituals [M3 $\left.{ }^{\prime} t-k_{3}\right]-R^{\prime}$
${ }^{2}$ Daugh[ter] of Ra of his body [ $H_{3}$ t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father [Amun-Ra, Lord of Thrones of Two Lands, Who is Foremost of Gods], what [she] does being given life like Ra forever.

## Complex of the Sun Cult, sun altar, south and north sides

## References:

Karkowski, The Solar Complex, 251, Pl. 50; Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I, 8, Pl. VIII; Urk. IV, 295
 m jnr ḥd nfr n 'nw jr[.s] dj(.tj) 'nh $\underline{d} d$ was mj $R$ ' $\underline{d} t$
[Life. Perfect God, Mistress of Thebes, Daughter of Ra of his body, $H 3 t-s ̌ p s w t-h n m t-J m n$, she made it as her monument for her father] Ra-Harakhty, i.e. making for him a great altar in beautiful limestone of 'Anu, what [she] does being given life, stability and dominion, like Ra forever.

## Lower Anubis Shrine, Hypostyle Hall, columns

## References:

Niwiński, Les colonnes proto-doriques avec inscriptions, Fig. 9; Witkowski, Certains aspects du culte des dieux funéraires, $78, \mathrm{Pl}$. G

1. Column 6
 $s] n j t[. s]$ Jnpw harj-tp ts hntj ḥwt-ntrr m jnr had nfr n 'nw jr.s dj(.tj) 'nh mj R' $\underline{d} t$

Horus [Wsrt-k3w], Perfect God, Lord of the Rituals, King of Upper and Lower Egypt [M3 $\left.{ }^{i} t-k_{3}-R^{\prime}\right]$, Daugh[ter] of Ra, [ $\mathrm{H}_{3} t$-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father Anubis, Who Is Upon the Earth, Foremost in the Divine Temple, in beautiful limestone of 'Anu, what she does being given life like Ra forever.

## 2. Column 7

 $m$ mnw[.s] n jt[.s] Jnpw hntj ḥwt-ntr m jnr had nfr n 'nw jr.s dj(.tj) 'nh mj R' $\underline{d} t$

Horus [Wsrt-kzw], Perfect God[dess], Mistr(ess) of the Rituals, King of Upper and Lower Egypt [M3 ${ }^{i} t-k z-$ $R^{\prime}$ '], Daugh[ter] of Ra, [Ḩ3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father Anubis, Foremost in [...] divine temple in beautiful limestone of 'Anu, what she does being given life like Ra forever.

## 3. Column 10

 $n j t[. s][J m n-R$ ' nb pt jrt sḥ-ntrr m jnr ḥd nfr n 'nw jr.s] dj(.tj) 'nh d dd wzs mj R' $\underline{d} t$
[Horus Wsrt-kzw], Perfect God[dess], Mistr(ess) of the Rituals, [King of Upper and Lower Egypt M3 ${ }{ }^{t}-k_{3}$ $R^{\prime}$ ], Daughter of Ra, [H3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn, she made (it)] as [her] monument for [her] father [Amun-Ra, Lord of Heaven, i.e. making sh-ntr in beautiful limestone of 'Anu, what she does] being given life like Ra forever.

## 4. Column 11

[Hrw Wsrt-kzw] ntr $(t) n f r[t] n b(t) j r t j h t[n s w t ~ b j t j ~ M 3 ' t-k z-R ' s 3 t ~ R ' H 3 t-s ̌ p s w t-h n m t-J m n ~ j r . n . s] ~ m ~ m n w[. s] ~$ $n j t[. s][J m n-R ` n s w t ~ n \underline{t r w}[\ldots]$ hwt-ntr $m$ jnr hạd nfr n 'nw jr.s] dj(.tj) 'nh mj R' $\underline{d} t$
[Horus Wsrt-kzw], Perfect God[dess], Mistr(ess) of the Rituals, [King of Upper and Lower Egypt M3 ${ }^{i} t-k_{3}-$ $R^{\prime}$ ], Daughter of Ra, [ $H_{3} t$-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], she made (it)] as [her] monument for [her] father [Amun-Ra, King of Gods [...] divine temple in beautiful limestone of 'Anu, what she does] being given life like Ra forever.

## Hathor Shrine, First Hypostyle Hall, columns

## References:

Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 4d; Pawlicki, Inscriptions des colonnes proto-doriques, 71, Fig. 2
[...].s pr-nw m jnr ḥd nfrn 'nw jr.s dj(.tj) 'nh mj R'd $d$
[...] pr-nw in beautiful limestone of 'Anu, what she does being given life like Ra forever.

## Hathor Shrine, First Hypostyle Hall, south wall

## References:

Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 8; Grallert, Bauen - Stiften - Weihen I. Text, 404 [Hat/Wf013]
 H3t-špswt-hnnmt-Jmn] jr.n[.s] m mnw[.s]
${ }^{2}$ [...] Hwt-Hrw hrjt-tp W3st nbt Jwnt hntt r ntrw s 'ḥ' n.s 'h-ntr šm jit jnbw.f hwt [...] f m jnr hạ nfr n 'nw

${ }^{1}$ [Horus Wsrt-kzw, Two Goddesses W3 ${ }^{d} t-r n p w t$, Gold Falcon Ntrt-hiw, true Perfect God(dess), [beloved] Amun-Ra, Lord of Thrones of Two Lands [...] Ḩ3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn] [she] made (it) as [her] monument ${ }^{2}$ [...] Hathor Who is Upon Thebes, Mistress of Dendera, Who is the Foremost of Gods, i.e. erecting for her southern divine palace, its walls are burnt [...] in beautiful limestone of 'Anu
${ }^{3}$ [...] true cedar of Lebanon, coiled with Asian copper. It has never been done since the primeval times of the earth, i.e. making for her a daughter of [...] like Ra forever.

## Hathor Shrine, First Hypostyle Hall, north wall

## References:

Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 9; Grallert, Bauen - Stiften - Weihen I. Text, 403 [Hat/Wf012]

${ }^{2}$ [...] n mwt.s Hewt-Hrw nbt Jwnt [... m] jnr hạ nfr n 'nw st.s $\underline{d} s$ stt n sp tpj hmt.n bjtjw smnh.s [...] n '3t

${ }^{1}$ [...] Daugther Who Is On His Thrones, Protector of All Gods, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, M3 ${ }^{\circ} t-k 3-R{ }^{c}$ [she] made (it) as her monument
${ }^{2}$ [...] for her mother Hathor Mistress of Dendera [...in] beautiful limestone of 'Anu, her sacred place of the first time, which was not known to kings of Lower Egypt, she embellishes [...] greater is the love for her than to all gods, she made, Son of Ra [ $H_{3} t$-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], given life, stability and dominion like Ra forever.

## Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, column 12

## References:

Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 13d; Pawlicki, Inscriptions des colonnes proto-doriques, 71, Fig. 2
[... m mnw[.s] n mwt.s Hewt-Hrw harjt-tp W3st nbt pt hanwt ntrw] jr.s dj(.tj) 'nh mj R'dt
[... she made (it)] as her monument for her mother Hathor, Who Is Upon Thebes, the Mistress of Heaven, the Mistress of Gods], what she does being given life like Ra forever.

## Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, architraves

## References:

Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 14
 $\underline{d} t$

King of Upper and Lower Egypt [ $\left.M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3-R^{\prime}\right]$ she made (it)] as her monument for her [mother Hathor, Who Is Upon Thebes, the Mistress of Gods], what she does being given life, stability and dominion forever.

## Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, north wall

References:
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 17; Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV, Pls LXXXVIII, XC; Urk. IV, 301.9-11
[...] jıtt nfrt nswt bjtj [M3 t-k3]-R' [jr.n.s] m mnw.s n [mwt.s Ḥwt-Hrw hrjit-tp W3st jr.s dj(.tj) 'nh did wzs mj $R$ ́dt]
[...] The One Who Takes The White Crown, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, [M3 $\left.{ }^{\text {t }} t-k 3\right]$ - $R^{\prime}$ [she made it] as her monument for [her mother Hathor, Who Is Foremost of Thebes, what she does being given life, stability and dominion like Ra forever].

## Hathor Shrine, Vestibule, west wall

References:
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor I, Pl. 29; Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV, Pl. CIII


${ }^{1}$ Horus [Wsrt-k3w], King of Upper and Lower Egypt, [M3 $\left.{ }^{*} t-k_{3}\right]-R^{c}$, [she] made (it) as [her] monument
 $J m n$ ], given life like Ra forever.

## Complex of the Royal Cult, Chapel of Thutmose I, false door, Louvre, Paris C48

References:
Roehrig, Dreyfus, Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut, 157, Fig. 87; Urk. IV, 313.13-14, Winlock, Notes on the Reburial of Tuthmosis I, Pls XI [2], XIII

Horus Wsrt-kzw, nswt bjtj nb (t) jrt jht [M3't-k3]-R` jr.n.s m mnw.s n jt.s
Horus Wsrt-kzw, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of Rituals, [M3 $\left.{ }^{\prime} t-k_{3}\right]-R^{\prime}$, she made (it) as her monument for her father.

## Ebony naos, Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo CG 70001

## References:

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I, Pl. XXVII; Roeder, Naos, 3-4; Urk. IV, 296.3-7
ntr nfr nb tzwj nb jrt jht nb hi'w jt nfrt nswt bjtj ' 3 -hpr-kz-R's3 R'n ht.f Dhwwtj-ms jr.n.fm mnw.fn jt.f Jmn-R jrt n.f sḥ-ntr šps m hbnj n tpjw haswt jr.s n.f 'nh.tj dd.tj mj R' $\underline{d} t$

Perfect God, Lord of Two Lands, Lord of Rituals, Lord of Crowns, The One Who Takes The White Crown Of The Two Lands, King of Upper and Lower Egypt ' $3-h p r-n-R$ ', the Son of his body, his beloved, $\underline{D} h w w t j-$ $m s$, she made (it) as his monument for his father [Amun-]Ra, i.e. making for him an august sh-ntrr of ebony of the finest of foreign lands, which she made for him, given life and stability like Ra forever.

## Temple of Tuthmose I- $\underline{H} n m t$ - ' $n \boldsymbol{n}$

## Hypostyle Hall, column

References:
unpublished
[...m] mnw.s $n[\ldots]$
[...] as her monument for [...]

## Temple at Medinet Habu - $\underline{D} \boldsymbol{r} r$-st

## Room Q, west wall, door jambs

References:
LD III, 7 [a]; The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX, Pl. 71; Urk. IV, 310-311


${ }^{3}$ [Jmn-R‘nb nswt t3wj] nb pt dj.f 'nh $\underline{d} d n b$ mj $R$ ' $\underline{d} t$
${ }^{1}$ Perfect God[dess], Mistr[ess] of the Two Lands, King of Upper and Lower Egypt [ $\left.M_{3}{ }^{i} t-k 3-R{ }^{\prime}\right]$, beloved of Amun-Ra, Lord of Gods
${ }^{2}$ Daugh[ter ]of Ra of his body, his beloved [H3t-špswt-hnmt-Jmn], [she] made (it) as [her] monument for [her] father
${ }^{3}$ [Amun-Ra, Lord of Thrones of Two Lands], Lord of Heaven, may he gives all life and stability forever.

# Appendix 2 <br> Names of temples 

## Temple of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari - Mn-swt



Tomb of Ineni (TT 81), transverse hall, west wall Urk. IV, 71
Dziobek, Das Grab des Ineni, 39

Statue of Sen-en-Mut with Nefrura, Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo CG 42114

## Temple of Mentuhotep II - $\boldsymbol{3} \boldsymbol{h}$-swt



Tomb of Ineni (TT 81), transverse hall, west wall Urk. IV, 71
Dziobek, Das Grab des Ineni, 39


1. Statue, Rhode Island School of Design Museum, Providence Rh.I 40.019
Dunham, A Statue Formerly at Uriage, Pl. XXVII [b] Urk. IV, 1501.14
2. Statue of Djehuty, Petrie Museum, London UC 14351
Petrie, A Season in Egypt, Pl. 21 [3]
Urk. IV, 451.8-452.4


Legrain, Statues et statuettes I, 63
Meyer, Senenmut, 315
Meyer, Senenmut 315


3

Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part
Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL

## Temple of Hatshepsut - $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$



1. Foundation deposit, axe

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI, Pl. CLXVIII

## 2. Foundation deposit, plaque

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI, Pl. CLXVIII
3. Foundation deposit, knife, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 20459
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 266
4. Foundation deposit, axe blade, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 20460
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 265


Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, east wall, north part, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 1636
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXXII
LD III, Pl. 17 [a]
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 112


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Portico, outer architrave
Karkowski, The External Row of Architraves of the Upper Portico, 60, Fig. 8
2. Foundation deposit, adze blade, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 20461
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 265
3. Foundation deposit, chisel, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 22.3.247
Roehrig, Dreyfus, Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut, 144, Fig. 76
4. Chapelle Rouge, north outer wall, 3rd course of blocks, block 40
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 98
5. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Portico, outer architrave
Karkowski, The External Row of Architraves of the Upper Portico, 60, Fig. 9


6. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Anubis

Shrine, Sanctuary, east wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari II, Pl. XLIV
2. Foundation deposit, pearl

Newberry, Extracts, 248
Urk. IV, 381.10
3. Stela of Senenu

Brovarski, Senenu, Pl. XIA (twice)


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Hall, south wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXLII
2. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, First Hypostyle Hall, pillar, south face unpublished

3. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, First Hypostyle Hall, pillar 02, west face
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 31 [right] Pirelli, The Pillars of the Outer Hypostyle Hall, 240
4. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, First Hypostyle Hall, pillar 07, west face

Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 3r [right] Pirelli, The Pillars of the Outer Hypostyle Hall, 241
3. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, north wall
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 17.4


1. Northampton stela

Urk. IV, 432


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Anubis Shrine, Hypostyle Hall, east wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari II, Pl. XXXIII
2. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, First Hypostyle Hall, Hathoric pillar
Niwiński, Miscellanea, 212


Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Anubis Shrine, Sanctuary, niche, west wall
Witkowski, Certains aspects du culte des dieux funéraires, 133


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Middlo Portico North (Punt Portico), west wall Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari III, Pl. LXXXIV
2. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Portico South (Coronation Portico), 5. pillar
Karkowski, An Archaeological Description of the Decoration of Osirid Pillars of the Upper Portico, 54-55, Figs 9, 10
3. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Hall, north wall
LD III, Pl. 20 [c]
4. Complex of the Sun Cult, entrance, west reveal Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I, Pl. 2
5. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, sun altar, north wall, graffiti
Karkowski, The Solar Complex, 255, Pl. 53A [right]
6. Foundation deposit, hoe, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 13114
7. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, west wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV, Pl. XCIV

Urk. IV, 381.1
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 265
7. Foundation deposit, adze, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 13115
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 265
Urk. IV, 381.1
8. Foundation deposit, vase, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 13118
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 265
Urk. IV, 381.3
9. Foundation deposit, vase and hoe

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI, Pl. CLXVIII (twice)
10. Foundation deposit

James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions I, no. 181
11. Foundation deposit, hoe, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 22.3.248
Roehrig, Dreyfus, Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut, 144 [76g]


Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Anubis Shrine, Sanctuary, east wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari II, Pl. LXIV


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Vestibule, west wall
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor I, Pl. 11
Karkowski, Hatshepsut Temple, Epigraphic Mission 1996, 48
Karkowski, The Decoration of the Temple of Hatshepsut, 113, Fig. 9 [A]
Roehrig, Dreyfus, Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut, 279, Fig. 100
2. Foundation deposit, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 13116
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 265
Urk. IV, 381.2
3. Foundation deposit, rocker

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI, Pl. CLXVIII
4. Bead of Sen-en-mut, Museum of Liverpool, Liverpool M11568
Eaton-Krauss, Inscribed bead, 169 [193]


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, north wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV, Pl. XLII Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 18
2. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, North Chamber of Amun, entrance, west reveal, inscription of Sen-en-mut
Hayes, Varia, Fig. 2

Gatty, Catalogue of the Mayer Collection, 56-57, n. 358
Reeves, Two Name-beads of Hatshepsut and Senenmut, 387-388
Schlick-Nolte, Werthmann, Loeben, An outstanding Glass Statuette, 15-16, Fig. 7
Stobart, Egyptian Antiquities, Pl. I [bottom left]
Urk. IV, 381.17
5. Sphinx of Hatshepsut, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 29.3.1
Tefnin, La statuaire d'Hatshepsout, 74
6. Stela of Senenu

Brovarski, Senenu, Pl. XIA (twice)
7. Statue of Amun-hetep

Dunham, A Statue Formerly at Uriage, 138, Pl. XXVII [a, b]
8. Stela of Sen-en-mut from North Karnak

Helck, Die Opferstiftung, 25
3. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, North Chamber of Amun, west wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I, Pl. XIX
4. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, storeroom Józefowicz, A Priest from the Middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty, 163-170

## 5. Foundation deposit, 7 vases

Winlock, Excavations, Pl. 42 [lower]

## 6. Foundation deposit

James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions I, no. 180
7. Chapelle Rouge, Sanctuary, south wall, 6th course of blocks, block 244
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 251


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Chapel of Hatshepsut, south wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV, Pl. CVIII
2. Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39)

Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê II, Pl. LIII
9. Stela of Senenu

Brovarski, Senenu, Pl. XIA
2. Statue of Sen-en-mut, Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth AP 85.2
Schulman, The Ubiquitous Senenmut, 65-67, 75-77, Figs 3-4

Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, North Chamber of Amun, west wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I, Pl. XX


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Anubis Shrine, Sanctuary, west wall
Witkowski, Certains aspects du culte des dieux funéraires, 143
2.Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, west wall, north part
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 21
2. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Vestibule, niche A, west wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV, Pl. XCVIII
3. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Anubis Shrine, east wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I, Pl. X

## 5. Northampton stela

Spiegelberg, Die Northampton Stele, 118-119
6. Stela of Senenu

Brovarski, Senenu, Pl. XIA (twice)


Tomb of Amun-em-hat (TT 82), Hall, east wall, south side
Davies, Gardiner, The Tomb of Amenemhēt, Pl. III

Statue of Hatshepsut, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 29.3.3 / Rijksmuseum van Oudheden,
Leiden L. 1998.80
Tefnin, La statuaire d'Hatshepsout, 25


Tomb of Sen-en-mut (TT 353), Chamber A, south wall, west section
Dorman, The Tombs of Senenmut, Pl. 67 [S64]


Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Hall, north wall
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXLIV


Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Hall, north wall
Marciniak, Une inscription commémorative, Pl. 17 [1. 8]



Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, north wall
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pl. 17.1
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV, Pl. XC


Chapelle Rouge, north outer wall, 3rd course of blocks, block 273
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 99


Statue of Sen-en-mut, Museum of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo 579
Meyer, Senenmut, 321
Urk. IV, 489.8



元


Foundation deposit, vase, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 20458
Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II, 266


Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part
Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL


1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, west wall, frames of Osiride niches
Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXXXIV (niches A and C)
2. Chapelle Rouge, south outer wall, 1st course of blocks, block 185
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 21

## Incomplete

1. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, Second Hypostyle Hall, pillars
Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II, Pls 3a [middle riight], b [right], d [middle left], e [middle left and right], o [right], q [right], s [left]
Pirelli, The Pillars of the Outer Hypostyle Hall, 241 (twice)
2. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Portico (Coronation Portico), pillar, block 197/72
Karkowski, An Archaeological Description of the Decoration of Osirid Pillars of the Upper Portico, 54, Fig. 9
3. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Portico (Coronation Portico), pillar, block 1625
Karkowski, An Archaeological Description of the Decoration of Osirid Pillars of the Upper Portico, 54, Fig. 9
4. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, west wall, scene above niche $\mathbf{N}$
Karkowski, The Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari. The Epigraphic Mission, Fig. 1
5. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Hall, north wall
Pawlicki, Deir el-Bahari: the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, 1998/1999, Fig. 7

## Temple of Thutmose I- $\underline{\text { Hnmt- } \boldsymbol{n} \boldsymbol{h}}$



Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, north wall
Karkowski, Notes on the Beautiful Feast of the Valley, 161, Fig. 5

Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL


Fragment of block found in the area of the temple of Mentuhotepa II at Deir el-Bahari
Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple III, Pl. XVI


Chapelle Rouge, south outer wall, 1st course of blocks, block 290
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 19
Lacau, Chevrier, Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout, 79-80, Pl. 4
Schnittger, Hatschepsut, 67, Fig. 35


1. Wooden door, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 22.2.26
Winlock, Notes on the Reburial of Tuthmosis I, Pl. XI [1]
Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt II, 82, Fig. 44
2. Fragment of an architrave, block from the storeroom no. 4 in the tomb MMA 828 at Qurna
Iwaszczuk, Unique Temple, Fig. 3
Iwaszczuk, The Temple of Tuthmosis I, 271, Fig. 2
3. Fragment of decorated block from the storeroom no. 4 in the tomb MMA 828 at Qurna
Iwaszczuk, The Temple of Tuthmosis I, 271, Fig. 2

## $\boldsymbol{H}^{〔}$-3ht temple



1. Statue of Sen-en-mut from Deir el-Bahari

Marciniak, Une nouvelle statue de Senenmout, Pl. XXIII
2. Carnelian bead from the collection of MacGregor Newberry, Extracts, 248
Urk. IV, 381


## Stela of Senenu

Brovarski, Senenu, Pl. XIA


1. Northampton Stela

Spiegelberg, Die Northampton Stele, 18, 123
Urk. IV, 422.16-423.1

## 2. Block from Ramesseum

Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. 57


Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part
Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL


Chapelle Rouge, south outer wall, 1st course of blocks, block 243
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 21
Lacau, Chevrier, Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout, 74-75, Pl. 4

## Temple of Thutmose III - Henkt- $n \boldsymbol{n}$



Chapelle Rouge, south outer wall, 1st course of blocks, block 290
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 19
Lacau, Chevrier, Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout, 80, Pl. 4
Schnittger, Hatschepsut, 67, Fig. 35


Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part
Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL


1. Fragment of statue of Thutmose III, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 50.19.1
Laboury, La statuaire de Thoutmosis III, 393-394 [Fr 5]
2. Stela of grey basalt

Weigall, A Repport on the Excavation, 130


1. Foundation deposit, adze blade, British Museum, London EA18194
Spiegelberg, Varia, 87
2. Foundation deposit, adze blade, Roemer- und Pel-izaeus-Museum, Hildesheim 5409
Schmitz, Zwei Gründungsbeigaben, 524, Fig. 2
3. Foundation deposit, adze blade, Louvre, Paris E 10443
Vernus, Deux objets, 60-62, Pls II-III

4. Stamped mud brick

LD III, Pl. 39 [g]
2. Stamped mud brick

Seco-Álvarez, Radwan, Egyptian-Spanish Project at the Temple of Thutmosis III, 70, Fig. 5 [5900]


Stamped mud brick
LD III, Pl. 39 [h]


Tomb of Benja (TT 343), inner room, south-west wall, scene 14
Guksch, Das Grab des Benja, 29 [Text 14b], Pl. 21

## $Q \quad 1$



Tomb of Benja (TT 343), inner room, south-west wall, scene 20
Guksch, Das Grab des Benja, 34 [Text 16b], Pl. 24

## Temple of Thutmose II - Šspt- $n h$



Block from Šspt- 'nh
Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II, 49, Pl. IX
Gabolde, Gabolde, Les temples 'mémoriaux', Pls XIV, XVI [B]

## Incomplete

## Stamped mud brick

Leblanc, Note sur une mention du temple de millions d'années, 117, Fig. 1

## Temple at Medinet Habu - $\underline{\text { D }} \boldsymbol{s r}$-st



Temple at Medinet Habu - Dssr-st, Room L The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX, Pl. 23


Temple at Medinet Habu - Dsr-st, Room O The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX, Pl. 41


1. Temple at Medinet Habu - Dssr-st, Room L, right jamb
The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX, Pl. 17
2. Temple at Medinet Habu - Dssr-st, Room L

The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX, Pl. 25
3. Temple at Medinet Habu - Drsr-st, Room L, left jamb
Johnson, Annual Report 1998-1999, Fig. 3
The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX, Pl. 29
4. Temple at Medinet Habu - Dsr-st, Room L, right jamb
The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX, Pl. 57

## Hr.j--ḷ-Jmn temple



Tomb of Ineni (TT 81), transverse hall, west wall Dziobek, Das Grab des Ineni, 39 Urk. IV, 71


## Vessel from Karnak

Traunecker, Un vase dédié à Amon, 307, Fig. 1


Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part
Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL


Chapelle Rouge, south outer wall, 1st course of blocks, block 242
Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I, 20
Lacau, Chevrier, Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout, 78, Pl. 4

## Hnmt-mn temple



Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part
Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL

## Hwt-k3 of Ahmose Nefertari


(3)

Tomb of Pui-em-Ra (TT 39), Hall, west wall, south part
Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I, Pl. XL

