The Coronation Ceremony During the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt

An Analysis of Three "Coronation" Inscriptions

Arto Onnig Arto Onnig Belekdanian

Queen's College

University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Oriental Studies

Hilary 2015

Thesis Title: **The Coronation Ceremony During the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: an Analysis of Three "Coronation" Inscriptions**

Candidate Name: **Arto Onnig Arto Onnig Belekdanian**

College/hall: **The Queen's College**

Degree: **DPhil Oriental Studies**

Term: **Hilary 2015**

Thesis Abstract:

This thesis provides a detailed interpretation of three key texts described in Egyptological research as "coronation inscriptions:" the *Historical Inscription* of Hatshepsut, Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse*, and Horemheb's Turin inscription. Similarities and differences between these texts, as well as other sources, both textual and pictorial, are discussed. A clear terminology is laid out, distinguishing between accession (the royal heir becoming king at the death of their predecessor), crowning (the action of placing the crowns on the new king's head), and coronation ceremony (following the accession by some time on which occasion the new ruler would have been bestowed with the crowns and regalia of his office, perhaps for the first time). The main aim of this thesis is to determine whether it would be accurate to label the discussed texts as coronation inscriptions and, if not, how they can best be described. It is determined that the evidence supports the earlier conclusion reached by Redford, that it would be incorrect to speak of a "coronation ceremony" in the dynastic period, for new kings would have been crowned at their accessions in a palace setting, soon after the death of their predecessors, this followed some time later by a public "appearance ceremony" in a temple festival setting. While it is determined that Thutmose III's inscription describes the time when kingship was predicted to him, it is concluded that the Hatshepsut and Horemheb texts narrate exceptional events on which occasion their accessions in a palace and public "appearance ceremonies" intersected.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first and foremost like to thank my parents and brother for their love and unwavering faith in me. The help and guidance that I received from my supervisor, Prof. Mark Smith, was invaluable, together with his insightful instruction throughout this process. I admire his knowledge, and proficiency in Egyptian, and will strive to follow the example he sets. It was a privilege that, under the auspices of Oxford University's Oriental Studies Faculty, I benefited from the expert tutelage of Prof. John Baines and Prof. Elizabeth Frood. I would also like to extend my sincerest thanks to Ann-Katrin Gill, a true friend and outstanding colleague. Finally, I would also like to thank all my friends and The Queen's College for all their help and support.

I cannot express my gratitude enough to everyone. The completion of this thesis would not have otherwise been possible.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW 1–28