## Hft-hr-nb.s



Stela Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vatican 22780
Bongrani Fanfoni, La stele di Hatscepsut e Thutmosi III, Fig. 1
Botti, Romanelli, Le sculture, Pl. LIX [128]
Champollion, Notices I, 701
Cozi, Khefethernebes, 32
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Fig. 1. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, view of the quarry (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 2. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, block in the process of extraction (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 3. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, marks left by extraction of a block (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 4. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, outlines after each day of work (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 5. Hatshepsut's quarry at Qurna, outlines after each day of work (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 6. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, foundations: Upper Courtyard, south wall (based on Stefanowicz, An Analysis of the South Wall of the Upper Court, 49, Fig. 6; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 7. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: dovetail cramp: a) wooden original, b) stone socket (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 8. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: block with Hatshepsut's cartouche carved in the part concealed under the wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 9. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, wall shapes: inclined walls erected only in some parts of the temple (based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).
Fig. 10. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: patches and plaster fillings (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 11. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, Osiride statues: Upper Portico, north wing, Osiride statue XXV (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 12. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, remains of the bolt of the door: entrance to the Room with the Window, east jamb (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 13. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, door: door to the Southern Room of Amun from inside (based on Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V, Pl. CXXX; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 14. Deir el-Bahari, Temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, distribution of door sockets (based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).
Fig. 15. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, column bases: a) Hathor Shrine; b) Lower Anubis Shrine; c) Northern Colonnade; d) Southern Lower Portico (Obelisks Portico); e) Southern Middle Portico (Punt Portico); f) Southern Middle Portico (Punt Portico); g) Southern Lower Portico (Obelisks Portico) (based on Połoczanin, The Upper Portico, 80-83; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 16. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements: columns, architraves and ceiling (based on Wysocki, The Upper Court Colonnade, 62; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 17. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, method of joining architraves: a) architraves in one row; b) joint of two perpendicular rows of architraves; c) end of a row of architraves with an architrave inserted in the wall (drawing J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 18. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, ceilings: a) ceiling of the Chapel of Hatshepsut (based on Połoczanin, Moduł architektoniczny w kompozycji górnego tarasu, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk); b) relieving structure over the Bark Hall (based on Wysocki, The Discoveries, Research and the Results, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 19. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, balustrade: a) regular balustrade; b) balustrade of the ramp which leads to the Upper Terrace (based on Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes (1932), 21, Fig. 21; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 20. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, torus moulding: a) fragment of a block topped with torus moulding; b) torus moulding en face; c) torus moulding, view of a corner block from above (digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 21. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architectural elements, architectural errors: foundation of the north wall of the Upper Courtyard (based on Karkowski, The Solar Complex, Pl. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 22. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, block from the lower part of the wall, retaining wall over the Hathor Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 23. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, tools for preliminary smoothing and polishing of walls: mallet, storeroom of the Mission at the temple of Thutmose III, Deir el-Bahari (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 24. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, polishing of the walls: marks left by polishing of the walls, Upper Courtyard, north wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 25. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques: contours and carving of reliefs; marks left by carving of reliefs in an unfinished wall, Complex of the Solar Cult, Courtyard, Niche B, west wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 26. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, application: a) remains of paints and whitewash: Upper Courtyard, east wall, northern part (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 27. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, application: bowls with pigments: season 1999/2000, excavations in the Northern Room of Amun (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 28. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, decoration techniques, correction of carvers' errors: Upper Courtyard, east wall, northern part (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 29. Qurna, Temple of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari, Mn-swt, plan (based on Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset, 197; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 30. Qurna, Temple of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari, Mn-swt: representation of Amenhotep I in $h ̣ b-s d$ pavillion (based on Winlock, A Restoration of the Reliefs, Pl. IV; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 31. Deir el-Bahari, Temple of Mentuhotep II, 3 h-swt: plan of the temple od Mentuhotep II (based on Arnold Di., The Temple at Mentuhotep, Pl. 42; Arnold Di., Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep I, Pl. 27; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 32. Dedicatory inscriptions of Hatshepsut: a. based on Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm MM 14385 (Donohue, Hatshepsut and Nebhepetre ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Mentuhotpe, Fig. 2); b. based on Liverpool Museum, Liverpool M 11929 (Dodson, Hatshepsut and „her Father", Pl. XXIX [2]; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 33. Vota with the name of Hatshepsut (Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple III, Pls XXV [5], XXVII [3]).
Fig. 34. Deir el-Bahari, Temple of Mentuhotep II, $3 h$-swt: stela stored in the British Museum, London EA690 (Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple I, Pl. XXV [B]).
Fig. 35. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, foundation deposits (based on Weinstein, Foundation Deposits, 151; Wysocki, Deir el-Bahari, 1977-1982, 344, Fig. 22, Pl. 5; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 36. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, Pui-em-Ra’s inscriptions on blocks (Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple, 40, Fig. 10).
Fig. 37. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, block with Pui-em-Ra's inscription, storeroom 1 at the Metropolitan House (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 38. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, Pui-em-Ra's inscription on block, storeroom no. 1 at the Metropolitan House (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 39. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple: plan and section (based on Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple, Pl. XXX; Lythgoe, Lansing, Davies, The Egyptian Expedition 1915-16, 11, Fig. 7; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 40. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the north-east (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 41. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, offset of the outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the east (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 42. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, gate in the outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the north-west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 43. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Valley Temple, gate in the outer wall of the Valley Temple, view from the north-west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 44. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, plan of the Bark Station (based on Eigner, Die monumentalen Grabbauten, Pl. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 45. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, remains of the Bark Station, view from the north-east (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 46. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, remains of the Bark Station, view from the north (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 47. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Station, remains of the Bark Station, detail of stairs, view from the west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 48. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, north-western corner (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 49. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, enclosure wall, north-western corner (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 50. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, enclosure wall, north wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 51. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, east wall, northern part (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 52. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, west wall, northern part, smoothed detail next to the Osiride statue (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 53. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, enclosure wall, north wall, view from the north-west (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 54. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Middle Terrace, outer wall in the north, added to the Northern Colonnade (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 55. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Lower Terrace, retaining wall, unfinished panels with the Horus name of Hatshepsut and beginning of the ramp leading to the Hathor Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 56. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Middle Terrace, Northern Colonnade added to the Lower Anubis Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 57. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Middle Terrace, cornice of the Northern Colonnade viewed from the north wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 58. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Ramp of the Hathor Shrine (1st phase): remains of the sandstone threshold which supported the ramp in the 1st phase of construction of the Hathor Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 59. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Ramp of the Hathor Shrine (1st phase), south retaining wall of the Middle Terrace with the negative of the ramp from the 1st phase of construction and decoration connected with it (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 60. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, narrow room located to the south of the Hathor Shrine, torus moulding chiselled off in the course of addition of the First Hypostyle Hall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 61. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Hathor Shrine, cornice over the west wall of the Second Hypostyle Hall (Phot J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 62. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, view of the Lower Anubis Shrine and retaining wall at the back of the area located to the north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico) (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 63. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area located north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico) (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 64. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico), view of the west wall of the area located north of the Upper Portico (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 65. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area located north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico) (based on Kwaśnica, Szafrański, The Problem of Reconstruction of the Retaining Wall, 56; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 66. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area north of the Upper Portico (Coronation Portico), fragment of the north wall of the retaining wall with building dipinti (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 67. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space at the back of the Upper Portico, corner of the retaining wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 68. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space at the back of the Upper Portico, fragment of the west wall of the retaining wall with an erasure covered with plaster (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 69. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space at the back of the Upper Portico, fragment of the north wall of the retaining wall with a chiselled part (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 70. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space above the Hathor Shrine, fragment of the retaining wall with lowered floor level, analogical to the lowered floor of the retaining wall above the Lower Anubis Shrine (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 71. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, space above the Hathor Shrine, fragment of the retaining wall with lowered floor level, analogical to the lowered floor of the retaining wall above the Lower Anubis Shrine (detail) (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 72. Osiride statues in front of the $\underline{H} n m t-n h$ temple (based on Davies, Two Ramesside Tombs, Pl. 13; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 73. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, area north of the Upper Portico, fragment of the wall closing the Upper Portico from the south with traces of smoothed surface (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 74. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, west wall, scene over niche H (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 75. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, entrance to the Sanctuary with marks of rebuilding (Phot. and drawing J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 76. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, column location according to Dąbrowski (based on Dąbrowski, The Main Hypostyle Hall, 51; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 77. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, column location according to Wysocki (based on Wysocki, The Upper Court Colonnade, 68; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 78. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location according to Karkowski (based on Karkowski, The Arrangement of the Architraves, 139-154; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 79. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location according to Pawlicki (based on Pawlicki, Skarby architektury, 81, Fig. 69; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 80. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location according to Kwaśnica (based on Szafrański, Szafrański, Deir el-Bahari. Season 1999/2000, 190, Fig. 4; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 81. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, architrave location: summary (based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).

Fig. 82. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Upper Courtyard, probable location of the altar (a) Dąbrowski, The Main Hypostyle Hall, Pl. XLVIII; b) based on plan made by T. Dziedzic).

Fig. 83. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Bark Hall: Osiride statue of Hatshepsut, partially reconstructed north-western Osiride statue of Hatshepsut with chiselling marks on the northern side (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 84. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Complex Solar Cult, Altar Court, small altar of the first phase (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 85. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Solar Cult Complex, the door between the Northern Room of Amun and the Courtyard of the Solar Cult Complex: a) view from the Solar Cult Complex; b) view from the Northern Room of Amun (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 86. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, Solar Cult Complex, Altar Court, enlarged altar (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 87. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, passage from the Bark Hall to the Statue Room, north wall (Phot. M. Jawornicki).
Fig. 88. Deir el-Bahari, stela of Senenu with a newly added fragment (drawing based on Brovarski, Senenu, Pl. XIA; Phot. Z. Doliński; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 89. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, auxiliary buildings, dwelling structures: a) mud brick houses; b) stone basin in one of the houses; c) serpentine wall (Carter, Excavations in the Valley of Dêr El Bahari, Pls XIX-XX).
Fig. 90. Deir el-Bahari, temple of Hatshepsut, representations which mention $t p-j t r w$ : butchery scene, Upper Courtyard, east wall, northern part, upper register (drawing and digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 91. $\underline{H n m t-}$ 'nh temple, plan of the temple (based on Barakat, The Temple of Kha'-'Akhet, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 92. $\underline{H} n m t-n h$ temple, fragment of architrave with the name of the temple (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 93. Hnmt- 'nh temple, brickes stamped with the names of Hatshepsut and Thutmose I, found on the area of the Hnkt-'nh temple: a) LD III, Pl. 25bis [i]; b) LD III, Pl. 26 [4]; found in the area of the Valley Temple of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ : c) Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple, 40, Pl. XXXII [4].
Fig. 94. Hnmt-'nh temple, base of the column in situ (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 95. Hnmt-'nh temple, corner block with marks left by an addition of a wall (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 96. $\underline{H n m t-' n h ~ t e m p l e, ~ r e u s e d ~ b l o c k ~(P h o t . ~ J . ~ I w a s z c z u k) . ~}$
Fig. 97. $\underline{H} n m t-n h$ temple, fragment of architrave with pigments applied directly on the stone (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 98. Hnmt-nh temple, fragments of blocks with cryptogram frieze (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 99. Hnmt- 'nh temple, fragment of Osiride statue (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 100. Hnmt-'nh temple, block with feet of goddess (Phot. D. Dąbkowski).
Fig. 101. Fragment of block with the cryptogram frieze (based on Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. 47; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 102. Fragment of block with the name of the temple (based on Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. 57; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 103. Pebble with inscription which mentions $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ (based on Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum, Pl. 52; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 104. Temple of Hatshepsut - Disr- $\underline{\underline{c}} s r w$, name of the gate leading to the Complex of the Solar Cult, east jamb (Phot. and drawing J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 105. Hnkt-' $n h$ temple of Thutmose III, foundation deposit under the north-western corner of the third Osiride pillar (based on Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses’ III., Pl. 12 [upper right]; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 106. Hnkt-' $n h$ temple of Thutmose III, adze blade from the foundation deposit (based on Schmitz, Zwei Gründungsbeigaben, Fig. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 107. Hnkt-'nh temple of Thutmose III, plan of the temple with marked foundation deposits and economic area (based on Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses' III., Pl. 4).
Fig. 108. Hnkt- 'nh temple of Thutmose III, stamped mud bricks (LD III, Pl. 39 [f-k]).
Fig. 109. Šspt-' $n h$ temple of Thutmose II, aerial view (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 110. Šspt- $n h$ temple of Thutmose II, fragments discovered in the temple, fragments with the cryptographic frieze discovered in the temple of Thutmose II (based on MMS Bruyère 1945-1946, 7, 10; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 111. Šspt- 'nh temple of Thutmose II, plan of the temple of Thutmose II with marked outlines of walls (based on Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II, Pl. I; Varille, Le temple du scribe royal Amenhotep, Pl. I; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 112. Šspt-'nh temple of Thutmose II, reconstruction of phases of the construction: a) phase I (times of Hatshepsut); b) phase II (times of Thutmose III) (based on Varille, Le temple du scribe royal Amenhotep, Pl. VII; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 113. $\check{S}$ spt- $n h$ temple of Thutmose II, sixteen-sided column rebuilt in the entrance of the temple (based on MMS Bruyère 1945-1946, 7; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 114. Šspt- 'nh temple of Thutmose II, gargoyle (based on Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II, 33, Fig. 17; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 115. Šspt- 'nh temple of Thutmose II: fragment of stairs (based on Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II, 30, Fig. 15; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 116. Ds $r$-st temple at Medinet Habu, plan of the temple (based on Hölscher, The Excavations of Medinet Habu II, Pl. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 117. Dsr-st temple at Medinet Habu, foundation of the temple (based on Hölscher, The Excavations of Medinet Habu II, Pl. 2; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 118. Hr.j-ḥr-Jmn temple, vessel for oils discovered at Karnak (based on Traunecker, Un vase dédié à Amon, 307, Fig. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 119. Hnmt-mn temple, blocks found in the area of the temple of Merenptah (based on Bickel, Tore, Pl. 95; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 120. $\underline{H} n m t-m n$ temple, vessels from the foundation deposit discovered by Petrie (based on Petrie, Six Temples, 4, Pl. IV [1-8]; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 121. Hnmt-mn temple, Sen-Amun's funerary cones (LD III, Pl. 39 [e]).
Fig. 122. Vessels represented on the south wall of the niche in the Upper Anubis Shrine in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 123. Stela Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vatican 22780 (based on Botti, Romanelli, Le sculture, Pl. LIX [128]; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 124. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Southern Valleys: a) view of the Southern Valleys from the north-east; b) view of the tomb of Hatshepsut; c) tomb of Hatshepsut (Phot. J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 125. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Southern Valleys, section of the rock at the level of the tomb of Hatshepsut (based on Carter, A Tomb Prepared for Queen Hatshepsut, Pl. XX; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

Fig. 126. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Southern Valleys, plan and section of the tomb of Hatshepsut (based on Carter, A Tomb Prepared for Queen Hatshepsut, Pl. XXI; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 127. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Valley of the Kings (KV 20): plan and section of the tomb of Hatshepsut in the Valley of the Kings (KV 20) (based on http://www.thebanmappingproject.com/sites/ browse_tomb_834.html, accessed November 22, 2016; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 128. Tomb of Hatshepsut in the Valley of the Kings (KV 20): (based on Davis, Naville, Carter, The Tomb of Hâtshopsîtû, 104, Fig. 1; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).
Fig. 129. Schematic plan of West Thebes in the times of Hatshepsut (based on $\mathrm{PM} \mathrm{II}^{2}$, Pl. XXXIII; digitising J. Iwaszczuk).

References

# Abbreviations 

| $\ddot{A} A T$ | Ägypten und Altes Testament |
| :---: | :---: |
| ADAIK | Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo |
| EgLeod | Aegyptiaca Leodiensia |
| AegMonast | Aegyptiaca Monasteriensia |
| AntWelt | Antike Welt. Zeitschrift für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte |
| AOAT | Alter Orient und Altes Testament |
| AOS | American Oriental Series |
| ArchVer | Archäologische Veröffentlichungen |
| ASAE | Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte |
| ASEg | Archaeological Survey of Egypt |
| $B \ddot{A} B A$ | Beiträge zur ägyptischen Bauforschung und Altertumskunde |
| BCE | Bulletin de liaison du Groupe international d'étude de la céramique égyptienne |
| BdE | Bibliothèque d'étude |
| BES | Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar |
| BIFAO | Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale |
| BIFAO-suppl. | Supplement au Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale |
| BMMA | Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art |
| BMSAES | British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan (http://www.thebritishmuseum. ac.uk/bmsaes; accessed November 22, 2016) |
| CahKarn | Cahiers de Karnak. Centre franco-égyptien d'étude des temples de Karnak |
| CASAE | Supplément aux Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte |
| ChronEg | Chronique d'Égypte |
| CRIPEL | Cahiers de recherches de l'Institut de papyrologie et égyptologie de Lille |
| DiscEg | Discussions in Egyptology |
| DossArch | Dossiers d'archéologie |
| EgArch | Egyptian Archaeology. The Bulletin of the Egypt Exploration Society |
| EgUit | Egyptologische Uitgaven |
| EtTrav | Études et travaux (Institut des Cultures Méditerranéennes et Orientales de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences; previously: Centre d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences) |
| EtudEg | Études d'égyptologie |
| EVO | Egitto e Vicino Oriente. Rivista della sezione di Egittologia e Scienze Storiche del Vicino Oriente |
| FIFAO | Fouilles de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale |
| GöttMisz | Göttinger Miszellen. Beiträge zur ägyptologischen Diskussion |
| $Н \ddot{A} B$ | Hildesheimer ägyptologische Beiträge |
| IBAES | Internet-Beiträge zur Ägyptologie und Sudanarchäologie (www.ibaes.de) |
| JARCE | Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt |
| JEA | Journal of Egyptian Archaeology |
| JESHO | Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient |
| JMFA | Journal of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston |
| JNES | Journal of Near Eastern Studies |
| Kemet | Kemet - das schwarze Land. Ägypten |
| Kêmi | Kêmi. Revue de philologie et d'archéologie égyptiennes et copte |
| KMT | K.M.T. A Modern Journal of Ancient Egypt |
| $L \ddot{A}$ | Lexikon der Ägyptologie I-VII, Wiesbaden 1975-1992 |
| L $D$ | K.R. Lepsius, Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien, 12 vols, Berlin 1849-1859 |
| Man | Man. Monthly Record of Anthropological Science |
| MÄS | Münchner ägyptologische Studien |
| $M \ddot{A} U$ | Münchner ägyptologische Untersuchungen |
| MDAIK | Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo |
| MEEF | Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund |


| Menes | Menes. Studien zur Kultur und Sprache der ägyptischen Frühzeit und des Alten Reiches |
| :---: | :---: |
| MIFAO | Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale |
| MMAEE | Metropolitan Museum of Art, Egyptian Expedition |
| MonAeg | Monumenta Aegyptiaca |
| MOSAIKjournal | MOSAIKjournal. Raumdimensionen im Altertum (www.mosaikjournal.com) |
| NAWG | Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse |
| OIC | Oriental Institute Communications |
| OIP | Oriental Institute Publications |
| OLA | Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta |
| OLZ | Orientalistische Literaturzeitung |
| OrMonsp | Orientalia Monspeliensia |
| PAM | Polish Archaeology in the Mediterranean |
| PM | B. Porter, R.L.B. Moss, Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings I-VIII, Oxford 1927- |
| PMMA | Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art |
| ProblÄg | Probleme der Ägyptologie |
| PSBA | Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology |
| PTT | Private Tombs at Thebes |
| RAPH | Recherches d'archéologie, de philologie et d'histoire |
| RecTrav | Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes |
| RdE | Revue d'égyptologie |
| RPTMS | Robb de Peyster Tytus Memorial Series |
| SAK | Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur |
| SAK Beihefte | Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur Beihefte |
| SAOC | Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations |
| SDAIK | Sonderschrift des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo |
| Serapis | Serapis. American Journal of Egyptology |
| StudAeg | Studia Aegyptiaca |
| StudEgypt | Studies in Egyptology |
| TLA | Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae (aaew.bbaw.de/tla/) |
| Urk. | Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums I-VIII, Leipzig, Berlin 1903-1957 |
| Wb | A. Erman, H. Grapow, Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache I-VI, Leipzig, Berlin 1926-1963 |
| TTS | Theban Tombs Series |
| WZKM | Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes |
| ZÄS | Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde |

## References

Abdel Ghany, Untersuchung<br>K. Abdel Ghany, Untersuchung einiger Merkmale der Gräber KV 38 und KV 20, GöttMisz 248, 2016, 11-25

## Abdel Ghany, Die königlichen Amduat-Fragmente

K. Abdel Ghany, Die königlichen Amduat-Fragmente vor der Regierungszeit Thutmosis’ III, ZÄS 143, 2016, 5-21

## Abitz, Die Entwicklung der Grabachsen

F. Abitz, Die Entwicklung der Grabachsen in den Königsgräbern im Tal der Könige, MDAIK 45, 1989, 1-25

## Allam, Une classe ouvrière: les merit

S. Allam, Une classe ouvrière: les merit, [in:] B. Menu (Ed.), La dépendance rurale dans l'Antiquité égyptienne et proche-orientale, $B d E$ 140, Le Caire 2004, 123-155

## Allam, Les équipes dites meret

S. Allam, Les équipes dites meret spécialisées dans le filage-tissage en Égypte pharaonique, [in:] B. Menu (Ed.), L’organisation du travail en Égypte ancienne et en Mésopotamie. Colloque Aidea - Nice 4-5 octobre 2004, BdE 151, Le Caire 2010, 41-64

## Allen, The Role of Amun

J.P. Allen, The Role of Amun, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 83-85

## Altenmüller, Bemerkungen zur frühen und späten Bauphase des Djoserbezirkes

H. Altenmüller, Bemerkungen zur frühen und späten Bauphase des Djoserbezirkes in Saqqara, MDAIK 28/1, 1972, 1-12

## Altenmüller, Bemerkungen

H. Altenmüller, Bemerkungen zu den Königsgräbern des Neuen Reiches, SAK 10, 1983, 25-62

## Andrássy, Zur Organisation und Finanzierung von Tempelbauten

P. Andrássy, Zur Organisation und Finanzierung von Tempelbauten im Alten Ägypten, [in:] M. Fitzenreiter (Ed.), Das Heilige und die Ware. Zum Spannungsfeld von Religion und Ökonomie, IBAES VII, Berlin 2007, 143-164

## Andrássy, Builders' Graffiti

P. Andrássy, Builders' Graffiti and Administrative Aspects of Pyramid and Temple Building in Ancient Egypt, [in:] R. Preys (Ed.), 7. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung. Structuring Religion, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft Früher Hochkulturen 3,2, Wiesbaden 2009, 1-16

## Arnold Di., Wandrelief und Raumfunktion

Di. Arnold, Wandrelief und Raumfunktion in ägyptischen Tempeln des Neuen Reiches, MÄS 2, Berlin 1962

## Arnold Di., Deir el-Bahari I

Di. Arnold, Deir el-Bahari I, [in:] LÄ I, 1006-1011

## Arnold Di., Deir el-Bahari III

Di. Arnold, Deir el-Bahari III, [in:] LÄ I, 1017-1023

## Arnold Di., Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep I

Di. Arnold, Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep von Deir el-Bahari. Band I. Architektur und Deutung, ArchVer 8, Mainz am Rhein 1974

## Arnold Di., Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep II

Di. Arnold, Der Tempel des Königs Mentuhotep von Deir el-Bahari. Band II. Die Wandreliefs des Sanktuares, ArchVer 11, Mainz am Rhein 1974

Arnold Di., Erscheinungsfenster
Di. Arnold, Erscheinungsfenster, [in:] $L \ddot{A}$ II, 14

Arnold Di., Vom Pyramidenbezirk
Di. Arnold, Vom Pyramidenbezirk zum „Haus für Millionen Jahre", MDAIK 34, 1978, 1-8

## Arnold Di., The Temple of Mentuhotep

Di. Arnold, The Temple of Mentuhotep at Deir el-Bahari, Mainz am Rhein 1979

## Arnold Di., The Pyramid of Senwosret I

Di. Arnold, The Pyramid of Senwosret I, PMMA XXII, New York 1988

## Arnold Di., Pharaonic Stone Masonry

Di. Arnold, Pharaonic Stone Masonry, New York 1991

## Arnold Di., Die Tempel Ägyptens

Di. Arnold, Die Tempel Ägyptens. Götterwohnungen - Baudenkmäler - Kultstätten, Zürich 1992

## Arnold Di., Royal Cult Complexes

Di. Arnold, Royal Cult Complexes of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, [in:] B.E. Shafer (Ed.), Temples of Ancient Egypt, London, New York 1997, 31-85

## Arnold Di., The Encyclopedia of Ancient Egyptian Architecture

Di. Arnold, The Encyclopedia of Ancient Egyptian Architecture, Cairo 2003

## Arnold Di., The Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari

Di. Arnold, The Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 135-141

## Arnold Do., The Destruction of the Statues of Hatshepsut

Do. Arnold, The Destruction of the Statues of Hatshepsut from Deir el-Bahari, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 270-276

## Arnold F., Pharaonische Prozessionsstrassen

F. Arnold, Pharaonische Prozessionsstrassen. Mittel der Machtdarstellung unter Königin Hatschepsut, [in:] E.-L. Schwandner, K. Rheidt (Eds), Macht der Architektur - Architektur der Macht. Bauforschungskolloquium in Berlin vom 30. Oktober bis 2. November 2002 veranstaltet vom Architektur-Referat des DAI, Diskussionen zur Archäologischen Bauforschung 8, Mainz am Rhein 2004, 13-23

## Arnold F., The Khnum temple 2014/2015

F. Arnold, The Khnum temple of the New Kingdom, [in:] S.J. Seidlmayer, F. Arnold, J. Budka, R. Colman, J. Fayein, C. Jeuthe, E. Khalifa, F. Keshk, P. Kopp, W. Mayer, C. von Pilgrim, J. Sigl, M.-K. Schröder, L.-A. Warden, N. Warner, Report on the Excavations at Elephantine by the German Archaeological Institute and the Swiss Institute from autumn 2014 to spring 2015, unpublished report, 12-15 (http://www.da inst.org/projekt/-/project-display/25953\#_LFR_FN__projectdisplay_WAR_daiportlet_view_downloads, accessed November 22, 2016)

## Arnold F., The Khnum temple 2015/2016

F. Arnold, The Khnum temple of the New Kingdom, [in:] S.J. Seidlmayer, F. Arnold, R. Bicker, R. Colman, D. Fritzsch, C. Jeuthe, E. Laskowska-Kusztal, P. Kopp, M. Renzi, J. Aaron Roberson, J. Sigl, C. von Pilgrim, L.-A. Warden, Report on the Excavations at Elephantine by the German Archaeological Institute and the Swiss Institute from autumn 2015 to summer 2016, unpublished report, 30-34 (http://www.da inst.org/projekt/-/project-display/25953\#_LFR_FN__projectdisplay_WAR_daiportlet_view_downloads, accessed November 22, 2016)

## Assmann, Die Zeit Hatschepsuts und Thutmosis' III.

J. Assmann, Die Zeit Hatschepsuts und Thutmosis' III. in religionsgeschichtlicher Sicht, [in:] A. Eggebrecht (Ed.), Ägyptens Aufstieg zur Weltmacht, Hildesheim 1987, 47-55

## Assmann, Das ägyptische Prozessionsfest

J. Assmann, Das ägyptische Prozessionsfest, [in:] J. Assmann, Th. Sundermeier (Eds), Das Fest und das Heilige. Religiöse Kontrapunkte zur Alltagswelt, Studien zum Verstehen fremder Religionen 1, Gütersloh 1991, 105-122

## Aston, Harrell, Shaw, Stone

B.G. Aston, J.A. Harrell, I. Shaw, Stone, [in:] P.T. Nicholson, I. Show (Eds), Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology, Cambridge 2001, 5-77

## Aubry et al., Pharaonic necrostratigraphy

Aubry et al., Pharaonic necrostratigraphy: a review of geological and archaeological studies in the Theban Necropolis, Luxor, West Bank, Egypt, Terra Nova 21/4, 2009, 237-256

## Awad, Untersuchungen zum Schatzhaus

Kh.A.H. Awad, Untersuchungen zum Schatzhaus im Neuen Reich: Administrative und ökonomische Aspekte, unpublished PhD thesis, Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, Göttingen 2002 (https://ediss. uni-goettingen.de/handle/11858/00-1735-0000-000D-F213-F, accessed November 22, 2016)

## Baillet, Les noms de l'esclave

J. Baillet, Les noms de l'esclave en Égyptiens, RecTrav XXIX/1-2, 1907, 6-25

## Bakir, Slavery

A.-M. Bakir, Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt, CASAE 18, Le Caire 1952

## BAR II

J.H. Breasted, Ancient Record of Egypt. Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. II. The Eighteenth Dynasty, Chicago 1906

## Baraize, Sur quelques travaux de consolidation

E. Baraize, Sur quelques travaux de consolidation exécutés en février et mars 1906, ASAE VII, 1906, 150-154

## Baraize, Rapport sur l'enlèvement et le transport du sarcophage

E. Baraize, Rapport sur l'enlèvement et le transport du sarcophage de la reine Hatchopsitou, ASAE XXI, 1921, 175-182

Barakat, The Temple of Kha'- Akhet
A. el-Ayun Barakat, The Temple of Kha'-`Akhet in Western Thebes, MDAIK 37, 1981, 29-33, Pls 4-5

## Barakat, A New Statue of Ken-Amun

A. Elyon Barakat, A New Statue of Ken-Amun, EtTrav XII, 1983, 85-91

## Barakat, The statue of Nefer-peret in Cairo Museum

A. El Youn El Barakat, The statue of Nefer-peret in Cairo Museum, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 1980-1988 4, Warsaw 1991, 72-80

## Barakt, A New Temple of Queen Hatshepsut in Qurna

A. El Youn El Barakt, A Preliminary Description of a New Temple of Queen Hatshepsut in Qurna, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigation and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological Mission 1972-1973 2, Warsaw 1980, 103-107

## Barguet, Le temple d'Amon-Rê à Karnak

P. Barguet, Le temple d'Amon-Rê à Karnak. Essai d'exégèse, RAPH 21, Le Caire 1962

## Barta, Der königliche Totenopfertempel

W. Barta, Der königliche Totenopfertempel und seine Entstehung, MDAIK 22, 1967, 48-52

## Barwik, The owner of the cliff tomb MMA 1021

M. Barwik, The owner of the cliff tomb MMA 1021 at Thebes, GöttMisz 165, 1998, 13-21

## Barwik, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, Season 2001

M. Barwik, Deir el-Bahari: The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, Season 2001, PAM XIII, 2002, 191-202

## Barwik, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, Season 2001/2002

M. Barwik, Deir el-Bahari: The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, Season 2001/2002, PAM XIV, 2003, 199-208

## Barwik, Ahmose

M. Barwik, Ahmose - a mayor of Thebes of the early Tuthmoside period, GöttMisz 216, 2008, 13-16

## Barwik, Sanctuary of the Hatshepsut Temple

M. Barwik, Sanctuary of the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] M. Dolińska, H. Beinlich (Eds), 8. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung: Interconnections between Temples, Königstum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 3,3, Wiesbaden 2010, 1-12

## Barwik, A record of offerings from the Temple of Hatshepsut

M. Barwik, A record of offerings from the Temple of Hatshepsut in Deir el-Bahari: ostrakon DeB Inv. No. 85/75 reconsidered, [in:] A. Łajtar, A. Obłuski, I. Zych (Ed.), Nubia Christiana. The Włodzimierz Godlewski Jubilee Volume on the occasion of his 70th Birthday, Warsaw 2016, 665-677

## Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor I

N. Beaux, N. Grimal, G. Pollin, J. Karkowski, E. Majerus, Temple d'Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari, La chapelle d'Hathor, I - Vestibule et sanctuaires, MIFAO 129, Le Caire 2012

## Beaux, Karkowski, La chapelle d'Hathor du Temple d'Hatchepsout

N. Beaux, J. Karkowski, La chapelle d'Hathor du Temple d'Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari: Rapport préliminaire, BIFAO 93, 1993, 7-24

## Beaux et al., La chapelle d'Hathor II

N. Beaux, J. Karkowski, E. Majerus, G. Pollin, Temple d'Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari. La chapelle d'Hathor. II - Façade et salles hypostyles. 1- Figures et planches, MIFAO 133, Le Caire 2016

## Beckerath, Ein Wunder des Amun

J. von Beckerath, Ein Wunder des Amun bei der Tempelgründung in Karnak, MDAIK 37, 1981, 41-49

## Beckerath, Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen

J. von Beckerath, Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen, MÄS 49, Mainz am Rhein 1999

## Bell, Luxor Temple

L. Bell, Luxor Temple and the Cult of the Royal Ka, JNES 44, 1985, 251-294

## Bell, The New Kingdom « Divine» Temple

L. Bell, The New Kingdom « Divine» Temple: The Example of Luxor, [in:] B.E. Shafer (Ed.), Temples of Ancient Egypt, London, New York 1998, 127-184

## Belmonte et al., From Umm al Qab to Biban al Muluk

J.A. Belmonte, A.C.G. García, M. Shaltout, M. Fekri, N. Miranda, From Umm al Qab to Biban al Muluk: The Orientation of Royal Tombs in Ancient Egypt, [in:] J. Vailkünas (Ed.), Astronomy and Cosmology in Folk Traditions and Cultural Heritage, Archaeologia Baltica 10, Klaipėda 2008, 226-233

## Belmonte, Shaltout (Eds), In Search of Cosmic Order

J.A. Belmonte, M. Shaltout (red.), In Search of Cosmic Order. Selected Essays on Egyptian Archaeoastronomy, Cairo 2009

## Belzoni, Narrative of the Operations and Recent Discoveries

G.B. Belzoni, Narrative of the Operations and Recent Discoveries within the Pyramids, Temples, Tombs, and Excavations, in Egypt and Nubia; and of a Journey to the Coast of the Red See, in Search of the Ancient Berenice; and Another to the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon, London 1820

## Bergmann, Inschriftliche Denkmäler

E. von Bergmann, Inschriftliche Denkmäler des Sammlung ägyptischer Alterthümer des östereichischen Kaiserhauses, RecTrav IX, 1887, 32-63

## Berlandini-Grenier, Senenmout

J. Berlandini-Grenier, Senenmout, stoliste royale, sur une statue-cube avec Neferourê, BIFAO 76, 1976, 111-132, Pls XVIII-XXIV

Białostocka, Rozważania na temat przedstawień posągów królewskich
O. Białostocka, Rozważania na temat przedstawień posągów królewskich w świątyniach tebańskich 18 dynastii (unpublished MA thesis), Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa 2003

Bialostocka, Alterations to the Relief Representations of Royal Family Members' Statues
O. Białostocka, Alterations to the Relief Representations of Royal Family Members' Statues in the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] J. Popielska-Grzybowska, O. Białostocka, J. Iwaszczuk (Eds), Proceedings of the Third Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists. Egypt 2004: Perspectives of Research. Warsaw 12-14 May 2004, Acta Archaeologica Pultuskiensia I, Pułtusk 2009, 11-15, Pl. 1

## Białostocka, Palace or Slaughterhouse

O. Białostocka, Palace or Slaughterhouse? The Function of the Room with a Window in the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XXVII, 2014, 37-60

Białostocka, Szafrański, Archaeological, Preservation and Epigraphic Missions
O. Białostocka, Z. Szafrański, Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. Archaeological, Preservation and Epigraphic Missions, [in:] Z.E. Szafrański (Ed.), Queen Hatshepsut and her Temple 3500 years later, Warsaw 2001, 269-274

## Bickel, Blocs d'Amenhotep III

S. Bickel, Blocs d'Amenhotep III réemployés das la temple de Merenptah à Gourna, BIFAO 92, 1992, 1-13

## Bickel, Tore

S. Bickel, Untersuchungen im Totentempel des Merenptah in Theben. III. Tore und andere wiederverwendete Bauteile Amenophis' III., BÄBA 16, Stuttgart 1997

## Bickerstaffe, The Discovery

D. Bickerstaffe, The Discovery of Hatshepsut's 'Throne', KMT 13/1, 2002, 71-77

Bietak, Theben-West
M. Bietak, Theben-West (Luxor). Vorbericht über die erster vier Grabungskampagnen (1969-1971), Wien 1972

## Bissing, Baumeister und Bauten

F.W. von Bissing, Baumeister und Bauten aus dem Beginn des Neuen Reichs, [in:] Studi in memoria di Ippolito Rosellini nel primo centenario della morte (4 giugno 1843) I, Pisa 1949, 127-234

## Biston-Moulin, À propos de la table d'offrandes

S. Biston-Moulin, À propos de la table d'offrandes de Thoutmosis III Caire JE 88803, CahKarn 13, 2010, 25-43

## Björkman, Kings at Karnak

G. Björkman, Kings at Karnak. A Study of the Treatment of the Monuments of Royal Predecessors in the Early New Kingdom, Uppsala 1971

## Blankenberg-van Delden, A genealogical reconstruction of the kings and queen

C. Blankenberg-van Delden, A genealogical reconstruction of the kings and queens of the late $17^{\text {th }}$ and early $18^{\text {th }}$ dynasties, GöttMisz 54, 1982, 31-45

## Boddens Hosang, De Egyptische verzameling van Baron van Westreenen

F.J.E. Boddens Hosang, De Egyptische verzameling van Baron van Westreenen. The Egyptian Collection of Baron van Westreenen, Monografieën van het Museum van het Boek 4, Haag 1989, 98-99, Pl. 50

## Bogoslavsky, Die, Auf-den-Ruf-Hörenden'

E.S. Bogoslavsky, Die ,Auf-den-Ruf-Hörenden' in der Privatwirtschaft unter der 18. Dynastie, [in:]
E. Endesfeld, K.-H. Priese, W.F. Reineke, S. Wenig (Eds), Ägypten und Kush, Berlin 1977, 81-95

## Bomann, The Private Chapel

A. Bomann, The Private Chapel in Ancient Egypt: A Study of the Chapels in the Workmen's Village at El Amarna with Special Reference to Deir el Medina and Other Sites, London, New York 1991

## Bommas, Der Tempel des Chnum

M. Bommas, Der Tempel des Chnum der 18. Dyn. auf Elephantine, unpublished PhD thesis, Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg 2000 (http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/3383/, accessed November 22, 2016)

## Bongrani Fanfoni, La stele di Hatscepsut e Thutmosi III

L. Bongrani Fanfoni, La stele di Hatscepsut e Thutmosi III presso il Museo Gregoriano Egizio, [in:] E. Bresciani, G. Geraci, S. Penigotti, G. Susini (Eds), Scritti in Onore di Orsolina Montevecchi, Bologna 1981, 39-47

## Bonnet, Valbelle, Le village de Deir el-Médineh

Ch. Bonnet, D. Valbelle, Le village de Deir el-Médineh: reprise de l'étude archéologique, BIFAO 75, 1975, 429-446, Pls LXII-LXXII

## Borchardt, Statuen und Statuetten

L. Borchardt, Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten im Museum von Kairo Nr. 1-1294 I-V, Berlin 1911-1935

## Borchardt, Tempel mit Umgang

L. Borchardt, Ägyptische Tempel mit Umgang, BÄBA 2, Kairo 1938

## Botti, Romanelli, Le sculture

G. Botti, P. Romanelli, Le sculture del Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vatican 1951

## Bourguet, Le temple de Deir el-Médîna

P. du Bourguet, Le temple de Deir el-Médîna, MIFAO 121, Le Caire 2008²

## Braun, Pharao und Priester

N.S. Braun, Pharao und Priester - Sakrale Affirmation von Herrschaft durch Kultvollzug. Das tägliche Kultbildritual im Neuen Reich und der Dritten Zwischenzeit, Philippika. Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 23, Wiesbaden 2013

## Brovarski, Senenu

E. Brovarski, Senenu, High Priest of Amun at Deir el-Bahri, JEA 62, 1976, 57-73, Pls XI, XIA

Bruyère, Les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1923-1924)
B. Bruyère, Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1923-1924), FIFAO II, Le Caire 1925

## Bruyère, Les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1927)

B. Bruyère, Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1927), FIFAO V, Le Caire 1928

Bruyère, Les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1928)
B. Bruyère, Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1928), FIFAO VI, Le Caire 1929

## Bruyère, Les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1931-1932)

B. Bruyère, Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1931-1932), FIFAO X, Le Caire 1934

## Bruyère, Les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1934-1935)

B. Bruyère, Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1934-1935). Deuxième partie: la nécropole de l'est, FIFAO XV/2, Le Caire 1937

## Bruyére, Sondages au temple funéraire de Thoutmosis II

B. Bruyère, Deir el Médineh. Année 1926. Sondage au temple funéraire de Thotmès II (Hat Ankh Shesept [...]), FIFAO IV/4, Le Caire 1952

## Bruyère, Les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1935-1940) II

B. Bruyère, Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1935-1940). Fasc. II. Trouvailles d'objets, FIFAO XX, Le Caire 1952

## Bryan, The statue program

B. Bryan, The statue program for the mortuary temple of Amenhotep III, [in:] S. Quirke (Ed.), The temple in ancient Egypt: new discoveries and recent research, London 1997, 57-81

## Bryan, The Temple of Mut

B. Bryan, The Temple of Mut. New Evidence on Hatshepsut's Building Activity, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 181-183

## Bryan, 2006 Report

B. Bryan, 2006 Report on the Johns Hopkins University Excavations at the Mut Temple, ASAE 82, 2008, 27-38

## Bryan, The origins of the Temple of Mut

B. Bryan, The origins of the Temple of Mut: new discoveries in and beneath the temple, 2004-2007, [in:] Tenth International Congress of Egyptologists. University of the Aegean Department of Mediterranean Studies, Rhodes 22-29 May 2008, Abstracts of Papers, Rhodes 2008, 29-30

## Budka, Non-Textual Marks

J. Budka, Non-Textual Marks from Asasif (Western-Thebes). Remarks on Function and Practical Use Based on External Textual Evidence, [in:] P. Andrássy, J. Budka, F. Kammerzell (Eds), Non-Textual Marking Systems, Writing and Pseudo Script from Prehistory to Modern Times, Lingua Aegyptia. Studia monographica 8, Göttingen 2009, 179-203

## Budzanowski, Sitting Statues of Hatshepsut

M. Budzanowski, Sitting Statues of Hatshepsut in their Architectural Setting in the Temple Djeser Djeseru at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] J. Popielska-Grzybowska (Ed.), Proceedings of the Second Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists. Egypt 2001: Perspectives of Research, Warsaw 5-7 March 2001, Warsaw Egyptological Studies IV, Warsaw 2003, 17-27

## Budzanowski, Nisze kultowe

M. Budzanowski, Nisze kultowe na Górnym Tarasie świątyni Hatszepsut w Deir el-Bahari. Aspekty kultu królewskiego w Świątyni Milionów Lat $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ w okresie panowania królowej Hatszepsut, unpublished PhD thesis, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków 2004

## Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge I

F. Burgos, F. Larché, La chapelle Rouge. Le sanctuaire de barque d'Hatshepsout. I. Fac-similés et photographies des scènes, Paris 2006

## Burgos, Larché, La chapelle Rouge II

F. Burgos, F. Larché, La chapelle Rouge. Le sanctuaire de barque d'Hatshepsout II, Paris 2008

## Bußmann, Die Provinztempel Ägyptens

R. Bußmann, Die Provinztempel Ägyptens von der 0. bis zur 11. Dynastie. Archäologie und Geschichte einer gesellschaftlichen Institution zwischen Residenz und Provinz, Probläg 30, Leiden, Boston 2010

## Caban, The niches of the Vestibule

M. Caban, The niches of the Vestibule of the Royal Mortuary Cult Complex of the Temple of Hatshepsut in Deir el-Bahari, PAM XXIV/2, 2015, 75-82

## Cabrol, Les voies processionnelles

A. Cabrol, Les voies processionnelles de Thèbes, OLA 97, Leuven 2001

## Calverley, Gardiner, The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos I

A.M. Calverley, The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos, Volume I: The Chapels of Osiris, Isis and Horus, London, Chicago 1933

## Caminos, Epigraphy in the Field

R.A. Caminos, Epigraphy in the Field, [in:] J. Assmann, G. Burkard, V. Davies (Eds), Problems and Priorities in Egyptian Archaeology, London, New York 1987, 57-67, Pls 7-13

## Caminos, James, Gebel es-Silsilah I

R.A. Caminos, T.G.H. James, Gebel es-Silsilah. I. The Shrines, ASEg 31, London 1963

## Carlotti, Considérations architecturales

J.-F. Carlotti, Considérations architecturales sur l'orientation, la composition et les proportions des structures du temple d'Amon-Rê à Karnak, [in:] P. Jánosi (Ed.), Structure and Significance.Thoughts on Ancient Egyptian Architecture, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Denkschriften der Gesamtakademie XXXIII, Untersuchungen der Zweigstelle Kairo des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes XXV, Wien 2005, 169-191, Pls I-XVI

## Carnarvon, Introduction

The Earl of Carnarvon, Introduction, [in:] Earl of Carnarvon, H. Carter, Five Years' Explorations at Thebes. A Record of Work Done 1907-1911, London 1912, 1-11

## Carnarvon, Carter, Five Years' Explorations

Earl of Carnarvon, H. Carter, Five Years' Explorations at Thebes. A Record of Work Done 1907-1911, London 1912

## Carter, Report on General Work

H. Carter, Report on General Work done in the Southern Inspectorate, ASAE IV, 1903, 43-50

## Carter, Report of Work

H. Carter, Report of Work Done in Upper Egypt, 1903-1904, ASAE VI, 1905, 112-129

## Carter, Excavations in the Valley of Dêr El Bahari

H. Carter, Excavations in the Valley of Dêr El Bahari, [in:] Earl of Carnarvon, H. Carter, Five Years' Explorations at Thebes. A Record of Work Done 1907-1911, London 1912, 22-33, Pls XIII-XXIV, LXXIX

## Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple

H. Carter, The 'Valley'-Temple of Queen Hatshepsût, [in:] Earl of Carnarvon, H. Carter, Five Years' Explorations at Thebes. A Record of Work Done 1907-1911, London 1912, 38-41, Pls XXX-XXXII

## Carter, A Tomb

H. Carter, A Tomb Prepared for Queen Hatshepsuit Discovered by the Earl of Carnarvon (October 1916), ASAE XVI, 1916, 179-182

## Carter, Note

H. Carter, Note upon the Mortuary Chapel of Amenhotep I and Aahmes-nefert-ari, JEA III, 1916, 153-154, Pl. XXIII

## Carter, A Tomb Prepared for Queen Hatshepsut

H. Carter, A Tomb Prepared for Queen Hatshepsut and Other Recent Discoveries at Thebes, JEA IV, 1917, 107-118, Pls XIX-XXII

## Carter, Newberry, The Tomb of Thoutmôsis IV

H. Carter, P.E. Newberry, The Tomb of Thoutmôsis IV. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire Nos 46001-46529, Westminster 1904

## Černý, The Valley of the Kings

J. Černý, The Valley of the Kings, Le Caire 1973

## Černy, Gardiner, Hieratic Ostraca

J. Černy, A.H. Gardiner, Hieratic Ostraca, Oxford 1957

## Champollion, Notices I

F. Champollion, Notices descriptives I, reprint, Genève 1973

## Chevrier, Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak

H. Chevrier, Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1947-1948), ASAE XLVII, 1947, 161-183, Pls XXIXXIX

Chevrier, Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak 1947-1948
H. Chevrier, Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak 1947-1948, ASAE XLIX, 1949, 1-15, Pls I-X

## Christophe, Le vocabulaire d'architecture monumentale

L.-A. Christophe, Le vocabulaire d'architecture monumentale d'après le papyrus Harris I, [in:] Mélanges Maspero I. Orient ancien, fasc. 4, Le Caire 1961, 17-29

## Clarke, Architectural Description

S. Clarke, Architectural Description, [in:] E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part VI. The Lower Terrace, Additions and Plans, MEEF 29, London 1908, 17-31

## Condon, Seven Royal Hymns

V. Condon, Seven Royal Hymns of the Ramesside Period. Papyrus Turin CG 54031, MÄS 37, München, Berlin 1978

## Cottevieille-Giraudet, Rapport sur le fouilles de Medamoud (1931)

R. Cottevieille-Giraudet, Rapport sur le fouilles de Médamoud (1931). Les monuments du Moyen Empire, FIFAO IX/1, Le Caire 1933

## Cozi, Khefethernebes

M. Cozi, Khefethernebes et la stèle de Hatshepsut, GöttMisz 143, 1994, 31-35

## Cozi, La nécropole

M. Cozi, La nécropole de Khefethernebes, GöttMisz 151, 1996, 37-47

## Cozi, Les interventions de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {e }}$ dynastie

M. Cozi, Les interventions de la XVIII ${ }^{e}$ dynastie sur le «Petit Temple » de Medinet Habu. Quelques observations sur les dates d'exécution des travaux, GöttMisz 163, 1998, 35-46

## Ćwiek, Relief Decoration in the Royal Funerary Complexes

A. Ćwiek, Relief Decoration in the Royal Funerary Complexes of the Old Kingdom. Studies in the Development, Scene Content and Iconography, unpublished PhD thesis, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa 2003

## Ćwiek, Fate of Seth

A. Ćwiek, Fate of Seth in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XXII, 2008, 37-60

## Ćwiek, Old and Middle Kingdom Tradition

A. Ćwiek, Old and Middle Kingdom Tradition in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XXVII, 2014, 61-93

## Ćwiek, The solar altar

A. Ćwiek, The solar altar in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari: Architecture and ideology, PAM XXIV/1, 2015, 693-700

## Daressy, Notice explicative

G. Daressy, Notice explicative des ruines de Médinet Habou, Le Caire 1897

## Daressy, La chapelle d'Uazmes

G. Daressy, La chapelle d'Uazmes, ASAE I, 1900, 97-108

## Daressy, Fouilles de la Vallée des Rois

G. Daressy, Fouilles de la Vallée des Rois (1898-1899). Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire N ${ }^{\text {os }} 24001$-24990, Le Caire 1902

## Daressy, Cercueils des cachettes royales

G. Daressy, Cercueils des cachettes royales. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire N ${ }^{\text {os }} 61001-61044$, Le Caire 1909

## Daressy, Le voyage d'inspection

G. Daressy, Le voyage d'inspection de M. Grébaut en 1889, ASAE XXVI, 1926, 1-22

## Daszkiewicz, Jelitto, Preliminary Report

M. Daszkiewicz, J. Jelitto, Preliminary Report on Results of Thin-sections Analysis of Pottery from the Trial Trenches in the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, DiscEg 22, 1992, 61-78

## David, Religious Ritual at Abydos

R. David, Religious Ritual at Abydos (c. 1300 B.C.), Warminster 1973

## Davies, El Amarna VI

N. de G. Davies, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna. Part VI. Tombs of Parennefer, Tutu, and Aÿ, ASEg 18, London 1908

## Davies, An Architects Plan

N. de G. Davies, An Architects Plan from Thebes, JEA IV, 1917, 194-199

## Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê I

N. de G. Davies, The Tomb of Puyemrê at Thebes I-II, RPTMS III, New York 1922-1923

## Davies, The Tomb of Two Sculptors at Thebes

N. de G. Davies, The Tomb of Two Sculptors at Thebes, RPTMS IV, New York 1925

## Davies, Tehuti: Owner of Tomb 110 at Thebes

N. de G. Davies, Tehuti: Owner of Tomb 110 at Thebes, [in:] Studies Presented to F.Ll. Griffith, London 1932, 279-290, Pls 35-44

## Davies, Gardiner, The Tomb of Amenemhēt

N. de G. Davies, A.H. Gardiner, The Tomb of Amenemhēt (No. 82), TTS 1, London 1915

## Davies, Macadam, A Corpus of Inscribed Egyptian Funerary Cones

N. de G. Davies, M.F.L. Macadam, A Corpus of Inscribed Egyptian Funerary Cones. Part I. Plates, Oxford 1957

## Davis, Naville, Carter, The Tomb of Hâtshopsîtû

T. Davis, E. Naville, H. Carter, The Tomb of Hâtshopsîtû, London 1906¹, $2004^{2}$

## Davis, The Canonical Tradition

W. Davis, The Canonical Tradition in Ancient Egyptian Art, Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney 1989

## Dąbrowska-Smektala, Remarks on the restoration of the Eastern Wall

E. Dąbrowska-Smektała, Remarks on the restoration of the Eastern Wall on the $3^{\text {rd }}$ Terrace of Hatshepsut Temple, EtTrav II, 1968, 65-78

## Dąbrowski, Temple d'Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari

L. Dąbrowski, Temple d'Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari, $3^{\text {e }}$ terrace. Projet de la reconstruction du mur ouest de la cour, EtTrav II, 1968, 39-45

## Dąbrowski, The Main Hypostyle Hall

L. Dąbrowski, The Main Hypostyle Hall of the Temple Ḥatshepsut at Deir el-Baḥri, JEA 56, 1970, 101-104

Dąbrowski, The reconstruction and conservation work on the upper portico colonnade
P. Dąbrowski, The reconstruction and conservation work on the upper portico colonnade, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 4, Warsaw 1991, 29-41

## Dąbrowski, The cornices in the Queen Hatshepsut Temple

P. Dąbrowski, The cornices in the Queen Hatshepsut Temple in Deir el-Bahari, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 4, Warsaw 1991, 57-61

## Delvaux, La statue Louvre A 134

L. Delvaux, La statue Louvre A 134 du Premier Prophète d'Amon Hapouseneb, SAK 15, 1988, 53-67, Pls 1-3

## Delvaux, Hatshepsout et le Gebel el-Silsileh

L. Delvaux, Hatshepsout et le Gebel el-Silsileh: les carrières d'une reine dangereuse, [in:] C.J. Eyre (Ed.), Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists, OLA 82, Leuven 1998, 317-324

Demaree, 3 h ikr n $\boldsymbol{R}$-Stelae
R.J. Demaree, 3 h ikr $n$ R'-Stelae. On Ancestor Worship in Ancient Egypt, EgUit III, Leiden 1983

## De Putter, Karlshausen, Provenance et caractères distinctifs des calcaires

T. De Putter, Ch. Karlshausen, Provenance et caractères distinctifs des calcaires utilisés dans l'architecture du Moyen et du Nouvel Empire à Karnak, CahKarn XI, 2003, 373-387

## Derchain, Débris du temple-reposoir

Ph. Derchain, Débris du temple-reposoir d'Aménophis Ier et d'Ahmes Nefertari à Dra‘ Abou'l Naga, Kêmi XIX, 1969, 17-21

## Description de l'Égypte II

Description de l'Égypte ou recueil des observations et des recherches qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l'expédition de l'armée française, publié par les ordres de Sa Majesté l'Empereur Napoléon le Grand II, Paris 1809

Desroches Noblecourt, La reine mystérieuse
Ch. Desroches Noblecourt, La reine mystérieuse. Hatshepsout, Paris 2002

## Dodson, The Tombs of the Kings

A.M. Dodson, The Tombs of the Kings of the Early Eighteenth Dynasty at Thebes, ZÄS 115, 1988, 110123

Dodson, Hatshepsut and „her Father"
A. Dodson, Hatshepsut and „her Father" Mentuhotpe II, JEA 75, 1989, 224-226, Pl. XXIX [2]

Dodson, The Sites of the Tombs of the Kings
A. Dodson, The Sites of the Tombs of the Kings of the Early Eighteenth Dynasty, ZÄS 116, 1989, 181, Pls VIII-X

## Dolińska, Temple at Deir el-Bahari in the New Kingdom

M. Dolińska, Temples at Deir el-Bahari in the New Kingdom, [in:] B. Haring, A. Klug (Eds), 6. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung. Funktion und Gebrauch altägyptischer Tempelräume, Leiden 4. -7. September 2002, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft Früher Hochkulturen 3,1, Wiesbaden 2007, 67-82

## Donohue, Hatshepsut and Nebhepetre ${ }^{c}$ Mentuhotpe

V.A. Donohue, Hatshepsut and Nebhepetre ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Mentuhotpe, DiscEg 29, 1984, 38-40, Fig. 2

## Dorman, The Monuments of Senenmut

P. Dorman, The Monuments of Senenmut. Problems in Historical Methodology, London, New York 1988

## Dorman, The Royal Steward, Senenmut

P.F. Dorman, The Royal Steward, Senenmut. The Career of Senenmut, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 107-109

## Dorman, The Proscription of Hatshepsut

P. Dorman, The Proscription of Hatshepsut, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 267-269

## Dorman, The Early Reign of Thutmose III

P.F. Dorman, The Early Reign of Thutmose III: An Unorthodox Mantle of Coregency, [in:] E.H. Cline, D. O'Connor (Eds), Thutmose III. A New Biography, Ann Arbor 2006, 39-68

## Drenkhahn, Kestner-Museum Hannover

R. Drenkhahn (Ed.), Ägyptische Reliefs im Kestner-Museum Hannover, Sammlungskatalog 5, Hannover $1994^{2}$

## Dunham, A Statue Formerly at Uriage

D. Dunham, A Statue Formerly at Uriage, JEA 26, 1941, 138, Pl. XXVII [a, b]

## Dziedzic, The Solar Altar

T. Dziedzic, The Solar Altar in the Hatshepsut temple at Deir el-Bahari, PAM XXII, 2013, 635-649

## Dziobek, Das Grab des Ineni

E. Dziobek, Das Grab des Ineni. Theben Nr. 81, ArchVer 68, Mainz am Rhein 1992

## Eaton-Krauß, The Khat Headdress

M. Eaton-Krauß, The Khat Headdress to the End of the Amarna Period, SAK 5, 1977, 21-39

## Eaton-Krauss, Four notes

M. Eaton-Krauss, Four notes on the early Eighteenth Dynasty, JEA 84, 1998, 209-210

## Edel, Qubbet el-Hawa

E. Edel, Die Felsgräbernekropole der Qubbet el Hawa bei Assuan I-III, K.-J. Seyfried, G. Vieler (Eds), Paderborn 2008

## Effland, Effland, "Ritual Landscape" und "Sacred Space"

A. Effland, U. Effland, "Ritual Landscape" und "Sacred Space". Überlegungen zu Kultausrichtung und Prozessionsachsen in Abydos, MOSAIKjournal 1, 2010, 127-158

## Eichler, Verwaltung des „Hauses des Amun"

S.S. Eichler, Die Verwaltung des „Hauses des Amun" in der 18. Dynastie, SAK Beihefte 7, Hamburg 2002

## Eigner, Die monumentalen Grabbauten

D. Eigner, Die monumentalen Grabbauten der Spätzeit in der Thebanischen Nekropole, Wien 1984
el-Enany, Le saint thébain
Kh. el-Enany, Le saint thébain Montouhotep Nebkhépetré, BIFAO 103, 2003, 167-190

## el-Naggar, Les voûtes. Texte

S. el-Naggar, Les voûtes dans l'architecture de l'Égypte ancienne. Texte, BdE 128/1, Le Caire 1999

## el-Naggar, Les voûtes. Planches

S. el-Naggar, Les voûtes dans l'architecture de l'Égypte ancienne. Planches, BdE 128/2, Le Caire 1999

## El-Sayed, Stèles de particuliers

R. El-Sayed, Stèles de particuliers relatives au culte rendu aux statues royales de la XVIII ${ }^{e}$ à la $\mathrm{XX}^{e}$ dynastie, BIFAO 79, 1979, 155-166

## Erichsen, DG

W. Erichsen, Demotisches Glossar, Kopenhagen 1954

## Ernst, Der Kult in den Opferhöfen

H. Ernst, Der Kult in den Opferhöfen der Totentempel, SAK 29, 2001, 41-53

## Eyre, Work and the Organisation of Work

Ch.J. Eyre, Work and the Organisation of Work in the New Kingdom, [in:] M.A. Powell (Ed.), Labor in the Ancient Near East, AOS 68, New Haven 1987, 167-221

## Fairman, Preliminary Report on the Excavations at 'Amārah West

W. Fairman, Preliminary Report on the Excavations at 'Amārah West, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1938-9, JEA 25, 1939, 139-144

## Fakhry, Miscellanea

A. Fakhry, Miscellanea, $A S A E$ XXXVII, 1937, 25-38, Pls I-III

## Farid, Preliminary Report

Sh. Farid, Preliminary Report on the Excavations of the Antiquities Department at Tell Basta (1961), ASAE LVIII, 1964, 85-98, Pls I-XIV

## Faulkner, CD

R.O. Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, Oxford 1988

## Fazzini, Some Aspects

R. Fazzini, Some Aspects of the Precinct of the Goddess Mut in the New Kingdom, [in:] E. Ehrenberg (Ed.), Leaving No Stones Unturned. Essays on the Ancient Near East and Egypt in Honor of Donald P. Hansen, Winona Lake, Indiana 2002, 63-76

## Fitzenreiter, Richtungsbezüge

M. Fitzenreiter, Richtungsbezüge in ägyptischen Sakralanlagen - oder: Warum im ägyptischen Tempel das Sanktuar hinten links in der Ecke liegt (Teil I), SAK 31, 2003, 107-151

Freier, Kühn, KV 20
U. Freier, T. Kühn, KV 20 - Das Königsgrab der Hatschepsut, Kemet - das schwarze Land. Ägypten 14/2, 1999, 33-35

## Furlong, Egyptian Temple Orientation

D. Furlong, Egyptian Temple Orientation. Astronomical Alignments in the Temples of Egypt (manuscript), 2007, 1-23

## Furlong, Midwinter Solstice Alignment

D. Furlong, Hatshepsut Temple. Midwinter Solstice Alignment (manuscript), 2007, 1-5

## Gaál, Stamped Bricks from TT 32

E. Gaál, Stamped Bricks from TT 32, StudAeg XV, Budapest 1993

## Gabolde, La chronologie du règne de Thoutmosis II

L. Gabolde, La chronologie du règne de Thoutmosis II, ses conséquences sur la datation des momies
royales et leurs répercutions sur l'histoire du développement de la vallée des rois, SAK 14 1987, 61-81, Pls 2-3

## Gabolde, La «Court de Fêtes»

L. Gabolde, La «Court de Fêtes » de Thoutmosis II à Karnak, CahKarn IX, 1993, 1-82, Pls I-XVIII

## Gabolde, Karnak sous le règne de Sésostris I ${ }^{\text {er }}$

L. Gabolde, Karnak sous le règne de Sésostris Ire Égypte, Afrique \& Orient 16, 2000, 13-24

## Gabolde, Les tombes d'Hatchepsout

L. Gabolde, Les tombes d'Hatchepsout, Égypte. Afrique \& Orient 17, 2000, 51-56

## Gabolde, Monuments

L. Gabolde, Monuments décorés en bas relief aux noms de Thoutmosis II et Hatchepsout à Karnak, MIFAO 123, Le Caire 2005

## Gabolde, Gabolde, Les temples 'mémoriaux'

L. Gabolde, M. Gabolde, Les temples 'mémoriaux' de Thoutmosis II et Toutânkhamon (un rituel destiné à des statues sur barques), BIFAO 89, 1989, 127-178, Pls XIII-XXIV

## Galán, The Inscribed Burial Chamber

J.M. Galán, The Inscribed Burial Chamber of Djehuty (TT 11), [in:] J.M. Galán, B.M. Bryan, P.F. Dorman (Eds), Creativity and Innovation in the Reign of Hatshepsut. Papers from the Theban Workshop 2010, SAOC 69, Chicago 2014, 247-272

## Galán, The hymns to Amun-Ra and Amun

J.M. Galán, The hymns to Amun-Ra and Amun in the tomb-chapel of Djehuty (TT 11), [in:] R. Jasnow, K.M. Cooney (Eds), Joyful in Thebes Egyptological Studies in Honor of Betsy M. Bryan, Material and Visual Culture of Ancient Egypt 1, Atlanta 2015, 183-196

## Gardiner, Ramesside Texts

A.H. Gardiner, Ramesside Texts Relating to the Taxation and Transport of Corn, JEA 27, 1941, 19-23

## Gardiner, AEO II

A.H. Gardiner, Ancient Egyptian Onomastica. Text II, Oxford 1947

## Gartkiewicz, On the research and preservation of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari

P.M. Gartkiewicz, On the research and preservation of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. Partial reconstruction of the Eastern Wall of the Hypostyle Hall, EtTrav II, 1968, 47-64

Gasse, Rondot, Les inscriptions de Séhel
A. Gasse, V. Rondot, Les inscriptions de Séhel, MIFAO 126, Le Caire 2007

## Glanville, Working Plan

S.R.K. Glanville, Working Plan for a Shrine, JEA XVI, 1930, 237-239, Pl. XLII [1]

## Goebs, King as God

K. Goebs, King as God and God as King, [in:] R. Gundlach, K. Spence (Eds), 5. Symposium zur Ägyptischen Königsideologie $/ 5^{\text {th }}$ Symposium on Egyptian Royal Ideology. Palace and Temple: Architecture Decoration - Ritual. Cambridge, July, 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}-17^{\text {th }}$, 2007, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft Früher Hochkulturen 4,2, Wiesbaden 2011, 57-101

## Goedicke, The Thutmosis I Inscription

H. Goedicke, The Thutmosis I Inscription near Tomâs, JNES 55, 1996, 161-176

## Goedicke, Deir el-Bahari

H. Goedicke, Deir el-Bahari, GöttMisz 231, 2011, 23-34

## Goyon, Le Ramesseum X

J.-C. Goyon, Le Ramesseum X. Les annexes nord-ouest, Le Caire 1976

## Grallert, Bauen - Stiften - Weihen. Text

S. Grallert, Bauen - Stiften - Weihen. Ägyptische Bau- und Restaurierungsinschriften von den Anfängen bis zur 30. Dynastie. Text, ADAIK 18/1, Berlin 2001

## Grallert, Bauen - Stiften - Weihen. Anfang

S. Grallert, Bauen - Stiften - Weihen. Ägyptische Bau- und Restaurierungsinschriften von den Anfängen bis zur 30. Dynastie. Anfang, ADAIK 18/2, Berlin 2001

## Griffin, A Reinterpretation of the Use and Function of the Rekhyt Rebus

K. Griffin, A Reinterpretation of the Use and Function of the Rekhyt Rebus in New Kingdom Temples, [in:] M. Cannata, C. Adams (Eds), Current Research in Egyptology 2006. Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Symposium, which took place at the University of Oxford, April 2006, Oxford 2007, 66-84

## Grimm, Schoske, Hatschepsut KönigIN Ägyptens

A. Grimm, S. Schoske, Hatschepsut KönigIN Ägyptens, München 1999

## Grothoff, Die Tornamen

T. Grothoff, Die Tornamen der ägyptischen Tempel, AegMonast I, Aachen 1996

## Guglielmi, Buroh, Die Eingangssprüche des Täglichen Tempelrituals

W. Guglielmi, K. Buroh, Die Eingangssprüche des Täglichen Tempelrituals nach Papyrus Berlin 3055 (I,1 - VI,3), [in:] J. van Dijk (Ed.), Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman Te Velde, Egyptological Memoirs 1, Groningen 1997, 101-166

## Guidotti, Gli oggetti del deposito di fondazione

M.C. Guidotti, Gli oggetti del deposito di fondazione di Hatscepsut nel Museo Egizio di Firenze, EVO V, 1982, 41-58

## Guksch, Das Grab des Benja

H. Guksch, Das Grab des Benja, gen. Paheqamen. Theben Nr. 343, ArchVer 7, Mainz an Rhein 1979

## Gundlach, Tempelfeste und Etappen der Königsherrschaft

R. Gundlach, Tempelfeste und Etappen der Königsherrschaft in der 18. Dynastie, [in:] R. Gundlach, M. Rochholz (Eds), 4. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung, Köln, 10.-12. Oktober 1996. Feste im Tempel, ÄAT 33.2, Wiesbaden 1998, 55-75

Gunn, Additions to the Collections of the Egyptian Museum
B. Gunn, Additions to the Collections of the Egyptian Museum during 1928, ASAE XXIX, 1929, 89-96

## Habachi, King Nebhepetre Menthuhotp

L. Habachi, King Nebhepetre Menthuhotp: His Monuments, Place in History, Deification and Unusual Representations in the Form of Gods, MDAIK 19, 1963, 16-52

Haeny, La fonction religieuse des „Châteaux de millions d'années"
G. Haeny, La fonction religieuse des „Châteaux de millions d'années", [in:] L'Égyptologie en 1979. Axes prioritaires de recherches I, Paris 1982, 111-116

## Haeny, Zur Funktion der „Häuser für Millionen Jahre"

G. Haeny, Zur Funktion der „Häuser für Millionen Jahre", [in:] R. Gundlach, M. Rochholz (Eds), Ägyptische Tempel - Struktur, Funktion und Programm. Akten der Ägyptologischen Tempeltagungen in Gosen 1990 und in Mainz 1992, НӒB 37, Hildesheim 1994, 101-106

## Haeny, New Kingdom "Mortuary Temples"

G. Haeny, New Kingdom "Mortuary Temples" and "Mansions of Millions of Years", [in:] B.E. Shafer (Ed.), Temples of Ancient Egypt, London, New York 1997, 86-126

## Hall, Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae V

H.R. Hall, Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae in the British Museum V, London 1914

## Hannig, Großes Handwörterbuch

R. Hannig, Die Sprache der Pharaonen. Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800-950 v.Chr.), Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 64, Hannig-Lexica 1, Mainz am Rhein 1995

## Haring, The Economic Aspects

B.J.J. Haring, The Economic Aspects of Royal "Funerary" Temples: A Preliminary Survey, GöttMisz 132, 1993, 39-48

## Haring, Divine Households

B.J.J. Haring, Divine Households. Administrative and Economic Aspects of the New Kingdom Royal Memorial Temples in Western Thebes, EgUit 12, Leiden 1997

## Harvey, Monuments of Ahmose

S. Harvey, Monuments of Ahmose at Abydos, EgArch 4, 1994, 3-5

## Harvey, New Evidence at Abydos

S. Harvey, New Evidence at Abydos for Ahmose's funerary cult, EgArch 24, 2004, 3-6

## Hassan, Some 18th Dynasty Hieratic Ostraca

Kh. Hassan, Some 18th Dynasty Hieratic Ostraca from Deir el-Bahri, BIFAO 115, 2015, 179-230

## Hayes, Royal Sarcophagi

W.C. Hayes, Royal Sarcophagi of the XVIII Dynasty, Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology, Quarto Series 19, Priceton 1935

## Hayes, Ostraka and Name Stones

W.C. Hayes, Ostraka and Name Stones from the Tombs of Sen-Mut (No. 71) at Thebes, MMAEE 15, New York 1942

## Hayes, Varia

W.C. Hayes, Varia from the Time of Hatshepsut, MDAIK XV, 1957, 78-90, Pls X-XIII

## Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt II

W.C. Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt. A Background for the Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Part II. The Hyksos Period and the New Kingdom (1675-1080 B.C.), New York 1959

## Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca

W.C. Hayes, A Selection of Tuthmoside Ostraca from Dēr El-Baḥri, JEA 46, 1960, 29-52, Pls 9-13

Helck, (rev.) A Corpus of inscribed Egyptian funerary cones
W. Helck, (rev.) A Corpus of inscribed Egyptian funerary cones, by Davies, N. de Garis and Macadam,
M. F. L., OLZ 54/7-8, 1959, 369-373

## Helck, Die Opferstiftung

W. Helck, Die Opferstiftung des Śn-mwt, ZÄS 85, 1960, 23-34

## Helck, Materialien I

W. Helck, Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reiches. Teil I. Die Eigentümer, Wiesbaden 1961

Helck, Der Papyrus Berlin P 3047
W. Helck, Der Papyrus Berlin P 3047, JARCE II, 1963, 65-73

Helck, (rev.) Dorman, Peter F. The Monuments of Senenmut
W. Helck, (rev.) Dorman, Peter F. The Monuments of Senenmut. (London; KPI; 1988), OLZ 85/4, 1990, 399-400

## Hieratische Papyrus III

Hieratische Papyrus aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin III, Leipzig 1911

## Hölscher, The Excavations of Medinet Habu II

U. Hölscher, The Excavations of Medinet Habu. II. The Temples of the Eighteenth Dynasty, OIP 41, Chicago 1939

Hölscher, Wilson, Medinet Habu Studies 1928/29
U. Hölscher, J.A. Wilson, Medinet Habu Studies 1928/29, OIC 7, Chicago 1930

## Hornung, Struktur und Entwicklung der Gräber

E. Hornung, Struktur und Entwicklung der Gräber im Tal der Könige, ZÄS 105, 1978, 59-66

## Hugonot, Le jardin

J.-C. Hugonot, Le jardin dans l'Égypte ancienne, Publications Universitaires Européennes XXVIII, Archéologie 27, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris 1989

## Ikram et al. (Eds), American Contributions

S. Ikram, J. Kamrin, S. Saunders, G.D. Scott III, K. Scanlan Scott, C.C. Van Siclen III (Eds), American Contributions to Egyptian Archaeology, Cairo 2006

## Iversen, Canon and Proportions

E. Iversen, Canon and Proportions in Egyptian Art, Warminster 1975

## Iwaszczuk, Surprising Name Stones

J. Iwaszczuk, Surprising Name Stones from Metropolitan House Storeroom, Luxor, [in:] J. Popielska-Grzybowska, J. Iwaszczuk (Eds), Fifth Central European Conference of Egyptologist. Egypt 2009: Perspectives of Research. Pułtusk 22-24 June 2009, Acta Archaeologica Pultuskiensia II, Pułtusk 2009, 55-63, Figs 19-23

## Iwaszczuk, The Works of Seninefer

J. Iwaszczuk, The Works of Seninefer. A Contribution to the Question of the Decoration of the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut in Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XXIII, 2010, 39-46

## Iwaszczuk, The Names of the Construction Parts

J. Iwaszczuk, The Names of the Construction Parts in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. The Question of the Erasures of the Feminine Endings, EtTrav XXIV, 2011, 109-115

## Iwaszczuk, Unique Temple

J. Iwaszczuk, Unique Temple of Thutmose I, Annual Reports. PAN, 2011, 22-25

## Iwaszczuk, The Temple of Tuthmosis I

J. Iwaszczuk, The Temple of Tuthmosis I Re-discovered, PAM XXI, 2012, 269-277

## Iwaszczuk, The Legacy of Senwosret I

J. Iwaszczuk, The Legacy of Senwosret I During the Reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, EtTrav XXVII, 2014, 161-178

## Iwaszczuk, Rebirth of Temples

J. Iwaszczuk, Rebirth of Temples under the Rule of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III: Vocabulary, EtTrav XXVIII, 2015, 29-58

## Iwaszczuk, Sacred Landscape of Thebes 2

J. Iwaszczuk, Sacred Landscape of Thebes During the Reign of Hatshepsut. Royal Construction Projects. Volume 2. Bibliographical Topography of the West Bank, Varsovie 2016

## Jacquet, Karnak-Nord V

J. Jacquet, Karnak-Nord V. Le trésor de Thoutmosis Ir. Étude architecturale, Fascicule I: Texte, FIFAO XXX/1, Le Caire 1983

## Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des domains funéraires

H.K. Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des domains funéraires sous l'Ancien Empire égyptien, BdE XXXIV, Le Caire 1962

## Jacquet-Gordon, Karnak-Nord X

H. Jacquet-Gordon, Karnak-Nord X, Le trésor de Thoutmosis I ${ }^{\text {er. La céramique, FIFAO 65, Le Caire } 2012}$

## James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions I

T.G.H. James, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions in the Brooklyn Museum 1, London 1974

## Jánosi, Die Entwicklung und Deutung des Totenopferraumes

P. Jánosi, Die Entwicklung und Deutung des Totenopferraumes in den Pyramidentempeln des Alten Reiches, [in:] R. Gundlach, M. Rochholz (Eds), Ägyptische Tempel - Struktur, Funktion und Programm. Akten der Ägyptologischen Tempeltagungen in Gosen 1990 und in Mainz 1992, HÄB 37, Hildesheim 1994, 143-163

## Janssen, Die Inschriften der Nische der Sieben Kühe

J.M.A. Janssen, Die Inschriften der Nische der Sieben Kühe in Deir el-Bahri, WZKM 54, 1957, 86-92

## Jaritz, Der Totentempel des Merenptah

H. Jaritz, Der Totentempel des Merenptah in Qurna. 5. Grabungsbericht, MDAIK 57, 2001, 141-170

## Jaritz, The Mortuary Temple of Merenptah

H. Jaritz, The Mortuary Temple of Merenptah at Qurna and Its Building Phases, [in:] Z. Hawass (Ed.), Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-first Century: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo 2000. 1. Archaeology, Cairo 2003, 138-146

## Jet, Sondages dans la cour nord du $V^{e}$ pylône

J.-F. Jet, Sondages dans la cour nord du Ve pylône. Résultats et étude d'un dépôt de fondation de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {e }}$ dynastie, CahKarn 13, 2010, 257-295

## Johnson, 'No One Seeing, No One Hearing'

G.B. Johnson, 'No One Seeing, No One Hearing'. KV 38 \& KV 20: The First Royal Tombs in the Valley of the Kings, KMT 3/4, 1992/1993, 64-81

## Johnson, Annual Report 1998-1999

W.R. Johnson, Epigraphic Survey, [in:] G. Gragg (Ed.), The Oriental Institute 1998-1999 Annual Report, Chicago 1989, 46-66 (http://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/oi.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/shared/docs/ar/91-00/98-99/98-99_AnnualReport.pdf, accessed November 22, 2016)

## Johnson, Annual Report 2001-2002

W.R. Johnson, Epigraphic Survey, [in:] G.J. Stein (Ed.), The Oriental Institute 2001-2002 Annual Report, Chicago 2002, 39-48 (https://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/oi.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/shared/docs/ar/01-10/01-02/01-02_AnnualReport.pdf, accessed November 22, 2016)

## Józefowicz, A Priest from the Middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty

E. Józefowicz, A Priest from the Middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] K. Endreffy, A. Gulyás (Eds), Proceedings of the Fourth Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists. $31 \mathrm{Au}-$ gust - 2 September 2006, Budapest, StudAeg XVIII, Budapest 2007, 163-170

## Junge, Elephantine XI

F. Junge, Elephantine XI. Funde und Bauteile. 1.-7. Kampagne, 1969-1976, ArchVer 49, Mainz am Rhein 1987

Kákosy et al., The Mortuary Monument of Djehutymes
L. Kákosy, T.A. Bács, Z. Bartos, Z.I. Fábián, E. Gaál, The Mortuary Monument of Djehutymes (TT32), StudAeg Series Maior I, Budapest 2004

## Kamal, Rapport sur les fouiles

A.B. Kamal, Rapport sur les fouilles faites dans la montagne de Sheîkh Saîd, ASAE X, 1910, 145-154

## Kapiec, Decoration of the Two Chests

K. Kapiec, Decoration of the Two Chests from the Frieze of Objects in the Southern Room of Amun in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XXIX, 2016, 95-110

## Karkowski, The History, Process of Unearthing and Reconstruction of the Hatshepsut Temple

J. Karkowski, The History, Process of Unearthing and Reconstruction of the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir elBahari, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission 1968-1972 1, Warsaw 1975, 5-20

## Karkowski, The Decoration of the Upper Court Columns

J. Karkowski, The Decoration of the Upper Court Columns - an Egyptological Note, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission 1968-1972 1, Warsaw 1975, 31-44

Karkowski, The Question of the Beautiful Feast of the Valley
J. Karkowski, The Question of the Beautiful Feast of the Valley Representations in Hatshepsut's Temple at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] W.F. Reinecke (Ed.), First International Congress of Egyptology. Acts, Berlin 1979, 359-364

Karkowski, An Archaeological Description of the Decoration of Osirid Pillars of the Upper Portico J. Karkowski, An Archaeological Description of the Decoration of Osirid Pillars of the Upper Portico of the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission 19721973 2, Warsaw 1980, 44-55

## Karkowski, The External Row of Architraves of the Upper Portico

J. Karkowski, The External Row of Architraves of the Upper Portico of the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission 1972-1973 2, Warsaw 1980, 56-65

## Karkowski, The Arrangement of the Architraves

J. Karkowski, The Arrangement of the Architraves in the Hatshepsut's Temple at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XIII, 1983, 139-153

## Karkowski, Notes on the Beautiful Feast of the Valley

J. Karkowski, Notes on the Beautiful Feast of the Valley as represented in Hatshepsut's Temple, [in:] 50 Years of Polish Excavations in Egypt and the Near East, Warsaw 1992, 155-166

## Karkowski, The Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari. The Epigraphic Mission

J. Karkowski, The Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari. The Epigraphic Mission, PAM VI, 1995, 48-52

## Karkowski, Der Tempel der Hatschepsut

J. Karkowski, Der Tempel der Hatschepsut in Deir el-Bahari, [in:] J. Lipińska, M. Dolińska, J. Aksamit (Eds), Geheimnisvolle Königin Hatschepsut. Ägyptische Kunst des 15. Jahrhunderts v. Ch., Warschau 1997, 37-43

Karkowski, Hatshepsut Temple, Epigraphic Mission 1996
J. Karkowski, Hatshepsut Temple, Epigraphic Mission 1996, PAM VIII, 1997, 46-58

Karkowski, Pharaoh in the Heb-Sed Robe
J. Karkowski, Pharaoh in the Heb-Sed Robe in Hatshepsut's Temple at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XIX, 2001, 81-112

## Karkowski, The Decoration of the Temple of Hatshepsut

J. Karkowski, The Decoration of the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] Z.E. Szafrański (Ed.), Queen Hatshepsut and her Temple 3500 years later, Warsaw 2001, 99-157

## Karkowski, The Solar Complex

J. Karkowski, The Temple of Hatshepsut. The Solar Complex, Deir el-Bahari VI, Varsovie 2003

## Karkowski, 'A Temple Comes to Being'

J. Karkowski, ‘A Temple Comes to Being'. A Few Comments on the Temple Foundation Ritual, EtTrav XXIX, 2016, 111-123

## Karkowski, el-Bialy, Qurna

J. Karkowski, M. el-Bialy, Qurna. New Finds of Decorated Blocks in Qurna, PAM XII, 2000, 237-245

## Karkowski, Wysocki, Deir el-Bahari 1971-1972

J. Karkowski, Z. Wysocki, Deir el-Bahari 1971-1972, EtTrav VIII, 1975, 341-348

Kees, $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ und
H. Kees, $A_{\square}$ und $\not \subset$, RecTrav XXXVI, 1914, 1-16, Pl. 1

## Kees, Die Königin Meritamun

H. Kees, Die Königin Meritamun, OLZ 36, 1933, 273-276

## Keller, The Joint Reign

C.A. Keller, The Joint Reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 96-98

## Keller, Hatshepsut Offers Maat

C.A. Keller, Hatshepsut Offers Maat to Amun, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 168-169 [92]

## Keller, Hatshepsut Wearing the White Crown

C.A. Keller, Hatshepsut Wearing the White Crown, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 169-170 [93]

## Klemm, Klemm, Steine und Steinbrüche

R. Klemm, D.D. Klemm, Steine und Steinbrüche im Alten Ägypten, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, London, Paris, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Barcelona, Budapest 1993

## Klemm, Klemm, Stones and Quarries

R. Klemm, D.D. Klemm, Stones and Quarries in Ancient Egypt, London 2008

## Kołodko-Dolińska, Studies on the Kheker Frieze

M. Kołodko-Dolińska, Studies on the Kheker Frieze in the Temple of Tuthmosis III in Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XIV, 1990, 29-60

## Konrad, Architektur und Theologie

K. Konrad, Architektur und Theologie. Pharaonische Tempelterminologie unter Berücksichtigung königsideologischer Aspekte, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 5, Wiesbaden 2006

## Kopp, Reconstruction Work

E. Kopp, Reconstruction Work in the Vestibule of the Chapel of Hatshepsut, PAM XIX, 2010, 273-277

Kozloff, A study of the painters of the tomb of Menna, Abstracts
A. Kozloff, A study of the painters of the tomb of Menna, no. 69, [in:] D. Wildung (Ed.), First International Congress of Egyptology, Abstracts of Papers, Münich 1976, 65-66

## Kozloff, A study of the painters of the tomb of Menna, Acts

A.P. Kozloff, A Study of the Painters of the Tomb of Menna, No. 69, [in:] W.F. Reinecke (Ed.), First International Congress of Egyptology. Acts, Berlin 1979, 395-402

## Krupp, Light in the temples

E. Krupp, Light in the temples, [in:] C.L.N. Ruggles (Ed.), Records in Stone. Papers in Memory of Alexander Thom, Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbeurne, Sydney 1988, 473-499

## Kwaśnica, Reconstructing the Architectural Layout of the Upper Courtyard

A. Kwaśnica, Reconstructing the Architectural Layout of the Upper Courtyard, [in:] Z.E. Szafrański (Ed.), Queen Hatshepsut and her Temple 3500 years later, Warsaw 2001, 81-97

## Kwaśnica, Szafrański, The Problem of Reconstruction of the Retaining Wall

A. Kwaśnica, Z.E. Szafrański, The Problem of Reconstruction of the Retaining Wall over the Lower Anubis Chapel, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 1980-1988 4, Warsaw 1991, 50-56

## Laboury, La statuaire de Thoutmosis III

D. Laboury, La statuaire de Thoutmosis III. Essai d'interprétation d'un portrait royal dans son contexte historique, $E g L e o d ~ 5, ~ L i e ̀ g e ~ 1998 ~$

## Lacau, Stèles I

P. Lacau, Stèles du Nouvel Empire I. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire Nos 34001-34064, Le Caire 1909

Lacau, Deux magasins à encens
P. Lacau, Deux magasins à encens du temple de Karnak, ASAE LII, 1952, 185-198

Lacau, Chevrier, Une chapelle de Sesostris I ${ }^{\text {er }}$
P. Lacau, H. Chevrier, Une chapelle de Sesostris I ${ }^{\text {er }}$ à Karnak, Cairo 1956

Lacau, Chevrier, Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout
P. Lacau, H. Chevrier, Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak, Le Caire 1977

## Lansing, Hayes, The Museum Excavations at Thebes

A. Lansing, W.C. Hayes, The Museum Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 32/1, 1937, 4-39

## Larché, Nouvelles observations

F. Larché, Nouvelles observations sur les monuments du Moyen et du Nouvel Empire dans la zone centrale du temple d'Amon, CahKarn XII/2, 2007, 407-592

Leblanc, Piliers et colosses de type «osiriaque»
Ch. Leblanc, Piliers et colosses de type «osiriaque» dans le contexte des temples de culte royal, BIFAO 80, 1980, 69-89, Pls XIX-XXII

Leblanc, Le culte rendu aux colosses «osiriaques»
Ch. Leblanc, Le culte rendu aux colosses «osiriaques » durant le Nouvel Empire, BIFAO 82, 1982, 295311, Pls XLIX-LVI

Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés
Ch. Leblanc, Les remplois de blocs décorés de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {ème }}$ dynastie, dans le secteur sud du Ramesseum, Memnonia VII, 1996, 83-109, Pls XXV-XXIX

## Leblanc, Quelques réflexions

Ch. Leblanc, Quelques réflexions sur le programme iconographique et la fonction des temples de «millions d'années », [in:] S. Quirke (Ed.), The Temple in Ancient Egypt. New Discovery and Recent Research, London 1997, 49-56

Leblanc, Quelques réflexions sur le programme iconographique
Ch. Leblanc, Quelques réflexions sur le programme iconographique et la fonction des temples de «Millions d'Années », Memnonia VIII, 1997, 93-105

Leblanc, Note sur une mention du temple de millions d'années
Ch. Leblanc, Note sur une mention du temple de millions d'années de Thoutmosis III à Thèbes-Ouest, Memnonia XII-XIII, 2001-2002, 117-122

Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum
Ch. Leblanc, À propos du Ramesseum et de l'existance d'un monument plus ancien à son emplacement, Memnonia XXI, 2010, 61-108, Pls VI-LVII

## Leblanc, Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés

Ch. Leblanc, M. de Saintilan, Autres remplois de blocs décorés de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {ème }}$ dynastie, dans le secteur sud du Ramesseum, Memnonia VIII, 1997, 47-59, Pls VIII-XIII

## Lecuyot, Loyrette, La chapelle de Ouadjmès

G. Lecuyot, A.-M. Loyrette, La chapelle de Ouadjmès. Rapport préliminaire - I., Memnonia VI, 1995, 85-93, Pls XIII-XVI

Legrain, Notes d'inspection
G. Legrain, Notes d'inspection, $A S A E$ V, 1904, 281-284

## Legrain, Statues et statuettes I

G. Legrain, Statues et statuettes de rois et de particuliers I. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire Nos 42001-42138, Le Caire 1906

## Legrain, Répertoire généalogique

G. Legrain, Répertoire généalogique et onomastique du Musée du Caire. Monuments de la XVII ${ }^{e}$ et de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {e dynastie, Genève } 1908}$

## Lesko, A Dictionary of Late Egyptian 2

L.H. Lesko, A Dictionary of Late Egyptian 2, Providence 2004

Letellier, Larché, La cour à portique de Thoutmosis IV
B. Letellier, F. Larché, La cour à portique de Thoutmosis IV, EtudEg 12, Paris 2013

## Lipińska, Names and History

J. Lipińska, Names and History of the Sanctuaries Built by Tuthmosis III at Deir el-Baḥri, JEA 53, 1967, 25-33

## Lipińska, Architecture

J. Lipińska, The temple of Tuthmosis III. Architecture, Deir el-Bahari II, Varsovie 1977

## Lipińska, Statuary and votive monuments

J. Lipińska, The temple of Tuthmosis III. Statuary and votive monuments, Deir el-Bahari IV, Varsovie 1984

## Lipińska, Statue der Königin Hatschepsut

J. Lipińska, Statue der Königin Hatschepsut, [in:] J. Lipińska, M. Dolińska, J. Aksamit (Eds), Geheimnisvolle Königin Hatschepsut. Ägyptische Kunst des 15. Jahrhunderts v. Ch., Warschau 1997, 96-97 [1]

## Lipińska, Kopf des Sphinxes

J. Lipińska, Kopf des Sphinxes der Hatschepsut, [in:] J. Lipińska, M. Dolińska, J. Aksamit (Eds), Geheimnisvolle Königin Hatschepsut. Ägyptische Kunst des 15. Jahrhunderts v. Ch., Warschau 1997, 98-99 [2]

## Lipińska, Dolińska, Aksamit (Eds), Geheimnisvolle Königin Hatschepsut

J. Lipińska, M. Dolińska, J. Aksamit (Eds), Geheimnisvolle Königin Hatschepsut. Ägyptische Kunst des 15. Jahrhunderts v. Ch., Warschau 1997

## Loeben, Ein Zaubermesser

Ch. Loeben, Ein Zaubermesser und zwei weitere magische Objekte aus dem Kestner-Museum, Kemet - das schwarze Land. Ägypten 14/2, 2005, 64-66

## Loeben, Ein „Riesen-Luxus-Zaubermesser"

Ch. Loeben, Ein „Riesen-Luxus-Zaubermesser" - vielleicht von Königin Hatschepsut? - sowie zwei weitere mit ägyptischer Magie assoziierte Objekte im Kestner-Museum Hannover, [in:] L. Gabolde (Ed.), Hommages à Jean-Claude Goyon offerts pour son $70^{\circ}$ anniversaire, $B d E$ 143, Le Caire 2008, 275-284

## Logan, Williams, The Identity of the Meritamun

T.J. Logan, B. Williams, The Identity of the Meritamun found by Winlock at Deir el-Bahari, Serapis 4, 1977-78, 23-29

## Loyrette, Un monument de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {ème }}$ dynastie

A.-M. Loyrette, Un monument de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {èm }}$ dynastie en bordure du Ramesseum: la chapelle d'Ouadjmès, Memnonia I, 1990-1991, 119-125

## Loyrette, Les monuments du prince Ouadjmès

A.-M. Loyrette, Les monuments du prince Ouadjmès, Memnonia III, 1992, 131-140

## Loyrette, La chapelle de Ouadjmès II

A.-M. Loyrette, La chapelle de Ouadjmès. Rapport préliminaire - II., Memnonia VII, 1996, 111-122, Pls XXX-XXXIII

Lythgoe, Lansing, Davies, The Egyptian Expedition 1915-16
A.M. Lythgoe, A. Lansing, N. de G. Davies, The Egyptian Expedition 1915-16, BMMA 12/5, 1917, 3-31

## Mackay, The Cutting and Preparation of Tomb-Chapels

E. Mackay, The Cutting and Preparation of Tomb-Chapels in the Theban Necropolis, JEA VII, 1921, 154167, Pls 23-24

## Manuelian, Loeben, From Daughter to Father

P. Der Manuelian, Ch.E. Loeben, From Daughter to Father: The Recarved Egyptian Sarcophagus of Queen Hatshepsut and King Thutmose I., JMFA 5, 1993, 24-61

## Manuelian, Loeben, New Light on the Recarved Egyptian Sarcophagus

P. Der Manuelian, Ch.E. Loeben, New Light on the Recarved Egyptian Sarcophagus of Hatshepsut and Thutmose I in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, JEA 79, 1993, 121-155

## Maravelia, Shaltout, The Great Temples of Thebes

A.-A. Maravelia, M.A.M. Shaltout, The Great Temples of Thebes and the Sunrise in the Winter Solstice: Applying Modern Archaeoastronomical Techniques to Study the Ancient Egyptian Mansions of Millions of Years, [in:] Ch. Leblanc, G. Zaki (Eds), Les temples de millions d'années et le pouvoir royal à Thèbes au Nouvel Empire. Sciences et nouvelles technologies appliquées à l'archéologie, Cahiers Supplémentaires des Memnonia II, Le Caire 2010, 283-295, Pls LVII-LX

## Marciniak, Une nouvelle statue de Senenmout

M. Marciniak, Une nouvelle statue de Senenmout récemment à Deir el-Bahari, BIFAO 63, 1965, 201-207, Pls XXI-XXIII

## Marciniak, Un reçu d'offrande

M. Marciniak, Un reçu d'offrande de Deir el-Bahari, BIFAO 78, 1978, 165-170, Pl. LI

Marciniak, Un reçu de transport de Deir el-Bahari
M. Marciniak, Un reçu de transport de Deir el-Bahari, Rocznik Orientalistyczny XLI/2, 1980, 69-72

Marciniak, Une inscription commémorative
M. Marciniak, Une inscription commémorative de Deir el-Bahari, MDAIK 37, 1981, 299-305

Marciniak, Une liste de fugitives
M. Marciniak, Une liste de fugitives à Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XIII, 1983, 249-255

## Maruéjol, Thoutmosis III

F. Maruéjol, Thoutmosis III et la corégence avec Hatchepsout, Paris 2007, 38-40

## Maruéjol, Un chaouabti de la reine Hatchepsout

F. Maruéjol, Un chaouabti de la reine Hatchepsout au Musée d'Aquitaine à Bordeaux, [in:] L. Gabolde (Ed.), Hommages à Jean-Claude Goyon offerts pour son 70 ${ }^{\text {c anniversaire, } B d E \text { 143, Le Caire 2008, 285-293 }}$

## Maspero, Les momies royales

G. Maspero, Les momies royales de Déir el-Baharî, MMAF I, Paris 1889

## Maspero, Brugsch, La trouvaille

G. Maspero, E. Brugsch, La trouvaille de Deir-el-Bahari, Le Caire 1881

## Mauric-Barberio, Le premier exemplaire

F. Mauric-Barberio, Le premier exemplaire du Livre de l'Amdouat, BIFAO 101, 2001, 315-350

## Megally, À propos de l'organisation administrative des ouvriers

M. Megally, À propos de l'organisation administrative des ouvriers à la XVIII dynastie, [in:] Studia Aegyptiaca, Budapest 1974, 297-311

## Megally, À propos de la dualité dans l'administration

M. Megally, À propos de la dualité dans l'administration au Nouvel Empire, [in:] G. Posener (Ed.), Égyptologie: Actes du XXIX ${ }^{e}$ Congrès international des Orientalistes, Paris, juillet 1973, Paris 1975, 76-81

## Megally, Un intéressant ostracon

M. Megally, Un intéressant ostracon de la XVIII ${ }^{\text {e }}$ dynastie de Thèbes, BIFAO-suppl. 81, 1981, 293-312

## Mensan, Tuthmosid foundation deposits

R. Mensan, Tuthmosid foundation deposits at Karnak, EgArch 30, 2007, 21-25

## Menu, Captifs de guerre

B. Menu, Captifs de guerre et dépendance rurale dans l'Égypte du Nouvel Empire, [in:] B. Menu (Ed.), La dépendance rurale dans l'Antiquité égyptienne et proche-orientale, $B d E$ 140, Le Caire 2004, 187-209

## Meyer, Senenmut

Ch. Meyer, Senenmut. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung, Hamburg 1982

## Meyer, Zur Verfolgung Hatschepsuts

Ch. Meyer, Zur Verfolgung Hatschepsuts durch Thutmosis III., [in:] H. Altenmüller, R. Germer (Eds), Miscellanea Aegyptologica: Wolfgang Helck zum 75. Geburtstag, Hamburg 1989, 119-126

## Montet, Géographie II

P. Montet, Géographie de l'Égypte Ancienne II, Paris 1961

## Munro, Kestner-Museum Hannover

P. Munro, Kestner-Museum Hannover, Führungsblätter. Ägyptische Abteilung, Hannover, Hannover [1976]

## Murnane, United with Eternity

W.J. Murnane, United with Eternity. A Concise Guide to the Monuments of Medinet Habu, Chicago, Cairo 1980

## Murnane, False Door and Cult Practices

W. Murnane, False Door and Cult Practices inside Luxor Temple, [in:] P. Posener-Kriéger (Ed.), Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar II, Le Caire 1986, 135-148

## Nasr, The Tomb of Thay

M. Nasr, The Tomb of Thay (Theban No. 349), SAK 12, 1985, 75-100

## Naville, Introductory Memoir

E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari: its plan, its founders, and its first explorers. Introductory Memoir, MEEF 12, London 1894

## Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari I

E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part I. The North-Western End of the Upper Platform, MEEF 13, London 1895

## Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari II

E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part II. The Ebony Shrine. Northern Half of the Middle Platform, MEEF 14, London 1897

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari III
E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part III. End of the Northern Half and Southern Half of the Middle Platform, MEEF 16, London 1898

## Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari IV

E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part IV. The Shrine of Hathor and the Southern Hall of Offerings, MEEF 19, London 1901

Naville, Excavations at Deir el-Bahari, 1905-6
E. Naville, 64. Excavations at Deir el-Bahari, 1905-6: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Man VI, 1906, 97-101

Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari V
E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part V. The Upper Court and Sanctuary, MEEF 27, London 1906

## Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple I

E. Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari. Part I, MEEF 28, London 1907

## Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari VI

E. Naville, The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part VI. The Lower Terrace, Additions and Plans, MEEF 29, London 1908

## Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple II

E. Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari. Part II, MEEF 30, London 1910

## Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple III

E. Naville, The XIth Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari. Part III, MEEF 32, London 1913

Nelson, Hölscher, Medinet Habu Reports
H.H. Nelson, U. Hölscher, Medinet Habu Reports, OIC 10, Chicago 1931

## Newberry, Extracts

P.E. Newberry, Extracts from my Notebooks, PSBA 24, 1902, 244-252, Pl. I

## Niedziółka, The Mortuary Temple of Amenophis II

D. Niedziółka, The Mortuary Temple of Amenophis II. Another Case of Temple Renaming?, EtudTrav XVII, 1995, 253-264

Niedziólka, The Mysterious Structure sj 'r.t-m3 ${ }^{\text {. } t}$
D. Niedziółka, The Mysterious Structure $\operatorname{sj}$ 'r.t-m3'.t in the Northampton Stela of Djehuti, [in:] J. Popiel-ska-Grzybowska, O. Białostocka, J. Iwaszczuk (Eds), Proceedings of the Third Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists. Egypt 2004: Perspectives of Research. Warsaw 12-14 May 2004, Acta Archaeologica Pultuskiensia I, Pułtusk 2009, 137-155

Nims, Places about Thebes
Ch.F. Nims, Places about Thebes, JNES 14/2, 1955, 110-123

## Nishimoto, Yoshimura, Kondo, Hieratic Inscriptions

S. Nishimoto, S. Yoshimura, J. Kondo, Hieratic Inscriptions from the Quarry at Qurna: an interim Report, BMSAES 1, 2002, 20-31

## Niwiński, Les colonnes proto-doriques avec inscriptions

A. Niwiński, Les colonnes proto-doriques avec inscriptions du Temple de Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav IX, 1976, 81-110

## Niwiński, Protodoric Columns with Inscriptions

A. Niwiński, Protodoric Columns with Inscriptions from the Temple of Hatshepsut - Remarks Concerning the Reconstruction, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 2, Warsaw 1980, 91-102

## Niwiński, Miscellanea

A. Niwiński, Miscellanea de Deir el-Bahari, MDAIK 41, 1985, 197-227

## Niwiński, Mein Gesicht ist auf Amun Gerichtet

A. Niwiński, Mein Gesicht ist auf Amun Gerichtet - ein Vorschlag der Identifizierung einer Kultstätte in Theben-West, GöttMisz 217, 2008, 7-8

Northampton, Spiegelberg, Newberry, Report on Some Excavations in the Theban Necropolis
The Marquis of Northampton, W. Spiegelberg, P.E. Newberry, Report on Some Excavations in the Theban Necropolis during the Winter of 1898-9, London 1908

Ockinga, Use, Reuse, and Abuse of "Sacred Space"
B.G. Ockinga, Use, Reuse and Abuse of "Sacred Space": Observation of Dra Abu al-Naga, [in:] P.F. Dorman, B.M. Bryan (Eds), Sacred Space and Sacred Function in Ancient Thebes, SAOC 61, Chicago 2007, 139-162

## Orgogozo, Égypte pharaonique : rites divins et funéraires

Ch. Orgogozo, Égypte pharaonique : rites divins et funéraires, [in:] Ch. Orgogozo, M.-H. Rutchowscaya, Fr. Villard (Eds), Égypte et Méditerranée. Objets antiques du musée d’Acquitaine, Bordeaux 1992, 15-39

## Orgogozo et al., Le Musée d'Aquitaine

Ch. Orgogozo, F. Berretrot, B. Derion, J.-P. Hiéret et al., Le Musée d'Aquitaine Bordeaux, Paris, Bordeaux 1992

Otto, Topographie
E. Otto, Topographie des Thebanischen Gaues, Berlin, Leipzig 1952

## Pawlicki, Inscriptions des colonnes proto-doriques

F. Pawlicki, Inscriptions des colonnes proto-doriques du Temple d'Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XII, 1983, 67-78

Pawlicki, Hatshepsut Temple: Conservation Project 1993/1994
F. Pawlicki, Deir el-Bahari, Hatshepsut Temple: Conservation Project 1993/1994, PAM VI, 1995, 53-59

## Pawlicki, Conservation and Preservation Project 1995/1996

F. Pawlicki, Hatshepsut Temple, Conservation and Preservation Project 1995/1996, PAM VIII, 1997, 59-67

## Pawlicki, Polnische Arbeiten

F. Pawlicki, Polnische Arbeiten im Tempel der Königin Hatschepsut in Deir el-Bahari, [in:] J. Lipińska, M. Dolińska, J. Aksamit (Eds), Geheimnisvolle Königin Hatschepsut. Ägyptische Kunst des 15. Jahrhunderts v. Ch., Warschau 1997, 45-56

## Pawlicki, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut 1997/1998

F. Pawlicki, Deir el-Bahari. The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut 1997/1998, PAM X, 1999, 119-130

## Pawlicki, Deir el-Bahari: the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, 1998/1999

F. Pawlicki, Deir el-Bahari: the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, 1998/1999, PAM XI, 2000, 153-166

## Pawlicki, Skarby architektury

F. Pawlicki, Skarby architektury starożytnego Egiptu: Królewskie świątynie w Deir el-Bahari, Warszawa 2000

## Pawlicki, Princess Neferure

F. Pawlicki, Princess Neferure in the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. Failed Heiress to the Pharaoh's Throne?, EtTrav XXI 2007, 109-127

## Pécoil, L'Akh-menou de Thoutmosis III

J.-F. Pécoil, L'Akh-menou de Thoutmosis III à Karnak. La Heret-ib et les chapelles attenantes. Relevés épigraphiques, Paris 2000

## Peet, Gardiner, Černý, The Inscriptions of Sinai I

T.E. Peet, A.H. Gardiner, J. Černý, The Inscriptions of Sinai I, MEEF XXXVI, Oxford 1917

## Peterson, Hatschepsut und Nebhepetre Mentuhotep

B.J. Peterson, Hatschepsut und Nebhepetre Mentuhotep, ChronEg XLII/84, 1967, 266-268

Petrie, A Season in Egypt
W.M.F. Petrie, A Season in Egypt 1887, London 1888

Petrie, Tell el Amarna
W.M.F. Petrie, Tell el Amarna, London 1894

Petrie, Six Temples
W.M.F. Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes. 1896, London 1897

Petrie, Qurneh
W.M.F. Petrie, Qurneh, BSAE 16, London 1909

Petrie, Forty-five Years Ago
W.M.F. Petrie, Forty-five Years Ago, [in:] S.R.K. Glanville (Ed.), Studies Presented to F.Ll. Griffith, London 1932, 477-479

## Petty, Redating the Reign of Hatshepsut

W.D. Petty, Redating the Reign of Hatshepsut, The Ostracon. The Journal of the Egyptian Study Society 12/2, 2001, 6-10

## Pinch, Votive Offerings

G. Pinch, Votive Offerings to Hathor, Oxford 1993

## Pirelli, Some Considerations

R. Pirelli, Some Considerations of the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, Annali Istituto Universitario Orientale Neapoli 54/4, 1994, 455-460

## Pirelli, The Pillars of the Outer Hypostyle Hall

R. Pirelli, The Pillars of the Outer Hypostyle Hall of the Hathor Shrine in the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XVIII, 1999, 221-243

## Polaczek, Reconstruction of the Pillars Decoration

K. Polaczek, Reconstruction of the Pillar Decoration in the Porticos of the Middle Court of the Queen Hatshepsut Temple, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation

Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 3, Warsaw 1985, 78-92, Pls 1-4

## Polz, Die šn'-Vorsteher

D. Polz, Die šn ${ }^{\prime}$-Vorsteher des Neuen Reiches, ZÄS 117, 1990, 43-60

## Polz, Der Beginn des Neuen Reiches

D. Polz, Der Beginn des Neuen Reiches. Zur Vorgeschichte einer Zeitenwende, SDAIK 31, Berlin, New York 2007

## Polz, Mentuhotep, Hatschepsut und das Tal der Könige

D. Polz, Mentuhotep, Hatschepsut und das Tal der Könige - eine Skizze, [in:] E.-M. Engel, V. Müller,
U. Hartung (Eds), Zeichen aus dem Sand. Streiflichter aus Ägyptens Geschichte zu Ehren von Günter Dreyer, Menes 5, Wiesbaden 2008, 525-531

## Polz, Seiler, Die Pyramidanlage des Königs Nub-Cheper-Re Intef

D. Polz, A. Seiler, Die Pyramidenanlage des Königs Nub-Cheper-Re Intef in Dra‘ Abu el-Naga, SDAIK 24, Mainz am Rhein 2003

## Połoczanin, The Upper Portico

W. Połoczanin, The Upper Portico of the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission 1972-1973 2, Warsaw 1980, 66-90

## Poloczanin, The Composition of the Building Development

W. Połoczanin, The Composition of the Building Development of the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut in the Light of Investigations into Selected Sections of the Building, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 3, Warsaw 1985, 63-77

## Połoczanin, The Restoration of the Upper Portico

W. Połoczanin, The Restoration of the Upper Portico, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 1980-1988 4, Warsaw 1991, 21-28

## Pommerening, Die altägyptischen Hohlmaße

T. Pommerening, Die altägyptischen Hohlmaße, BSAK 10, Hamburg 2005

## Posener, Sur l'orientation et l'ordre des point cardinaux

G. Posener, Sur l'orientation et l'ordre des point cardinaux chez les Égyptiens, NAWG, Göttingen [1965], 69-73

## Posener-Kriéger, Les archives du temple funéraire de Néferirkarê-Kakaï

P. Posener-Kriéger, Les archives du temple funéraire de Néferirkarê-Kakaï (Les papyrus d'Abousir). Traduction et commentaire II, $B d E$ LXV/2, Le Caire 1976

## Posener-Kriéger, Remarques sur l'ensemble funéraire de Neferirkare ${ }^{c}$ Kakai

P. Posener-Kriéger, Remarques sur l'ensemble funéraire de Neferirkare ${ }^{c}$ Kakai à Abu Sir, [in:] W. Helck (Ed.), Festschrift für Siegfried Schott zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1967, Wiesbaden 1968, 112-120

Quibell, The Ramesseum
J.E. Quibell, The Ramesseum, London 1898

## Ratié, La reine Hatchepsout

S. Ratié, La reine Hatchepsout. Sources et problèmes, OrMonsp I, Leida 1979

## Reeves, Two Name-beads of Hatshepsut and Senenmut

N. Reeves, Two Name-beads of Hatshepsut and Senenmut from the Mortuary Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahri, Antiquaries Journal LXVI/2, 1986, 387-388

## Reeves, The Valley of the Kings

C.N. Reeves, Valley of the Kings: The Decline of a Royal Necropolis, StudEgypt, London 1990

## Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses' III.

H. Ricke, Der Totentempel Thutmoses' III. Baugeschichtliche Untersuchung, BÄBA 3/1, Kairo 1939

## Robichon, Varille, Le temple du scribe royal Amenhotep

C. Robichon, A. Varille, Le temple du scribe royal Amenhotep fils de Hapou, FIFAO XI, Le Caire 1936

## Robins, Proportion and Style

G. Robins, Proportion and Style in Ancient Egyptian Art, Austin 1994

## Rochholz, Schöpfung, Feindvernichtung, Regeneration

M. Rochholz, Schöpfung, Feindvernichtung, Regeneration. Untersuchungen zum Symbolgehalt der machtgeladenen Zahl 7 im alten Ägypten, $̈$ ÄAT 56, Wiesbaden 2002

## Roeder, Naos

G. Roeder, Naos. Catalogue Général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire Nos 70001-70050, Leipzig 1914

## Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften II

G. Roeder, Aegyptische Inschriften aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin II, Leipzig 1924

## Roehrig, Life along the Nile

C.H. Roehrig, Life along the Nile: Three Egyptians of Ancient Thebes, BMMA 60/1, 2002, 6-56

## Roehrig, The Statue of the Royal Nurse Sitre

C.H. Roehrig, The Statue of the Royal Nurse Sitre with her Nursling Maatkare Hatshepsut, [in:] M. Eldamaty, M. Trad (Eds), Egyptian Museum Collections Around the World. Studies for the Centennial of the Egyptian Museum, Cairo II, Cairo 2003, 1003-1010, Pls I-II

## Roehrig, Foundation Deposits

C.H. Roehrig, Foundation Deposits for the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 141-145

## Roehrig, The Two Tombs of Hatshepsut

Ch. Roehrig, The Two Tombs of Hatshepsut, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 184-189

## Roehrig, Dreyfus, Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut

C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005

## Romano, Observations

J.F. Romano, Observations on Early Eighteenth Dynasty Royal Sculpture, JARCE XIII, 1976, 97-111

## Romer, Thutmosis I and the Biban el-Moluk

J. Romer, Thutmosis I and the Biban el-Moluk: Some Problems of Attribution, JEA 60, 1974, 119-133

## Romer, Royal Tombs

J. Romer, Royal Tombs of the Early Eighteenth Dynasty, MDAIK 32, 1976, 191-206

## Romer, Valley of the Kings

J. Romer, Valley of the Kings, New York 1981

Römer, (rev.) Die Verwaltung des "Hauses des Amun"
M. Römer, (rev.) Die Verwaltung des "Hauses des Amun" in der 18. Dynastie by Selke Susan Eichler, JESHO 45/2, 2002, 288-291

## Römer, Die Ostraka DAI/ASASIF

M. Römer, Die Ostraka DAI/ASASIF 55 und 56 - Dokumenten der Bauarbeiten in Deir el-Bahari und im Asasif unter Thutnosis III, [in:] E.-M. Engel, V. Müller, U. Hartung (Eds), Zeichen aus dem Sand. Streiflicher aus Ägyptens Geschichte zu Ehren von Günter Dreyer, Menes 5, Wiesbaden 2008, 613-625

## Roth, Hatshepsut's Mortuary Temple

A.M. Roth, Hatshepsut's Mortuary Temple at Deir el-Bahari - Architecture as Political Statement, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 147-151

## Roth, False Door of Thutmose I

A.M. Roth, False Door of Thutmose I, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 156-157

## Roth, Erasing a Reign

A.M. Roth, Erasing a Reign, [in:] C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus, C.A. Keller (Eds), Hatshepsut. From Queen to Pharaoh, New York, New Haven, London 2005, 277-281

## Rzepka, Old Kingdom Graffiti

S. Rzepka, Old Kingdom Graffiti in Deir el-Bahari, [in:] N. Kloth, K. Martin, E. Pardey (Eds), Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück. Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag, Hamburg 2003, 379-385

## Sainte Fare Garnot, Le lion

J. Sainte Fare Garnot, Le lion dans l'Art égyptien, BIFAO 37, 1937-1938, 75-91

Saleh, Three Old Kingdom Tombs at Thebes
M. Saleh, Three Old Kingdom Tombs at Thebes, ArchVer 14, Mainz am Rhein 1977

## Samborski, Conservatory-Reconstructional Works on the West Wall in the Upper Court

M. Samborski, Conservatory-Reconstructional Works on the West Wall in the Upper Court of the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari in 1967-1971, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservations Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 1, Warsaw 1979, 107-118, Figs 1-4

## Sankiewicz, Cryptogram Uraeus Frieze

M. Sankiewicz, Cryptogram Uraeus Frieze in Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XXII, 2008, 199-214

## Satzinger, Ostrakon

H. Satzinger, Ostrakon, [in:] A. Eggebrecht (Ed.), Ägyptens Aufstieg zur Weltmacht, Hildesheim 1987, 248 [297]

Säve-Södenbergh, Four Eighteenth Dynasty Tombs
T. Säve-Södenbergh, Four Eighteenth Dynasty Tombs at Thebes, PTT I, Oxford 1957

## Schlüter, Sakrale Architektur im Flachbild

A. Schlüter, Sakrale Architektur im Flachbild. Zum Realitätsbezug von Tempeldarstellungen, $̈ A T$ 78, Wiesbaden 2009

## Schmitz, Amenophis I.

F.-J. Schmitz, Amenophis I. Versuch einer Darstellung der Regierungszeit eines ägyptischen Herrschers der frühen 18. Dynastie, $H \ddot{A} B 6$, Hildesheim 1978

## Schmitz, Zwei Gründungsbeigaben

B. Schmitz, Zwei Gründungsbeigaben Thutmosis' III. im Pelizaeus-Museum Berlin, SAK 11, 1984, 521528, Pls 27-28

## Schnittger, Hatschepsut

M. Schnittger, Hatschepsut. Eine Frau als König von Ägypten, Mainz am Rhein 2008

## Scholz, Fürstin Iti

P. Scholz, Fürstin Iti - "Schönheit" aus Punt, SAK 11, 1984, 529-556

## Schott, Das Goldhaus

E. Schott, Das Goldhaus im Grab des Nefer-renpet, GöttMisz 29, 1978, 127-132

## Schott, Zum Krönungstag der Königin Hatschepsût

S. Schott, Zum Krönungstag der Königin Hatschepsût, NAWG 6, Göttingen 1955, 195-219

## Schröder, Millionenjahrhaus

S. Schröder, Millionenjahrhaus. Zur Konzeption des Raumes der Ewigkeit im konstellativen Königtum in Sprache, Architektur und Theologie, Wiesbaden 2010

## Schulman, Some Remarks

A.R. Schulman, Some Remarks on the Alleged "Fall" of Senmūt, JARCE VIII, 1969-1970, 29-48

## Schulman, The Ubiquitous Senenmut

A.R. Schulman, The Ubiquitous Senenmut, BES 9, 1987/88, 61-81

## Schulz, Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des kuboiden Statuentypus I

R. Schulz, Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des kuboiden Statuentypus. Eine Untersuchung zu den sogenannten "Würfelhockern" I, HÄB 33, Hildesheim 1992

## Seco Álvarez, Martínez Babón, Foundation Deposit

M. Seco Álvarez, F. Martínez Babón, Foundation Deposit in the Temple of Millions of Years of Thutmose III in Luxor, Memnonia XXV, 2014, 157-167

## Seco Àlvarez, Radwan, Egyptian-Spanish Project at the Temple of Thutmosis III

M. Seco Àlvarez, A. Radwan, Egyptian-Spanish Project at the Temple of Thutmosis III in Luxor West Bank: Results of two Seasons, [in:] Ch. Leblanc, G. Zaki (Eds), Les temples de millions d'années et le pouvoir royal à Thèbes au Nouvel Empire. Sciences et nouvelles technologies appliquées à l'archéologie, Cahier Supplémentaire des Memnonia 2, Le Caire 2010, 59-71, Pls I-III

## Seco Álvarez, Radwan et al., First Season of the Egyptian-Spanish Project

M. Seco Álvarez, A. Radwan et al., First Season of the Egyptian-Spanish Project at the Funerary Temple of Thutmosis III in Luxor, ASAE 84, 2010, 27-61

## Seidel, Die königlichen Statuengrupen

M. Seidel, Die königlichen Statuengrupen. Band I: Die Denkmäler vom Alten Reich bis zum Ende der 18. Dynastie, $H \ddot{A} B 42$, Hildesheim 1996

## Serpico, The contents of jars

M. Serpico, The Contents of Jars in Hatshepsut's Foundation Deposit at Deir el-Bahri and their Significance for Trade, [in:] D. Aston, B. Bader, C. Gallorini, P. Nicholson, S. Buckingham (Eds), Under the Potter's Tree. Studies on Ancient Egypt Presented to Janine Bourriau on the Occasion of her 70th Birthday, OLA 204, Leuven, Paris, Walpole, MA 2011, 843-883

Sethe, (rev.) Spiegelberg, W., Zwei Beiträge
K. Sethe, (rev.) Spiegelberg, W., Zwei Beiträge zur Geschichte und Topographie der Thebanischen Necropolis im Neuen Reich, Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen 164, 1902, 29-32

## Sethe, Die Berufung eines Hohenpriesters des Amon

K. Sethe, Die Berufung eines Hohenpriesters des Amon unter Ramses II., ZÄS 44, 1907, 30-35

## Sethe, Das Jubiläumsbild

K. Sethe, Das Jubiläumsbild aus dem Totentempel Amenophis I., NAWG, Göttingen 1921

## Seyfried, Thebanischen Kaleidoskop

K.J. Seyfried, Thebanisches Kaleidoskop. Ausgewählte Funde des Heidelberger Ramessidenprojekts, [in:]
J. Assmann, G. Burkard (Eds), 5000 Jahre Ägypten, Genese und Permanenz Pharaonischer Kunst, Heidelberg 1983, 103-116

## Seyfried, Zweiter Vorbereit

K.J. Seyfried, Zweiter Vorbereit über die Arbeit des Ägyptologischen Instituts der Universität Heidelberg in thebanischen Gräbern der Ramessidenzeit, MDAIK 40, 1984, 265-276, Pl. 40

## Seyfried, Das Grab des Amonmose

K.J. Seyfried, Das Grab des Amonmose (TT 373), Theben 4, Mainz am Rhein 1990

## Shaltout, Belmonte, On the orientation of ancient Egyptian Temples I

M. Shaltout, J.A. Belmonte, On the orientation of ancient Egyptian Temples I: Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia, Journal for the History of Astronomy 36, 2005, 273-298

Shaw, Balustrades, Stairs and Altars
I. Shaw, Balustrades, Stairs and Altars in the Cult of the Aten at el-Amarna, JEA 80, 1994, 109-127

## Shukanau, New stone sculptures

A. Shukanau, New stone sculptures of Hatshepsut from Deir el-Bahari, PAM XXII, 2013, 152-159

## Simon-Boidot, Encore une révision de l'ostracon BM 41228

C. Simon-Boidot, Encore une révision de l'ostracon BM 41228 et sa représentation de reposoir de barque!, [in:] L. Gabolde (Ed.), Hommages à Jean-Claude Goyon offerts pour son 70 ${ }^{\mathrm{e}}$ anniversaire, Le Caire 2008, 361-373

## Simpson, Studies

W.K. Simpson, Studies in the Twelfth Egyptian Dynasty: I-II, JARCE II, 1963, 53-63, Pl. VIII

## Smilgin, Sandstone sphinxes

A. Smilgin, Sandstone sphinxes of Queen Hatshepsut from Deir el-Bahari: preliminary remarks, PAM XXI, 2012, 255-260

Sourouzian, L'apparition du pylône
H. Sourouzian, L'apparition du pylône, BIFAO-suppl. 81, 1981, 141-151

## Spalinger, The Limitations

A. Spalinger, The Limitations of Formal Ancient Egyptian Religion, JNES 57/4, 1998, 241-260

## Spence, Topography, Architecture and Legitimacy

K. Spence, Topography, Architecture and Legitimacy: Hatshepsut's foundation deposits at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] T. Schneider, K. Szpakowska (Eds), Egyptian Stories. A British Egyptological Tribute Alan B. Lloyd on the Occasion of His Retirement, AOAT 347, Münster 2007, 353-371

## Spencer, The Egyptian Temple

P. Spencer, The Egyptian Temple. A Lexicographical Study, London, Boston 1984

## Spiegelberg, Die aegyptische Sammlung des Museum-Meermanno-Westreenianum

W. Spiegelberg, Die aegyptische Sammlung des Museum-Meermanno-Westreenianum im Haag, Strassburg 1896

## Spiegelberg, Varia

W. Spiegelberg, Varia, RecTrav XIX, 1897, 86-101

## Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge

W. Spiegelberg, Zwei Beiträge zur Geschichte und Topographie der Thebanischen Necropolis im Neuen Reich, Straßburg 1898

## Spiegelberg, Die Northampton Stele

W. Spiegelberg, Die Northampton Stele, RecTrav XXII, 1900, 115-125

## Stadelmann, Tempelpalast und Erscheinungsfenster

R. Stadelmann, Tempelpalast und Erscheinungsfenster in den Thebanischen Totentempel, MDAIK 29/2, 1973, 221-242

## Stadelmann, Tempel und Tempelnamen

R. Stadelmann, Tempel und Tempelnamen in Theben-Ost und -West, MDAIK 34, 1978, 171-180

## Stadelmann, Totentempel und Millionenjahrhaus

R. Stadelmann, Totentempel und Millionenjahrhaus in Theben, MDAIK 35, 1979, 303-321

## Stefanowicz, An Analysis of the South Wall of the Upper Court

A. Stefanowicz, An Analysis of the South Wall of the Upper Court, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 1980-1988 4, Warsaw 1991, 42-49

## Steinmann, Untersuchungen

F. Steinmann, Untersuchungen zu den in der handwerklich-künstlerischen Produktion beschäftigten Personen und Berufsgruppen des Neuen Reichs, ZÄS 107, 1980, 137-157

## Stephan, Die Dekoration der „Chapelle Rouge"

K. Stephan, Die Dekoration der „Chapelle Rouge" in Karnak. Struktur und Funktion, Norderstedt 2008

## Stewart, Egyptian stelae, reliefs and paintings

H.M. Stewart, Egyptian stelae, reliefs and paintings from the Petrie collection: part 1. The New Kingdom, Warminster 1976

## Stupko, Sceny ofiarne w Kaplicy Hatszepsut

Stupko, Sceny ofiarne w Kaplicy Hatszepsut, Deir el-Bahari. Diachroniczny rozwój motywu, unpublished PhD thesis, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa 2011

## Stupko-Lubczyńska, Offering Scenes in the Chapel of Hatshepsut

A. Stupko-Lubczyńska, Offering Scenes in the Chapel of Hatshepsut. Diachronic Development of Their Composition and Content 1-2, Deir el-Bahari VII, Warsaw 2016

## Switalski Lesko, The Senmut Problem

B. Switalski Lesko, The Senmut Problem, JARCE VI, 1967, 113-117

## Szafrański, Buried statues

Z.E. Szafrański, Buried statues of Mentuhotep II Nebhepetre and Amenophis I at Deir el-Bahari, MDAIK 41, 1985, 257-263, Pls 38-39

## Szafrański, Pottery from Trial Trenches

Z.E. Szafrański, Pottery from Trial Trenches in the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, BCE X, 1985, 25

## Szafrański, Pottery from the Time of Construction

Z.E. Szafrański, Pottery from the Time of Construction of the Hatshepsut Temple, DiscEg 22, 1992, 53-59

## Szafrański, Deir el-Bahari 1994

Z.E. Szafrański, Deir el-Bahari 1994. Pottery from the Temples of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III, PAM VI, 1995, 63-66

## Szafrański, On the foundations of the Hatshepsut Temple

Z.E. Szafrański, On the foundations of the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] D. Kessler, R. Schulz (Eds), Gedenkschrift für Winfried Barta, MÄU 4, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wien 1995, 371-373

## Szafrański, Deir el-Bahari. Season 1999/2000

Z.E. Szafrański, Deir el-Bahari. The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut, Season 1999/2000, PAM XII, 2001, 185-219

## Szafrański, Exceptional Queen, Unique Temple

Z.E. Szafrański, Exceptional Queen, Unique Temple: Polish Activity in the Temple of Hatshepsut, [in:]
Z.E. Szafrański (Ed.), Queen Hatshepsut and her Temple 3500 years later, Warsaw 2001, 57-79

## Szafrański, Temple of Hatshepsut, Season 2003/2004

Z.E. Szafrański, Temple of Hatshepsut, Season 2003/2004, PAM XVI, 2005, 223-237

## Szafrański, King (?) Neferure

Z.E. Szafrański, King (?) Neferure, Daughter of Kings Tuthmosis II and Hatshepsut, EtTrav XXI, 2007, 139-150

## Szafrański, Deir el-Bahari, Season 2006/2007

Z.E. Szafrański, Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, Season 2006/2007, PAM XIX, 2010, 251-268

## Szafrański, Imiut in the 'Chapel of the Parents'

Z.E. Szafrański, Imiut in the 'Chapel of the Parents' in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] M. Dolińska, H. Beinlich (Eds), 8. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung: Interconnections between Temples, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 3,3, Wiesbaden 2010, 187-196

## Szafrański (Ed.), Queen Hatshepsut

Z.E. Szafrański (Ed.), Queen Hatshepsut and her Temple 3500 years later, Warsaw 2001

## Śliwa, On the Meaning of the So-called Sinusoidal Walls

J. Śliwa, On the Meaning of the So-called Sinusoidal Walls in Egypt during the Middle Kingdom, [in:] U. Luft (Ed.), The intellectual heritage of Egypt. Studies presented to László Kákosy by Friends and Colleagues on the Occasion of his $60^{\text {th }}$ Birthday, StudAeg 14, Budapest 1992, 523-526

## Śliwa, Queen Hatshepsut in Cracow

J. Śliwa, Queen Hatshepsut in Cracow, [in:] J. Aksamit, M. Dolińska, A. Majewska, A. Niwiński, S. Rzepka, Z. Szafrański (Eds), Essays in honour of Prof. Dr. Jadwiga Lipińska, Warsaw Egyptological Studies I, Warsaw 1997, 65-68, Pl. VI

## Tacke, Das Opferritual

N. Tacke, Das Opferritual des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches I-II, OLA 222, Leuven, Paris, Walpole, MA 2013

## Teeter, Scarabs

E. Teeter, Scarabs, Scaraboids, Seals, and Seal Impressions from Medinet Habu, OIP 118, Chicago 2003

## Tefnin, L'an 7 de Touthmosis III et Hatshepsout

R. Tefnin, L'an 7 de Touthmosis III et Hatshepsout, ChronEg XLVIII/96, 1973, 232-242

## Tefnin, La chapelle d'Hathor du temple d'Hatshepsout à Deir el-Bahari

R. Tefnin, La chapelle d'Hathor du temple d'Hatshepsout à Deir el-Bahari: La recherche de l'harmonie dans l'architecture égyptienne, ChronEg L/99-100, 1975, 136-150

## Tefnin, La statuaire d'Hatshepsout

R. Tefnin, La statuaire d'Hatshepsout. Portrait royal et politique sous la $18^{e}$ dynastie, MonAeg 4, Bruxelles 1979

## Tefnin, Lecture d'un espace architectural

R. Tefnin, Lecture d'un espace architectural. Un fragment du temple d'Hatshepsout à Deir el-Bahari, ChronEg LX/119-120, 1985, 303-321

## Tefnin, Sculpture

R. Tefnin, Sculpture, [in:] D.B. Redford, The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt 3, Oxford 2001, 218-250

## The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX

The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX. The Eighteenth Dynasty Temple. Part I. The Inner Sanctuaries, OIP 136, Chicago 2009

## Thiem, Anmerkungen zur Identifikation des Tempels $\boldsymbol{h} w t-J m n-h t p-n-p 3-k 3 m w$

A.-Ch. Thiem, Anmerkungen zur Identifikation des Tempels hwt-Jmn-htp-n-pz-k3mw. Annex zum Problem pAbbott rt. 2.2-2.4, GöttMisz 175, 2000, 79-97

## Thiers, Zignani, The temple of Ptah

Ch. Thiers, P. Zignani, The temple of Ptah at Karnak, EgArch 38, 2011, 20-24

## Thomas, The Royal Necropoleis

E. Thomas, The Royal Necropoleis of Thebes, Princeton 1966

## Thomas, The Tomb of Queen Ahmose (?) Merytamen

E. Thomas, The Tomb of Queen Ahmose (?) Merytamen, Theban Tomb 320, Serapis 6, 1980, 171-182

## Towry-Whyte, Types of Ancient Egyptian Draughts-men

E. Towry-Whyte, Types of Ancient Egyptian Draughts-men, PSBA XXIV, 1902, 261-263, Pls I-II

## Trapani, The Royal Decree and the Divine Oracle

M. Trapani, The Royal Decree and the Divine Oracle from the Old to the New Kingdom: A Compared Research, [in:] Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia. Atti II, Torino 1993, 537-545

## Traunecker, Rapport préliminaire

C. Traunecker, Rapport préliminaire sur la chapelle de Sésostris I ${ }^{\text {er }}$ découverte dans le IX ${ }^{\text {e }}$ pylône, CahKarn VII, 1982, 121-126

## Traunecker, Un vase dédié à Amon

C. Traunecker, Un vase dédié à Amon de Heriherimen, CahKarn VII, 1982, 307-311

## Traunecker, Le «Château de l'Or » de Thoutmosis III

C. Traunecker, Le «Château de l'Or » de Thoutmosis III et les magasins nord du temple d'Amon, CRIPEL 11, 1989, 89-111

## Ullmann, Die Mittelstützscheintür im Tempel

M. Ullmann, Die Mittelstützscheintür im Tempel, [in:] C.J. Eyre (Ed.), Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists, OLA 82, Leuven 1998, 1177-1189

## Ullmann, König für die Ewigkeit

M. Ullmann, König für die Ewigkeit. Die Häuser der Millionen von Jahren. Eine Untersuchung zu Königskult und Tempeltypologie in Ägypten, $̈ A A T$ 51, Wiesbaden 2002

## Ullmann, Thebes: Origins of a Ritual Landscape

M. Ullmann, Thebes: Origins of a Ritual Landscape, [in:] P.F. Dorman, B.M. Bryan (Eds), Sacred Space and Sacred Function in Ancient Thebes, SAOC 61, Chicago 2007, 3-25

Valbelle, Les ouvriers de la tombe
D. Valbelle, «Les ouvriers de la tombe». Deir el-Médineh à l'époque ramesside, $B d E$ XCVI, Le Caire 1985

## Vandier, Manuel II

J. Vandier, Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne. Tome II (2). Les grandes époques. L'architecture religieuse et civile, Paris 1955

Van Siclen, The Temple of Meniset
Ch.C. Van Siclen III, The Temple of Meniset at Thebes, Serapis 6, 1980, 183-207

Van Siclen, Ostracon BM 41228
Ch.C. Van Siclen, Ostracon BM 41228: A Sketch Plan for a Shrine Reconsidered, GöttMisz 90, 1986, 75-77

Van Siclen, A Sketch Plan for a Shrine Reconsidered
Ch.C. Van Siclen, Ostracon BM 41228: A Sketch Plan for a Shrine Reconsidered (Göttinger Miszellen 90, 1986, p. 71ff), GöttMisz 94, 1986, 95

## Van Siclen, New Data

Ch.C. Van Siclen III, New Data on the Date of the Defacement of Hatshepsut's Names and Images on the Chapelle Rouge, GöttMisz 107, 1989, 85-86

## Verbovsek, Private Tempelstatuen

A. Verbovsek, „Als Gunsterweis des Königs in den Tempel gegeben...". Private Tempelstatuen des Alten und Mittleren Reiches, $̈$ Ä $A T$ 63, Wiesbaden 2004

## Verbovsek, Befund oder Spekulation? Der Standort privater Statuen in Tempeln

A. Verbovsek, Befund oder Spekulation? Der Standort privater Statuen in Tempeln des Alten und Mittleren Reiches, [in:] B. Haring, A. Klug (Eds), 6. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung. Funktion und Gebrauch altägyptischer Tempelräume, Leiden 4.-7. September 2002, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft Früher Hochkulturen 3,1, Wiesbaden 2007, 257-276

## Vernus, Omina calendériques

P. Vernus, Omina calendériques et comptabilité d'offrandes sur une tablette hiératique de la XVIII ${ }^{\mathrm{e}}$ dynastie, $R d E 33,1981,81-124$, Pls 5-6

## Vernus, Deux objets

P. Vernus, Deux objets consacrés par Thoutmosis III, DiscEg 1, 1985, 59-63, Pls I-III

## Vomberg, Das Erscheinungsfenster

P. Vomberg, Das Erscheinungsfenster innerhalb der amarnazeitlichen Palastarchitektur: Herkunft - Entwicklung - Fortleben, Wiesbaden 2004

## Vörös, Pudleiner, Preliminary Report of the Excavations at Thoth Hill

G. Vörös, R. Pudleiner, Preliminary Report of the Excavations at Thoth Hill, Thebes. The Temple of Montuhotep Sankhkara (Season 1995-1996), MDAIK 53, 1997, 283-287

Wallet-Lebrun, $\boldsymbol{H} \boldsymbol{f t}-\boldsymbol{h} r \boldsymbol{r}$
Ch. Wallet-Lebrun, Hft-hr dans les texts de construction, GöttMisz 58, 1982, 75-95

## Warmenbol (Ed.), Ombres d'Égypte

E. Warmenbol (Ed.), Ombre d'Egypte, le peuple de pharaon : catalogue de l'exposition présentée au Musée du Malgré-Tout à Treignes en 1999, Treignes 1999

## Weigall, A Repport on the Excavation

A.E.P. Weigall, A Repport on the Excavation of the Funeral Temple of Thoutmosis III at Gurneh, ASAE VII, 1906, 121-141

## Weinstein, Foundation Deposits

J.M. Weinstein, Foundation Deposits in Ancient Egypt, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1973

Wente, (rev.) L'Épouse du dieu Ahmes Néfertary
E.F. Wente, (rev.) L'Épouse du dieu Ahmes Néfertary: documents sur sa vie et son culte posthume by Michel Gitton, JNES 38, 1979, 70-72

## Wente, Some Graffiti

E.F. Wente, Some Graffiti from the Reign of Hatshepsut, JNES 43, 1984, 47-54

## Wenzel, The Use of the Term Khefethernebes

D. Wenzel, The Use of the Term Khefethernebes as a Divine Epithet, [in:] J.-C. Goyon, Ch. Cardin (Eds), Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Egyptologists/ Acts du Neuvième Congrès International des Égyptologues. Grenoble. 6-12 septembre 2012 II, OLA 150, Leuven, Paris, Dudley, MA 2007, 1927-1933

## Werbrouck, Le temple d'Hatshepsout

M. Werbrouck, Le temple d'Hatshepsout à Deir el Bahari, Brouxelles 1949

## Wieczorek, Building Dipinti

D.F. Wieczorek, Building Dipinti from the Temple of Hatshepsut. Preliminary Remarks, 2005/2006, PAM XVIII, 2008, 285-289

## Wieczorek, Some Remarks on the Dates in the Building-Dipinti

D.F. Wieczorek, Some Remarks on the Dates in the Building-Dipinti Discovered in the Temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] J. Popielska-Grzybowska, J. Iwaszczuk (Eds), Fifth Central European Conference of Egyptologist. Egypt 2009: Perspectives of Research. Pułtusk 22-24 June 2009, Acta Archaeologica Pultuskiensia II, Pułtusk 2009, 207-211, Figs 105-107

## Wieczorek, Building dipinti season 2007/2008

D.F. Wieczorek, Building dipinti in the Temple of Hatshepsut. Documentation work, season 2007/2008, PAM XX, 2011, 203-211

## Wieczorek, Summarising four seasons of work

D. Wieczorek, Building Dipinti in the Hatshepsut and Thutmose III Temples at Deir el-Bahari. Summarising four seasons of work (2006, 2008, 2009, 2011), in: J. Budka, F. Kammerzell, S. Rzepka (Eds), Non-Textual Marking Systems in Ancient Egypt (and Elsewhere), LingAeg Studia Monographica 16, Hamburg 2015, 49-57

## Wiedmann, Two Dated Monuments

A. Wiedmann, Two Dated Monuments of the Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum at the Haag, PSBA VII, 1885, 179-184

## Wiedemann, On a Monument

A. Wiedemann, On a Monument of the First Dynasties, PSBA IX, 1887, 180-184

## Wildung, Garten

D.Wildung, Garten, [in:] $L \ddot{A}$ II, 376-378

## Wilkinson, The Garden

A. Wilkinson, The Garden in Ancient Egypt, London 1998

## Wilkinson, Topographical Survey

J.G. Wilkinson, Topographical Survey at Thebes, Tápé, Thaba, or Diospolis Magna, London 1830

## Willockx, Two Tombs

S. Willockx, Two Tombs attributed to Tuthmosis I: KV20 and KV38 (http://www.egyptology.nl/2TT1.pdf, accessed November 22, 2016)

## Winlock, A Restoration of the Reliefs

H.E. Winlock, A Restoration of the Reliefs from the Mortuary Temple of Amenhotep I, JEA IV, 1917, 11-15, Pls III-IV

## Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes (1923)

H.E. Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 18/12, 1923, 11-39

## Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1923-1924

H.E. Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1923-1924, BMMA 19/12, 1924, 3-33

## Winlock, The Tombs of Kings

H.E. Winlock, The Tombs of Kings of Seventeenth Dynasty at Thebes, JEA X, 1924, 224-225, Pl. XIII

Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes (1926)
H.E. Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 21/3, 1926, 5-32

Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1925-1927
H.E. Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1925-1927: The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 23/2, 1928, 3-58

Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1927-1928
H.E. Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1927-1928: The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 23/12, 1928, 3-28

## Winlock, Notes on the Reburial of Tuthmosis I

H.E. Winlock, Notes on the Reburial of Tuthmosis I, JEA XV, 1929, 56-68

## Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1928-1929

H.E. Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1928-1929: The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 24/11, 1929, 3-34

Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1929-1930
H.E. Winlock, The Egyptian Expedition 1929-1930: The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 25/12, 1930, 3-28

Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes (1932)
H.E. Winlock, The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, BMMA 27/3, 1932, 4-37

## Winlock, The Tomb of Queen Meryet-Amūn

H.E. Winlock, The Tomb of Queen Meryet-Amūn at Thebes, MMAEE VI, New York 1932

## Winlock, A Granite Sphinx

H.E. Winlock, A Granite Sphinx of Ḥat-Shepsūt, BMMA 30/8, 1935, 159-160

## Winlock, Excavations

H.E. Winlock, Excavations at Deir el-Bahri 1911-1931, New York 1942

Winlock, The Rise and Fall
H.E. Winlock, The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom of Thebes, New York 1947

## Witkowski, Certains aspects du culte des dieux funéraires

M.G. Witkowski, Certains aspects du culte des dieux funéraires aux temps de la Reine Hatshepsout à Deir el-Bahari 1-3, unpublished PhD thesis, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Varsovie 1983

## Witkowski, Le rôle et les fonctions des chapelles d'Anubis

M.G. Witkowski, Le rôle et les fonctions des chapelles d'Anubis dans le complexe funéraire de la reine Hatshepsout à Deir el Bahari, [in:] S. Schoske (Ed.), Akten des vierten internationalen Ägyptologen Kongresses München 1985 3, SAK Beihefte 3, Hamburg 1988, 431-440

## Witkowski, Quatre saisons des travaux

M.G. Witkowski, Quatre saisons des travaux de documentation dans les chapelles d'Anubis au Temple de la Reine Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari, EtTrav XIV, 1990, 369-392

## Witkowski, Deir el-Bahari

M.G. Witkowski, Deir el-Bahari et l'enigme des chapelles redoublées, DossArch 187, 1993, 80-83

## Witkowski, Der Tempel der Königin Hatschepsut

M. Witkowski, Der Tempel der Königin Hatschepsut in Deir el-Bahari. Seine Geschichte, Erforschung und Rekonstruktion, AntWelt 29, 1998, 41-56

Wreszinski, Atlas II<br>W. Wreszinski, Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte II, Leipzig 1935

## Wysocki, The Discovery, Research, Studies and the Reconstruction of the Rock Platform

Z. Wysocki, The Discovery, Research, Studies and the Reconstruction of the Rock Platform above the Upper Terrace of Queen Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission 1972-1973 2, Warsaw 1980, 7-43

Wysocki, The Upper Court Colonnade
Z. Wysocki, The Upper Court Colonnade of Hatshepsut's Temple at Deir el-Bahri, JEA 66, 1980, 54-69, Figs 1-9, Pls VIII-IX

Wysocki, The Discoveries, Research and the Results
Z. Wysocki, The Discoveries, Research and the Results of the Reconstruction Made at the Rock Platform and the Protective Wall over the Upper Terrace in the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahri, MDAIK 39, 1983, 243-253

## Wysocki, The results of research

Z. Wysocki, The results of research, architectonic studies and of protective work over the North Portico of the Middle Courtyard in the Hatshepsut Temple at Deir el-Bahari, MDAIK 40, 1984, 329-349

## Wysocki, The Discovery and Reintegration of Two Niches

Z. Wysocki, The Discovery and Reintegration of Two Niches in the Main Sanctuary at Deir el-Bahari, [in:] Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mohktar II, Cairo 1985, 361-378

## Wysocki, Architectural Investigations and Preservation Work Carried in the Northern Portico

Z. Wysocki, Architectural Investigations and Preservation Work Carried in the Northern Portico of the Middle Court of the Queen Hatshepsut Temple, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 3, Warsaw 1985, 10-34

## Wysocki, The Results of Architectural Investigations

Z. Wysocki, The Results of Architectural Investigations on Historical Development of the Queen Hatshepsut Temple, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 3, Warsaw 1985, 35-62

## Wysocki, The results of analysis and studies

Z. Wysocki, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. The results of analysis and studies on the meaning of the lines retained on the south revetment of the Middle Courtyard Terrace, MDAIK 41, 1985, 293-307

## Wysocki, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut

Z. Wysocki, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari: Its Original Form, MDAIK 42, 1986, 213-228, Pls 30-31

## Wysocki, The Results of Architectural Research over the North Part of the Upper Terrace

Z. Wysocki, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir El Bahari - The Results of Architectural Research over the North Part of the Upper Terrace, MDAIK 43, 1986, 267-276, Pls 34-35

Wysocki, Deir el-Bahari, 1977-1982
Z. Wysocki, Deir el-Bahari, 1977-1982, EtTrav XIV, 1990, 321-347, Pls 4-6

## Wysocki, The Architectural and Implementational Work

Z. Wysocki, The Architectural and Implementational Work of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission in 1968-1988, [in:] The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Results of the Investigations and Conservation Works of the Polish-Egyptian Archaeological and Preservation Mission Deir el-Bahari 1980-1988 4, Warsaw 1991, 7-20

Wysocki, The Raising of the Structure
Z. Wysocki, The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari: The Raising of the Structure in View of Architectural Studies, MDAIK 48, 1992, 233-254

Yoyotte, La date supposée du couronnement
J. Yoyotte, La date supposée du couronnement d'Hatshepsout, Kêmi 18, 1968, 85-91

## Žaba, The Rock Inscriptions

Z. Žaba, The Rock Inscriptions of Lower Nubia (Czechoslovak Concession), Prague 1974

## Indices

# Indices <br> General index 

11th dynasty $64,73,129,130$
17th dynasty 215
18th dynasty $3,8,48,51,131,135,153,163,167$, $177,189,195,206,208,215,216$
19th dynasty 182
3rd dynasty 53

## A

Abitz, Friedrich 200
Altenmüller, Hartwig 206
Amarna Period 123, 143, 148, 154, 174, 268
angled joints $80,81,84,86,113,114,117,121$
Antikenmuseum, Basel 204
architectural elements
altar $58,87,109,110,116,117,118,119,120$, $132,135,163,223,232$
Solar Altar 58, 120, 132, 135, 163
architrave $24,25,49,78,91,100,102,103,104$, $105,107,114,115,219,230,275$
balustrade $25,26,28,29,73,74,78,79,86,87$, $90,92,95,100,117,118$
bark hall $19,25,26,27,43,50,58,84,86,88$, $98,99,107,110,111,124,125,135,150$, $154,162,163,179,212,223,231,232,235$, 236
bark station $64,65,66,211$
basin 90, 94, 129, 130
ceiling $21,25,26,27,28,29,32,58,62,63,73$, $77,78,82,83,84,85,86,87,91,95,100$, $110,111,114,115,116,120,121,123,124$, $128,137,162,163,171,172,174,202,203$
barrel vault $25,163,193$
ceiling slab 100
corbelled vault 25,26
relieving structure $26,27,124,135$
relieving vault 25,26
vaulted ceiling $77,85,86,87,111,115,116$, 120, 121, 128
chapel $4,26,29,37,38,40,46,77,80,82,83$, $84,111,112,113,116,121,129,130,140$, $144,149,150,151,158,171,174,178,187$, 200, 206, 208, 211, 214, 215, 216, 270
colonnade 28, 91, 103, 114, 119, 132, 162, 267
column 223, 224
column base $23,86,89,103,107$
fluted abacus 171
cornice $28,29,77,82,83,86,87,98,100,118$, $120,123,161,172,178$
courtyard $12,31,39,45,59,61,67,68,72,83$, $95,96,103,105,107,108,112,114,116$, $119,122,123,131,132,137,162,164,171$,
$172,173,174,183,192,205,219$
festival courtyard 95, 108, 219
door $9,19,21,22,23,29,31,37,38,39,40,45$, $58,64,66,67,68,71,73,83,84,85,86$, $87,95,96,98,110,111,112,113,114,115$, $116,117,118,119,120,121,122,123,129$, $132,133,140,141,143,144,150,152,153$, $158,162,163,171,172,173,174,178,179$, 180, 195, 201, 202, 208, 213, 214, 215, 216, 220, 223, 226, 237
double-leaf $21,67,84,85,86,87,95,96,98$, $110,111,115,117,121$
gate $32,40,50,54,62,63,66,71,74,84,85$, $86,88,89,91,95,96,98,99,107,108,114$, $120,125,153,161,170,219,223$
jamb 9, 21, 31, 98, 118, 125, 153, 179, 223, 241
lintel $21,37,38,39,40,84,86,87,96,108$, 120
name of the gate $84,85,88,89,95,99,125$, 153
single-leaf $21,77,87,118,120,122$
threshold $75,79,81,83,84,85,118,137,171$, 173
dovetail 16, 23, 98
dovetail cramp 16
enclosure wall $14,17,43,54,58,63,64,67,68$, $69,71,73,75,83,128,130,153,157,161$, $162,163,164,171,173,174,177$
façade $5,73,76,77,79,81,82,83,84,85,86$, 98, 171
false door $29,38,40,112,113,115,116,132$, $140,144,158,163,174,195,208,213,214$, 215, 216, 226
double false door 215
Ramesside false door 215
floor $8,17,21,22,23,39,73,78,79,82,83,84$, $85,87,89,93,94,96,100,103,104,111$, $112,114,115,117,118,120,123,163,170$, $171,172,173,174,177,178,180,182,195$, 202
foundation $3,5,10,14,15,26,27,29,30,32$, $39,45,51,52,53,54,61,63,64,68,81$, $118,120,127,132,140,149,151,152,158$, $159,160,161,162,165,168,169,170,171$, $177,178,180,182,184,185,192,200,201$, 204, 205, 206, 280, 289
gorgoyle 29, 86, 94, 95, 171, 172
hypostyle hall $23,26,58,76,79,80,81,82,83$, $84,85,86,92,101,103,104,105,109,114$, $135,137,139,140,141,149,154,171,172$,

223, 224, 225, 226, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 267, 270, 284
mortar $15,16,19,34,63,91,98,108,118,124$, 163, 177
mud brick 129, 160, 161, 191, 193, 239, 240
naos 111, 112, 125, 226
niche $10,17,19,21,28,50,58,84,85,87,92$, $96,97,98,99,100,111,112,114,115,116$, $117,119,120,122,125,130,188,203,220$, 221, 222, 223, 232, 234, 236
pavement $15,39,64,73,79,80,81,82,83,85$, $86,87,89,91,92,96,100,103,105,117$, 169, 211
pedestal $73,84,87,90,92,94,132,173$
pillar $24,25,90,158,160,162,178,192,201$, 202, 231, 232, 236
Hathoric pillar 232
platform $15,29,83,95,96,103,107,111,113$, $122,124,153,161,178,198$
portico $12,14,19,20,22,24,25,28,29,55,62$, $67,69,72,73,77,78,79,82,85,86,88,89$, $90,91,92,94,95,107,117,123,135,213$, 230, 232, 236, 275, 284, 295, 296
processional alley $7,10,14,43,45,50,54,55$, $56,64,66,142,153,211$
pylon $3,38,39,68,86,94,107,153,161,164$, 170
rain gutter $69,70,94,172$
ramp $26,27,28,46,47,54,71,72,73,75,76$, $79,80,81,83,87,130,140,148,161,162$, 164, 195
retaining wall $14,15,32,67,73,75,76,77,79$, $80,81,82,83,88,91,92,93,94,100,124$, 162
sanctuary $10,21,25,26,28,50,60,66,81,85$, $86,87,88,96,98,99,107,108,109,110$, $111,112,120,122,125,132,133,231,232$, 233, 234, 260, 281, 296
serpentine wall 129,130
shrine $56,80,85,95,98,99,123$
skylight $28,110,112$
stairs $26,28,66,74,87,202,288$
storeroom 32, 56, 87, 120, 121, 127, 133, 135, 141, 144, 193, 233
terrace $26,43,46,59,63,81,82,83,87,88,162$, 267
torus moulding $28,29,69,81,82,83,98,113$, $115,116,141,161,178$
vestibule
of the Chapel of Hatshepsut in the Complex of the Royal Cult in the $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ temple 103, 114, 123, 277
window $27,50,87,96,99,100,111,122,123$, 124, 178
architectural errors 30
architectural module $12,78,89,99,119,173,205$
Arnold, Dieter 68, 72, 73, 115, 121, 122, 151, 257, 258

Arnold, Dorothea 76, 107
Arnold, Felix 40, 66
Awad, Khaled Ahmed Hamza 121

## B

Baraize, Émile 50, 72, 78, 92, 116, 195, 198, 259
Barakat, Abu el Youn 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, $143,144,151,154,157,158,259$
Barguet, Paul 192
bark of Amun 5, 88, 111, 132, 135, 144, 150, 153, 154, 173, 211
Beautiful Feast of the Valley 4, 66, 111, 132, 137, 144, 151, 153, 237, 275
Beaux, Nathalie 49, 80
Beckerath, Jürgen von 192, 260
Beechey, Henry William 49
Belmonte, Juan Antonio 49, 199, 260, 261, 288
Belzoni, Giovanni Battista 49, 199
Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin 11, 34, 41, 76, 173, 230, 232, 233, 236
Białostocka, Olga 111
Bissing, Friedrich Wilhelm von 72, 261
Book of Amduat 4, 198, 202, 204
Book of the Dead 130
Bodreaux, Musée d'Aquitaine 204, 280, 282
Breasted, James Henry 192
Brune, E. 49
Bruyère, Bernard 167
Budzanowski, Mikołaj 98
building dipinto 3, 5, 58, 63, 91, 92
Burton, James 199

## C

Cabrol, Agnès 189
Cairo, Museum of Egyptian Antiquities 3, 11, 37, $41,43,55,56,62,74,76,89,98,107,112$, $125,131,135,142,154,157,158,164,165$, $173,180,182,192,195,200,207,226,229$, 236
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 182
Carlotti, Jean-François 12, 264
Carter, Howard 5, 14, 37, 39, 40, 50, 53, 56, 57, $59,60,61,62,63,64,67,71,128,129,130$, $138,139,178,195,196,197,198,199,200$, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 251, 264, 265, 267
Champollion, Jean-François 43, 49, 179, 243, 265
Chester, Greville 203
Chicago, Oriental Institute Museum 134, 148, 160, 177, 180, 201
Clarke, Somers 11, 15, 54, 64, 67, 68, 73, 75, 76, $78,80,82,83,87,89,98,104,116,123$, 265
collection of MacGregor 150, 238
Cracow, Czartoryski Museum 201
Ćwiek, Andrzej 26, 28, 29, 38, 50, 56, 66, 72, 73, $85,87,103,110,115,144,214,266$

## D

Dąbrowski, Leszek 19, 23, 28, 50, 88, 91, 98, 101, 103, 104, 105, 109, 114, 267
Daressy, Georges $37,145,149,163,175,178$, 207, 211, 266
dedicatory inscription 4, 10, 95, 96, 110, 132, 140, 177, 179, 219
dementio memoriae 108
Derchain, Philippe 37, 40, 267
Der Manuelian, Peter 200
Devilliers, René Edouard 49
dipinto 3, 5, 58, 63, 91, 92
Dodson, Aidan M. 45, 46, 201, 205, 207, 268
donations 127, 152
Dorman, Peter F. 73, 151
Dufferin, Frederik Lord 43
Dziedzic, Teresa 49, 105

## E

Earl of Carnarvon 50, 195, 264, 265
economic area 128, 134, 159, 251
Eigner, Dieter 64, 66, 269
el-Naggar, Salah 25, 77, 121, 269
elements of decoration
cryptogramm frieze 28
geometric frieze 99
kheker frieze 28
erasures 5, 38, 73, 92, 148, 154, 184

## F

festival procession 144
festivals
Beautiful Feast of $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w$ 4, 134, 153, 154
Beautiful Feast of Opet 4, 66, 111, 132, 137, 144, 151, 153, 237, 275
Beautiful Feast of the Valley 4, 66, 111, 132, 137, 144, 151, 153, 237, 275
Fischer, Clarence S. 39
foundation deposit $51,132,152,158,160,161$, 168, 184, 185, 200, 201, 204, 205
Fort Worth, Kimbell Art Museum 55, 234
Foundation ritual 51, 160
funerary cone $58,135,165$
Furlong, David 28, 49, 50, 110, 270

## G

Gabolde, Luc 167
Gabolde, Marc 167
Gardiner, Alan H. 182
Gartkiewicz, Przemysław 96
Goedicke, Hans 189
Green, John 49
Grothoff, Thomas 125
Gundlach, Rolf 193

## H

Hanover, Museum August Kestner 45, 204
Haring, Ben J.J. 6, 127, 128, 132, 133, 150, 158, 183, 268, 272, 292
Hatshepsut's accession to the throne 51
Hausner, Walter 50
Hay, Robert 49
Hayes, William C. 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 34, 51, 53, 55, $56,58,61,62,74,76,77,78,108,131,134$, $137,141,148,151,153,154,180,195,196$, 204, 205, 206, 207, 212, 214, 216, 233, 237, 272, 277

## J

Jacquet, Jean 22, 125, 205, 274
Jollois, François 49

## K

Karkowski, Janusz 4, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, $25,29,30,32,34,40,49,50,51,54,58,62$, $66,67,74,78,80,81,82,83,85,89,90,91$, $96,100,102,103,104,105,107,108,110$, $111,112,114,115,116,117,118,119,121$, $122,123,124,125,132,135,137,144,147$, $148,149,151,153,219,223,230,232,233$, 236, 237, 260, 275, 276
Kees, Hermann 121
Keller, Cathleen A. 32, 34, 61, 74, 108, 147, 148, $226,230,232,233,257,258,263,268,276$, 286
Konrad, Kirsten 19, 132, 150, 277
Kopp, Edyta 115
Kwaśnica, Andrzej 24, 25, 83, 90, 92, 95, 99, 100, 104, 105, 107, 277

## L

Lansing, Ambrose 50, 53
Late Period 38
Leblanc, Christian 6, 94, 128, 148, 149, 152, 154, 157, 193, 213, 238, 240, 277, 278, 280, 287
Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 11, 235
Lepsius, Karl Richard 49, 199
Lipińska, Jadwiga 5, 66, 107, 108, 131, 151, 174, 276, 278, 279, 283, 291
Liverpool, Liverpool Museum
Loeben, Christian E. 200
London, British Museum 46, 47, 48, 55, 56, 62, 85, 94, 157, 160, 165, 239, 255, 272
London, Petrie Museum 43, 46, 47, 48, 58, 148, 184, 229

## M

Mariette, Auguste 49
materials
alabaster 46, 54, 115
Asian copper 21, 96, 220, 224
bronze $32,53,150,152$
calcite $85,141,181,200$
copper $21,32,58,96,160,179,220,224$
diorite $11,61,131$
electrum 58, 96, 99, 220
gold 180, 181
granite $10,12,21,50,61,74,76,88,91,95,96$, $98,99,107,108,110,115,116,135,140$, $141,142,164,192,208,213,214,216,219$, 220
granodiorite $11,108,164$
indurated limestone 11, 141
ivory 181
jasper 204
limestone $10,11,15,21,22,34,37,39,40,43$, $46,47,49,61,62,63,64,67,68,74,85$, $87,88,98,99,111,115,121,130,131,137$, $139,140,141,143,147,148,149,157,161$, $162,167,170,171,172,173,174,184,192$, $198,200,201,202,206,207,208,213,214$, 216, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225
quartzite $4,61,62,141,177,195,207$
sand $5,15,22,34,53,61,63,98,162,163,170$, 177, 184, 200
sandstone $10,11,12,15,29,43,63,64,66,68$, $72,74,76,78,79,81,83,87,88,120,121$, $137,139,140,142,143,149,157,160,161$, $163,164,167,170,171,172,173,174,175$, 177, 179, 203, 211, 213
wood 16, 21, 98, 99, 181, 200
ssdm wood 181
Mauric-Barberio, Florence 4, 204, 206, 280
Michiewicz, Mieczysław 107
Middle Kingdom 17, 23, 40, 48, 115, 131, 160, $175,176,177,178,190,266,290,295$
Möller, Georg 37
Montet, Pierre 182
Moss, Rosalind L.B. 132, 256
Munich, Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst 55
Myjak, Wojciech 89

## N

name stone 5, 9, 61, 62, 63, 128, 177, 189
Nasr, Mohammed 37
Naville, Edouard 10, 22, 27, 28, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, $50,54,56,75,77,78,79,80,84,85,86,88$, $94,100,104,112,121,122,123,125,127$, 131, 133, 135, 137, 148, 179, 203, 215, 219, 220, 223, 225, 226, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 251, 265, 267, 281, 282
Newberry, Percy E. 37, 63, 64, 128, 147, 150, 152, 193, 200, 231, 238, 265, 282
New York, Brooklyn Museum 55, 274
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 11, 21, $34,49,53,54,55,56,61,74,76,89,98$, $107,111,115,116,138,141,142,148,164$, 204, 214, 230, 232, 233, 235, 237, 239, 255, 256, 272
Niedziółka, Dariusz 6, 58, 99, 112, 282

Nims, Charles F. 189
Niwiński, Andrzej 43, 86, 95, 132, 181, 182, 219, 223, 232, 235, 282, 291

## O

offering $26,27,40,47,48,51,94,95,110,113$, $115,116,120,121,122,123,125,130,132$, $133,134,135,140,144,158,163,178,206$, 208, 214, 215, 303
officials
mayor of Thebes 142, 260
overseer of all works of Amun 55
overseer of all works of the king 55
overseer of all works of the king in the house of Amun 55
overseer of $m r w$ people 127
overseer of the granary 41,55
overseer of the priests of hours [of the House] of Amun in Dsr-dsrw 135
overseer of the šn' of [Amun] in $\underline{D} s r-\underline{d} s r w 128$
overseer of works of Amun in $\underline{D} s r$ - $\underline{d} s r w 55$
scribe $8,58,110,130,167,169,170,171,172$, 174, 190, 285
scribe of outlines 58
stonemason 7
supervisor of the altar of Amun in $\operatorname{D} s r-[\ldots]$.
Old Kingdom 1, 43, 50, 115, 116, 125, 131, 132, 133, 190, 214, 215, 266, 286
ostracon $3,7,8,9,10,34,51,55,56,58,66,127$, $129,133,134,142,180,187,212,280,288$

P
Paris, Louvre 38, 40, 56, 116, 134, 157, 160, 165, 199, 215, 226, 239, 267
Pawlicki, Franciszek 3, 28, 50, 54, 87, 95, 99, 103, 104, 105, 111, 112, 115, 121, 122, 125, 130, 132, 154, 208, 224, 225, 236, 283
Petrie, William Matthew Flinders 8, 10, 41, 43, $46,47,48,58,144,148,160,184,185,229$, 283, 284, 289
Pinch, Geraldine 132
Pirelli, Rosanna 82, 83, 108, 231, 236, 284
Pococke, Richard 49
Połoczanin, Waldemar 12, 19, 22, 24, 27, 32, 75, $79,80,87,89,90,91,98,99,284$
Polz, Daniel 45
Porter, Bertha 132, 256
priests
lector priest in 3 h-swt 47
$w^{\prime} b$ priest in 3 h-swt 41, 47, 48, 58, 135, 165, 173, 185
w'b priest of Amun in $3 h-s t 47$
w'b priest of Hathor in 3 h-swt 47
$w^{\prime} b$ priest of Nb-hpt-R' 47
processional route $54,71,76,83,211$
Providence, Rhode Island School of Design Museum 229

Ptolemaic Period 10, 111, 190
Pudleiner, Rezsö 39

## Q

quarry $10,11,12,13,14,15,32,60,66,74,77$, $107,108,111,129,144,174,184,192,213$, 214

## R

Ramesside Period 37, 40, 48, 123, 143, 187, 192, 265
Ratié, Suzanne 189
Reeves, Carl Nicholas 207
relief
sunken relief $74,82,84,100,139,141$
restorations
post-Amarna restorations $10,38,111$
Ricke, Herbert 157, 214
ritual
daily ritual $21,125,133,134$
foundation ritual 51,160
offering ritual $125,132,140$
ritual of ancestors 125,134
royal cubit 12
stretching of the cord 160
s3hw rituals 214
Roehrig, Catharine H. 32, 34, 51, 54, 61, 74, 131, $147,148,153,195,204,226,230,232,233$, 257, 258, 263, 268, 276, 285, 286
Romer, John 40, 78, 199, 202, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 286

## S

saff tomb 12, 61
Sankiewicz, Marta 28, 85, 87, 131, 148, 180, 287
Second Intermediate Period 48
sed festival 85,89
Sethe, Kurt 39, 40, 177, 181, 182, 189, 190, 192, 288
Shaltout, Mosalam 43, 49, 50, 157, 260, 261, 279, 288
Shaw, Ian 28, 74, 87, 288
Shukanau, Aleksei 108, 288
Simon-Boidot, Claire 66, 288
Smilgin, Agata 66
Sośnierz, Andrzej 72
Spence, Kate 54
Spiegelberg, Wilhelm 5, 21, 37, 38, 39, 40, 49, 58, $63,64,96,99,128,143,147,150,152,157$, $158,160,165,180,193,204,234,238,239$, 282, 288, 289
Stadelmann, Rainer 6, 27, 38, 50, 112, 123, 124, 183, 289
statue
private statues
diorite statue of Sen-en-mut 131
limestone statue of Amenhotep 131
statue of Djehuty 46
statue of Sat-Re 131
royal statue
large kneeling statue 107
Osiride statue 20, 68, 69, 70, 77, 86, 94, 98, 110, 141, 143, 160
of Amenhotep I 46, 47
of Mentuhotep II 46, 47, 48, 94
small kneeling statue 107
sphinx $66,72,142,211$
limestone sphinx 74, 214
standing statue 107
Stefanowicz, Adam 54
stela 48
stela $5,21,46,47,48,49,83,94,99,125,126$, $127,132,134,150,152,154,173,180,181$, 187, 190, 191, 192, 193, 208, 231, 234
Northampton stela 5, 21, 49, 99, 150, 152, 231, 234
stela from Serabit el-Khadim 208
stela of Neferu 181
stela of Sen-en-mut from North Karnak 125, 127
stela of Senenu 126
stela of Tjay-nefer 47
Stephan, Karin 193
Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet 45, 46, 248, 303, 309
Stupko-Lubczyńska, Anastasiia 34
Szafrański, Zbigniew E. 3, 15, 24, 31, 43, 49, 50, $67,72,87,88,90,92,95,98,99,100,103$, $104,111,112,114,117,132,187,261,276$, 277, 290, 291

## T

Tefnin, Roland 3, 11, 19, 51, 54, 55, 66, 72, 74, $76,77,79,80,82,83,90,91,98,107,108$, 111, 131, 204, 214, 233, 235, 291
Theban Mapping Project 199, 201, 202, 203, 205
Thomas, Elizabeth 78, 125, 195, 198, 199, 200, 203, 205, 207, 291
tomb equipment
canopic chest of Hatshepsut 201, 202, 203, 204
coffin 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209
sarcophagus $55,56,195,196,198,200,201$, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209
of Sen-en-mut 207
sarcophagus A 206
sarcophagus B 207, 209
sarcophagus C 204, 206, 208
sarcophagus D 208
sarcophagus E 207, 208
sarcophagus F 207
Tombos 190
tree 72, 130
Mimusops Schimperi 67

## $\mathbf{U}$

Ullmann, Martina 112

## V

Van Siclen, Charles C. 37, 38, 39, 40, 66, 108, 273, 292
Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Egizio 190, 191, 243, 262
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum 34
visitor 95, 121
Vörös, Gyözö 39
voto 46

## W

Wallet-Lebrun, Christiane 189
Weinstein, James Morris 51, 52, 53, 54, 160, 200, 201, 206, 293
Werbrouck, Marcelle 121
Westcar, Henry 49
Wieczorek, Dawid F. 9, 56, 58, 66, 82, 293

Wilkinson, John Gardner 1, 66, 199, 294
Willockx, Sjef 201, 202, 203, 294
Winlock, Herbert Eustis 6, 9, 11, 14, 28, 34, 37, $39,40,43,45,49,51,53,54,55,64,66$, $71,72,73,74,76,77,78,87,107,108,111$, $115,116,127,129,131,138,141,144,151$, 189, 191, 199, 200, 204, 205, 207, 208, 212, 223, 226, 234, 237, 279, 294, 295
winter solstice $28,50,51,110,111,158$
Witkowski, Maciej G. 23, 58, 78, 85, 86, 87, 99, 112, 120, 223, 232, 234, 295
wooden mallet 32
Wysocki, Zygmunt 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, $26,27,29,32,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56$, $62,64,72,73,75,77,78,79,80,81,82,83$, $86,87,96,98,99,101,103,105,110,111$, $112,113,114,116,117,119,121,122,123$, 124, 212, 276, 295, 296

## Index of royal and private names

## Aa-kheper 47

Ah-mes (the mayor of Thebes) 142
Ah-mes of Pen-iaty 41, 56, 168, 212
Ahmose 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 78, 120, 128, 130, 142, $154,173,181,182,184,185,187,188,202$, 204, 212, 215, 229, 243, 260, 272, 291
Ahmose (queen) $37,38,39,40,41,78,99,120$, $128,130,142,154,173,181,182,184,185$, 187, 188, 202, 204, 212, 215, 229, 243, 260, 272, 291
Ahmose Nefertari (queen) $37,38,39,40,41,181$, $182,187,188,202,204,212,215,229,243$
Amenemhat I 40
Amenemhat III 40
Amenhotep I 173, 182, 185, 187, 212
Amenhotep II 78, 164, 181, 184, 205, 213, 215
Amenhotep III 4, 74, 141, 181, 182, 261, 263
Amun-em-hat (second priest of Amun in $\operatorname{Dsr}$ - $\underline{-} s r w$ ) 134, 235
Amun-hetep (overseer of the priests of hours [of the House] of Amun in $\underline{D} s r-d s r w)$ 47, 58, 110, 135, 165, 233
Amun-hetep (scribe) 58, 110
Amun-hetep ( $w^{\prime} b$ priest, reign of Thutmose III) 47, 58, 110, 135, 165, 233
Amun-hetep ( $w$ ' $b$ priest) $47,58,110,135,165$, 233
Amun-hetep son of Tjembu 47, 135
Antefoker 190
Ashayet (queen) 215
Dedia 41, 43, 213
Djehuty (owner of tomb TT 11) 5, 46, 47, 48, 58, $96,99,135,148,180,229,270$
Djehuty (owner of tomb TT 110) 5, 46, 47, 48, 58, 96, 99, 135, 148, 180, 229, 270

Djehuty ( $w^{\prime} b$ priest) $5,46,47,48,58,96,99,135$, 148, 180, 229, 270
Dua-er-neheh 181
Hapu-seneb 187, 199, 212, 215
Imi-seba 38, 41, 182
Ineni $5,37,41,43,56,128,143,181,183,190$, 192, 205, 208, 211, 215, 229, 242, 268
Ipu-er 8
Ken-Amun 141, 143, 259
Mentuhotep II Nebhepetra 7, 43, 46, 51, 54, 68, 71, 73, 94, 215
Meritamon (queen) 29, 78, 195
Ma-ru-ben-re-khy 8
Mery-Maat (priest of Amun in Dsr-dsrw) 135
Min-mes 56, 71
Nakht-Amun 182
Neb-Amun 8, 58, 141, 143, 192
Neb-Amun (scribe of outlines) 8, 58, 141, 143, 192
Neb-unnef 41
Neferu 64, 73, 181
Nefrura 3, 54, 99, 130, 131, 151, 154, 208, 229
Pui-em-Ra 5, 41, 56, 57, 128, 150, 151, 157, 165, $174,179,181,183,185,187,229,234,236$, 237, 238, 239, 242, 243
Ramesses II 45, 46, 128, 147, 149, 154, 155, 182, 215
Ramesses IX 38, 182, 203
Rekh-mi-Ra 7, 41, 183, 213
Ren-iker 190
Sebekhetep II 40
Sen-Amun (owner of tomb TT 252) 41, 165, 173, 184, 185
Sen-en-mut 3, 5, 7, 8, 41, 47, 56, 64, 67, 71, 74, $84,85,95,107,119,125,127,129,131$,

132, 143, 151, 152, 154, 173, 180, 187, 207, Senwosret III 40, 48 $212,214,215,233,234,235,236,238$

Surer 74
Senenu 83, 126, 127, 134, 135, 150, 152, 231, 233, 234, 238, 262

Thutmose I $2,4,25,39,40,54,98,105,112,113$, $114,115,116,119,120,125,127$,
Senseneb 120

## Index of divinities

Amun 4, 5, 8, 25, 26, 28, 30, 41, 43, 46, 47, 48, $50,55,56,58,60,81,85,86,88,95,96$, $110,111,121,125,127,128,132,134,135$, $141,143,144,145,148,150,151,152,153$, $154,157,158,164,165,173,177,179,180$, 181, 182, 184, 185, 187, 189, 190, 192, 200, $211,215,219,220,221,222,223,224,226$, 227, 233, 234, 235, 259, 260, 262, 269, 270, 275, 276, 282, 286
Amun, who is present in Hr.j-hr-Jmn 181
Amun-Ra 5, 95, 96, 110, 152, 179, 180, 190, 192, 215, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 227, 270
Amun-Ra, who is present in Dsr-st 179
Anubis 21, 26, 78, 85, 86, 87, 92, 107, 120, 132, 223, 224, 277, 295
Anubis who is on his mountain 85
Behdeti 143
Hathor 4, 24, 25, 26, 32, 43, 44, 45, 46, 53, 54, 58, $71,72,73,75,76,79,80,81,82,83,84,85$, $86,93,94,99,107,130,131,132,134,135$, $151,152,153,163,164,182,224,225,226$,
$231,232,233,234,235,236,260,281,284$, 291
Hathor-cow 45, 132
Hathor of 3h-swt 46
Hathor who is upon Thebes 84, 131
Horus $28,67,75,76,121,122,140,190,215$, $219,220,221,222,223,224,226,264$
Isis 215, 264
Khonsu 181
Mut 3, 181, 214, 229, 263, 269, 272
Ptah 167, 181, 214, 215, 291
Ptah-Sokar 167
Ra 5, 7, 41, 56, 57, 95, 96, 110, 128, 150, 151, $152,157,165,174,179,180,181,183,185$, 187, 190, 192, 212, 213, 215, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 242, 243, 270
Ra-Harakhte 215
Seth 1,38, 121, 266
Wadjet 28
Thoth 39, 121, 125, 293, 301

## Index of geographical names

Abydos 1, 7, 128, 133, 215, 220, 264, 266, 269, 272
temple of Seti I 37, 133, 182, 192, 215, 220
Amara-West 21
Armant 7
Asasif VI, 99, 137, 138, 139, 143, 147, 151, 263, 286
Asfun 7
Aswan 21, 96
Asyut 7
Bubastis 40
Buhen 219
Dendera 43, 224, 225
el-Kab 7
el-Lisht 17, 40, 76
pyramid of Sesostris I 17, 76
el-Matanah 7
Elephantine 3, 43, 135, 258, 259, 262, 275
Esna 7, 10, 201, 202
Gebel es-Silsileh 137, 142, 154, 157, 177
Hierakonpolis 7

Khenenu, see also: Gebel es-Silsileh 142, 307
Medamud 40
Nag el-Girgawi 190
Nefrusi 7
Qaw el-Kebir 7
Serabit el-Khadim 208
Shatt el-Regal 41, 168
Thebes
Birabi 63, 148, 193
chapel of Wadjmose 149, 211
Deir el-Bahari $1,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,12,15,16$, $17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27$, $28,29,30,32,33,34,35,43,44,46,47,49$, $50,51,52,53,54,56,57,58,59,60,61,62$, $63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74$, $75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,84,85,86,87$, $88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99$, $100,101,102,103,104,105,106,109,110$, $112,115,117,118,119,120,121,122,123$, $125,126,127,129,132,133,134,135,140$, $144,148,151,153,154,179,180,181,187$,

192, 199, 200, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, $212,214,219,220,223,225,226,230,231$, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 271, 273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 295, 296
Deir el-Medineh 8, 142, 187, 189, 192
temple of Maat 142
Dra Abu el-Naga 147, 191, 192
el-Khokha 192
el-Tarif 191
hill 10414
Hnmt-mn temple 183, 184, 185, 213, 214, 242
$H^{\prime}-3 h t$ temple 2, 60, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 183, 184, 213, 214, 238
Karnak 1, 3, 4, 5, 12, 22, 39, 40, 46, 50, 56, 60, $66,72,110,127,128,150,152,153,154$, $157,179,181,182,183,189,190,191,192$, 200, 205, 206, 211, 214, 215, 219, 233, 242, 255, 260, 262, 264, 265, 267, 270, 274, 277, 280, 283, 289, 291
3rd Pylon 4
4th Pylon 39
5th Pylon 205
6th Pylon 3, 192
8th Pylon 50
9th Pylon 181
Chapelle Blanche 23
Chapelle Rouge $4,16,60,143,150,154,157$, $160,164,165,174,180,183,193,206,212$, 230, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 242, 289, 292
$h b-s d$ temple of Amenhotep II 215
Palace of Maat 4, 192, 215
Treasury of Thutmose I 205
Luxor 3, 11, 61, 104, 141, 177, 181, 211, 214 , $215,259,260,261,273,281,287,288$
temple of Ramesses II 128, 149, 215
Medinet Habu 4, 63, 100, 128, 138, 163, 167, $174,175,176,177,178,179,180,189,191$, $211,213,215,226,241,265,273,281,282$, 291
temple at Medinet Habu - Dsr-st 4, 63, 100, 179, 180
temple of Ramesses III 133
Qurna 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 37, 38, 39, 56, 61, 107, $133,137,139,140,144,147,148,149,151$, $154,177,182,192,215,259,274,276,282$
Sheikh Abd el-Qurna 192
Southern Valleys 2, 195, 196, 197, 198, 206
Sikket Taqet Zeid 195, 196, 197, 198, 206
Wadi Gabbanat el-Qurud 195, 196, 197, 198
temple of Amenhotep I and Ahmose-Nefertari -Mn-swt 38, 39, 40, 182, 212
Mn-swt temple 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 183, 187, 211, 212, 213, 215, 229
temple of Hatshepsut - D $\operatorname{sr}-\underline{d} s r w$ 3, 10, 50, 53, $56,60,77,95,125,127,128,129,132,140$,
$148,150,151,152,153,200,208,211,213$,
214. See also: Deir el-Bahari

Bark Station 64, 65, 66, 211
dwelling structures $14,129,163$
Lower Terrace 15, 49, 54, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, $71,73,75,78,81,83,95,107,129,130$, 181, 265, 281
Lower Portico North (Portico of Hunting) 72, 73
Lower Portico South (Portico of Obelisks) 24, 67, 73, 130, 135
Lower Ramp 10, 53, 72, 73, 74, 87, 88
Middle Terrace $15,54,55,71,72,73,74,75$, $76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,85,151$
Hathor Shrine 24, 32, 44, 46, 54, 58, 71, 72, $73,75,76,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,93$, $94,99,107,130,132,135,151,163,164$, $182,224,225,231,232,233,234,235,236$, 284
Middle Courtyard 14, 56, 74, 76, 108, 295, 296
Middle Portico North (Portico of Birth) 28, 79, 80, 85, 86
Middle Portico South (Portico of Punt) 24, 55, 76, 79, 81, 82, 83
Northern Colonnade 10, 24, 25, 29, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 86, 87, 120, 130
Upper Ramp 10, 53, 79, 87
Processional Alley 49, 53, 64, 65, 66, 67, 71, 72
Upper Terrace $10,12,15,19,20,22,24,25$, $28,29,53,55,69,72,76,80,81,83,86,87$, $88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,97,99,100$, $101,103,105,107,109,111,112,113,114$, $115,116,117,119,120,121,122,123,124$, 131, 230, 232, 236, 275, 284, 295, 296
Complex of the Royal Cult 21, 31, 96, 103, $112,113,114,115,116,120,122,123,132$, 216, 226
Complex of the Solar Cult 33, 50, 85, 100, $116,117,125,132,153$
Main Sanctuary of Amun 25, 26, 28, 50, 81, 85, 86, 88, 132
Northern Chamber of Amun 19, 28, 34, 95, $100,117,118,120,121,122$
Ptolemaic Portico 107
Room with the Window 21, 27, 28, 95, 96, $112,114,120,121,122,123,133$
Southern Chamber of Amun 22, 95, 96, 112, 113, 116, 120, 121, 133
Upper Courtyard 4, 15, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, $28,29,30,32,33,35,43,66,74,88,89,93$, $95,96,97,98,99,100,101,103,104,105$, $107,108,109,110,111,112,113,114,116$, $117,118,120,121,122,123,125,130,132$, 133, 134, 135, 144, 153, 219, 220, 230, 236, 237, 277
Upper Shrine of Anubis 25, 111, 116, 119,

120, 131, 188, 234
Valley Temple 10, 12, 50, 53, 56, 57, 59, 60, $61,62,63,64,88,128,139,142,150,151$, 153, 182, 193, 199, 213
temple of Merenptah at Qurna 154, 183, 184, 214
temple of Ramesses II (Ramesseum) 121, 128, $147,148,149,152,154,193,211,214,215$, 238, 271, 278, 279, 285
temple of Ramesses VI at Qurna 214
temple of Seti I 37, 133, 182, 192, 215, 220
temple of Thutmose I - Hnmt- 'nh 2, 21, 66, 94, $137,138,139,140,141,142,143,144,145$, $151,174,175,199,208,212,213,214,215$, 216, 226, 237, 239
temple of Thutmose II - Šspt- 'nh 167, 168, 169, $170,171,172,174,183,212,213,240$
temple of Thutmose III - Dsr-3ht 5, 51, 107, $125,143,151,152,174$
temple of Thutmose IV at Qurna 107
Theban tombs
tomb DB 320203
tomb of Amun-em-heb (TT 85) 181
tomb of Djehuty (TT 110) 135
tomb of Dua-er-neheh (TT 125) 181
tomb of Imi-seba (TT 65) 38, 41, 182
tomb of Meritamon (DB 358) 29, 78, 195
tomb of Min-mes 71
tomb of Neb-unnef 41
tomb of Nefertari 195
tomb of Rekh-mi-Ra 41
tomb of Sen-en-mut (TT 353) 8, 55, 56, 235
tomb of Senenmut (TT 71) 55, 56
tomb of Surer 74
tomb of Thay (TT 349) 37
tomb TT 1370187
tomb TT 1379187
tomb TT 2298
Thoth Hill 39, 293
Valley of the Kings 2, 9, 10, 174, 198, 199, 200, 201, 203, 205, 207, 208, 213, 251, 265, 274, 285, 286
tomb KV 11203
tomb KV 16203
tomb KV 17203
tomb KV 6203
tomb KV 9203
tomb of Amenhotep II (KV 35) 203, 205
tomb of Hatshepsut (KV 20) 50, 119, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 214, 215, 251, 269, 274
tomb of Ramesses IX (KV 4) 203
tomb of Thutmose I (KV 38) 198
tomb of Thutmose II (KV 42) 199
tomb of Thutmose III (KV 34) 158, 161, 205, 206, 207, 214
tomb of Thutmose IV (KV 43) 200

## Index of Egyptian words and phrases

[Jm]n hrrj-jb Ḥr.j-ḥr-Jmn 181
db3t 121, 133
Dhwtj-ms h'nfrw 40
dnj 191
Dsr-3ht 5, 51, 107, 125, 143, 151, 152, 174
Dsr Nb-hpt-R 43
Dsrt 43
Dsrw 43
d3dw 193
grg W3st 189
hft-hr 189, 190
Hft-hr-nb.s 179, 182, 189, 190, 191, 192, 211, 243
Hftt-hr-nb.s 189, 192, 193
h.k. 91, 164
hm-ntr 134, 135, 145, 165, 181
ham-ntr tpj $n$ Jmn m Dss-dsrw 134
ḥm-ntr tpj n Ḥwt-Hr hrt-jb Dsr-dsrw 134
hnbwt Hft-ḥr-nb.s 190
Hnmt-mn 183, 184, 185, 212, 213, 214, 242
harj-hbt 47, 135, 145, 173
hrj hawt n(w) Jmn m D. $\operatorname{sr}$-[...] 135
hrj mrw 127
hrp k3t $m$ Jpt-swt 55
hrp kzt nbt nt nsw 55

Hrt-jb 121
htp-dj-nswt 48
hawt-ntrr 49, 96, 147, 150, 151, 157, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224
ḥwt-ntr '3t nt ḥhw m rnpwt 49, 220, 221, 222
jhmt 191
jmj-r gs-pr n ḥwt 56
jmj-r gs-prw n(w) Jmn 56
jmj-r hntjw-š n(w) Jmn 56
jmj-r k3t 41, 55, 56, 58, 143, 168
jmj-r k3t n(t) DDsr-kз-R'm3'hrw 41, 56
jmj-r k3t n $n(t)$ Jmn 55

jmj-r kzt n(t) Mwt m Jšrw 55
jmj-r k3t n(t) '3-hpr-k3-R' 41, 56, 143
jmj-r k3t n(t) '3-hpr-n-R' 41,56
jmj-r kzt nbt n(t) nswt m pr-Jmn 55
jmj-r kzt nbt nt nsw 55
jmj-r mnmnt n(t) Jmn 56
jmj-r mnmnt n(t) Jmn m Jpt-swt 56
jmj-r nfrt nt Jmn 56
jmj-r prwj-hd 55
jmj-r prwj-hd prwj-nbw 55
jmj-r prwj-nbw 55

## jmj-r pr wr n Jmn 56

jmj-r šnwtj 56
jmj-r šnwtj $n(w)$ Jmn 56
jmj-r šnwtj n(w) Jmn-wsr-ḥzt 56
jmj-r šnwtj n(w) Jmn m nwt rsjt 56
jmj-ršn'[n Jmn] m Dsr-dsrw 128
jmj-r 3ḥwt n(w) Jmn 56
jmj-r 'ḥwtjw $n(w)$ Jmn 56
jmj-st- ` \(n\) Jmn m Her.j-ḥr-Jmn 181 Jmn dsr mnw 88 jnt Nb-hpt-R' 43 jst 7, 8, 145 j3t 95, 154 \(k_{3} 16,28,29,41,46,48,53,56,63,64,84,85,87\), \(88,90,95,99,121,125,127,131,141,143\), \(144,150,151,153,158,162,164,165,168\), \(177,179,187,188,203,212,214,219,220\), \(221,222,223,224,225,226,227,243\) k3rjj 127 m m3wt 190 mиw 46, 88, 121, 192, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227 m s3h nbw t3-dsr 220 \(M_{3}{ }^{\prime} t-k 3-R{ }^{\prime} 16,28,46,53,63,84,85,88,90,99\), \(125,131,150,151,153,162,168,177,179\), 203, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 227 M3 't-k3-R' gmt 3ht Jmn 125 M3 't-kz-R'Jmn htp hr mnw.s 88 Nb-hpt-R' 43, 46, 47 pr 43, 55, 56, 80, 84, 85, 99, 121, 124, 127, 128, \(133,150,152,180,224\) pr-dwzt 121, 124 pr-hd \(121,127,150\) pr-wr 84 pr Jmn 128 r-pr 80 rmt 7 rmt jst 7 sb3 19, 88, 125, 153, 219, 220, 223 sb3 '3 88, 219 sdm- ̌̌sw 8 sdmw 8 sdsr 192 shhbt tzwj m nfrw.s 219 shw 133 shww'b 133 sj rt-m3't 58, 99 sm 135 smnh 192, 225 šmw 55 šnw 127 šn` $127,128,133,164,173,284$
šn'w'b 133
sš-kd 58
šsp mnw hnmt-Jmn-ḩ̣t-špswt 88
Šspt-' nh 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 183, 212, 213, 240
$s$ 'h' 192, 219, 224
tp jtrw 134
wdn 135
wsht 95, 131, 132, 133, 219
wsht ḥbjjt 95, 131, 132, 133
w3hjjit 66
w3s 91, 220, 223, 224, 225
W3st 84, 152, 164, 189, 190, 223, 224, 225, 226
W3st-hft-hr-nb.s 190
w'b $41,47,48,58,133,135,145,165,173,185$
$W^{\prime} b-k b b 60,150$
w'b n Hwt-Hrw m 3h-swt 47
w'b n Jmn m Ḥnkt- 'nh 135
w'b n Jmn m 3h-st 47
3h-mnw 121, 192
3h-swt 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 211, 212, 213, 229
3 hit $2,3,5,10,51,55,56,60,99,107,125,127$, $135,143,147,148,149,150,151,152,153$, $154,155,174,180,183,184,212,213,214$, 220, 221, 222, 238
'nh 2, 21, 34, 66, 91, 94, 98, 99, 111, 128, 130, $135,137,138,139,140,141,142,143,144$, $145,150,151,153,157,158,159,160,161$, $162,164,165,167,168,169,170,171,172$, $174,175,183,184,199,205,208,212,213$, $214,215,216,219,220,221,222,223,224$, 225, 226, 227, 237, 239, 240
't ḥnkt 133
'3-hpr-kz-R' mrjj Jtm 125

## Index of museum objects

Antikenmuseum, Basel 204
Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin 214434
22883 11, 107
2299 11, 76
230111
8755 41, 173
Bodreaux, Musée d'Aquitaine 1252204
Cairo, Museum of Egyptian Antiquities

CG 25665142
CG 25667135
CG 34012192
CG 42114 41, 56, 229
CG 4211756
CG 4212243
CG 46004200
CG 579 3, 55
CG 70001a 112
CG 70001b 112

CG 843135
JE 27978135
JE 30739112
JE 30740112
JE 3350037
JE 3857484
JE 47032195
JE 47702 11, 107
JE 47703 11, 107
JE 5212962
JE 52458 11, 107
JE 53113 11, 74
JE 53114 11, 76
JE 53115 11, 107
JE 55190 11, 76
JE 5519176
JE 56259 76, 89
JE 56259 A-B 89
JE 5626089
JE 5626198
JE 5626289
JE 5626311
JE 56766 41, 173
JE 56767 41, 173
RT 26/7/14/52 204
Chicago, Oriental Institute
Museum
E 29386201
E 29402201
E 8798134
Cracow, Czartoryski Museum
MNK XI-1137a 201
MNK XI-1137b 201
Fort Worth, Kimbell Art Muse-
um
AP 85.2 55, 234
Hague, Museum-Meerman-no-Westreenianum
79/130 204
Hanover, Museum August
Kestner
1935.200.152 204
1935.200.485 204
1935.200.82 45
1949.350204

Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oud-
heden
1928/29.2 11
Liverpool, Liverpool Museum
M 11929 45, 46
London, British Museum
EA1513 55, 56
EA174 55, 56

EA40963 47
EA41228 66
EA42179 85
EA52882 62
EA52883 62
EA52884 62
EA52885 62
EA56921 47
EA683 47
EA690 46, 47, 94
London, Petrie Museum
UC 14351 43, 46, 47, 229
UC 14390 47, 48
UC 15948184
UC 15949184
UC 15950184
UC 15951184
UC 15952184
UC 15953184
UC 15954184
UC 3767858
Munich, Staatliche Sammlung
Ägyptischer Kunst
ÄS 626555
New York, Brooklyn Museum 67.6855

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
12.181.305 56
1971.20955
22.2.26 21, 141, 237
23.3.1 11, 107
23.3.2 11, 107
23.3.4 34
23.3.50 98
25.3.39 53
26.7.1452 204
27.3.163 11
28.3.18 11, 107
29.3.1 11, 107, 233
29.3.2 11, 115, 214
29.3.3 11, 235
30.3.1 11, 107
30.3.2 11, 107
30.3.3 11, 214
31.3.153 111
31.3.154 111
31.3.155 111
31.3.156 89
31.3.157 98
31.3.158 89
31.3.159 89
31.3.160 107
31.3.161 107
31.3.162 107
31.3.163 98
31.3.164 98
31.3.166 11, 76
31.3.167 11, 76
31.3.168 11
31.3.94 11, 74
31.3.95 55
32.2.11 61
32.2.12 61
32.2.13 61
32.2.14 61
32.2.15 61
32.2.16 61
32.2.17 61
32.2.7 61
32.2.8 61
32.2.9 61
32.3.264 61
32.3.266 61
32.3.268 61
32.3.270 61
32.3.271 61
32.3.272 61
32.3.277 61
32.3.279 61
32.3.280 61
32.3.282 61
32.3.283 61
32.3.284 61
32.3.287 61
35.3.297 142
48.149.7 55
65.27455
90.6.42 138
90.6.43 138

Paris, Louvre
A 134 199, 215, 267
B 58 38, 40
E 1105756
E 6244134
Providence, Rhode Island School of Design Museum
Rh.I 40.019 47, 229
Stockholm, Medelhavsmuseet
MM 14385 45, 46
Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Egizio
22780 190, 191, 243
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum
101834


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Summary, see: Ullmann, Thebes: Origins of a Ritual Landscape, 3.
    ${ }^{2}$ E.g. for Abydos: Effland, Effland, "Ritual Landscape" und "Sacred Space", 127-158.
    ${ }^{3}$ Posener, Sur l'orientation et l'ordre des point cardinaux, 69-73.
    ${ }^{4}$ Wildung, Garten, 376; Wilkinson, The Garden, 2, 120; Hugonot, Le jardin, 168-170.
    ${ }^{5}$ Gabolde, Karnak sous le règne de Sésostris I ${ }^{\text {er, }}$ 3-12.
    ${ }^{6}$ Iwaszczuk, Rebirth of Temples, 29-58.

[^1]:    ${ }^{7}$ Roth, Hatshepsut's Mortuary Temple, 151, n. 3.
    ${ }^{8}$ Urk. IV, 59.16-60.4.

[^2]:    ${ }^{9}$ Cf. constructions in Karnak (Gabolde, Monuments, passim) and on Elephantine (Bommas, Der Tempel des Chnum, passim; Arnold F., The Khnum temple 2014-2015, 12-15; Arnold F., The Khnum temple 2015-2016, 30-34).
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