I. The Coronation Ceremony During the Ptolemaic Period 4–15

1. The coronation ceremonies of the later Ptolemies 4–11

a. Ptolemy V Epiphanes 4–8

b. Ptolemy IX Soter II 8–9

c. Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos 9–11

2. The Coronation Ceremonies of the Argead Dynasty and the Early Ptolemies 12–15

II. Literature review 15–28

CHAPTER II: THE KARNAK COMPLEX IN THE EARLY 18TH DYNASTY 29–35

I. Overall layout of the temple 29–31

II. Conclusions and interpretations 31–5

The *wadjyt* 32–5

CHAPTER III: THE *HISTORICAL INSCRIPTION* OF HATSHEPSUT 36–123

I. The Lay of the Land 40–9

1. The *ḥ ḥw nb n nsw.t* 40

2. The *tp-i̯trw* and *wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w* 41–2

3. Palaces 42–9

II. Analysis of Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription* 49–122

1. Amun is out on a festival procession; does not perform an expected *bi̯ꜣy.t* at the Station 50–2

2. The procession continues, and reaches the *ḥ-nsw.t* 53–64

3. Hatshepsut meets Amun, who leads her to the Palace of Maat 64–71

4. Speech of Amun where he reveals his immediate intentions 71–4

5. The installation of Hatshepsut on the throne 75–81

6. The procession continues, followed by a speech by the Uraeus-goddess 82–7

7. Hatshepsut receives the crowns 87–9

8. Speech of a deity, the *ḫ ḥw-nsw.t*, and the formulation of the titulary 89–100

a. The *ḫ ḥw-nsw.t* 93–7

b. The titulary 97–100

9. Hatshepsut's appointment at the Station, and the performance of an offering 100–10

a. The procession 102–5

b. Appointment at the *Station* 105–10

10. Hatshepsut's speech: oath and claims to veracity (excerpt) 110–13
11. Hatshepsut's speech: recollection of different oracular processions 113–18
12. Hatshepsut's speech: an account of the oracular processions of a goddess (excerpt) 118–22
III. Summary of conclusions reached 122–3
CHAPTER IV: THE *TEXTE DE LA JEUNESSE* OF THUTMOSE III 124–98
I. The Lay of the Land 126–7
II. Analysis of the *Texte de la jeunesse* 127–71
1. Beginning of the text; statements of legitimacy 127–30
2. The god emerges from the inner areas of his temple 130–5
3. The great food-offering 135–43
On Amun "receiving" a *bỉʒy.t* 142–3
4. Amun mysteriously seeks out Thutmose, and finds him 143–9
5. Thutmose's reaction to Amun stopping for him, and the god's own reaction thereto 149–57
Thutmose III's 7th Pylon Inscription 155–7
6. Thutmose's reaction to Amun stopping for him, and the god's own reaction thereto (*cont.*) 157–9
7. Claims to veracity and the hidden will of the gods 159–60
8. The doors of the 5th Pylon are opened for Thutmose, who passes through 160–5
9. The crowning of Thutmose and the establishment of his titulary 165–71
III. Final analysis 171–97
1. The *Texte de la jeunesse* as a séance oraculaire 172–81
2. The *Texte de la jeunesse* as accession or coronation ceremony 181–6
3. The possible coregency of Thutmose II with Thutmose III 186–8
4. The remainder of the 7th Pylon inscription and its ramifications 188–91
5. The historicity of the *Texte de la jeunesse* 191–7
IV. Conclusions 197–8
CHAPTER V: THE TURIN INSCRIPTION OF HOREMHEB 199–264
I. Analysis of the Text 202–53
1. Beginning of the procession in Karnak 202–6
The Identity of Horus 205–6
2. The encounter of Horemheb and Horus with Amun 206–12
On the meeting place of Horemheb with Amun 209–12
3. Amun joins the festival and leads Horemheb to the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr* 212–28

a. The term *pr-nsw.t* and "cultic" palaces 215–17
b. The *pr-nsw.t* in the Turin inscription 217–28
i. The *pr-nsw.t* as the palace of Karnak Temple 218–20
ii. The *pr-nsw.t* as the palace of Luxor Temple 220–2
iii. The *pr-nsw.t* as Luxor Temple itself 222–8
4. The crowning moment of the festival 229–39
Similarities with the pictorial evidence 229–39
5. The Ennead celebrates, and gives a speech 240–7
6. The making of the titulary 247–8
7. Exit from the *pr-nsw.t* and public confirmation of kingship 249–51
8. End of festivities and sailing northward 251–3
II. Final analysis 254–63
1. Coronation ceremony and *pr-nsw.t* as a designation of Luxor Temple 254–60
2. Accession and *pr-nsw.t* as a palace 260–3
III. Conclusions 263–4
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION 265–72
I. Problems with previous research 266–8
1. The terminology 266–7
2. The use of different kinds of sources across Egyptian history 267–8
3. The premise that there did exist a coronation ceremony 268
II. Results 268–71
III. Future research 272
APPENDIX A: TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF THE *HISTORICAL INSCRIPTION* 273–304
Part 1: Text 273–82
Part 2: Translation 283–304
APPENDIX B: HISTORY OF DISCUSSION OF BLOCK 287 OF THE HISTORICAL INSCRIPTION 305–9
APPENDIX C: TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF THE *TEXTE DE LA JEUNESSE* 310–22
Part 1: Text 310–16
Part 2: Translation 317–22
APPENDIX D: TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF HOREMHEB'S TURIN INSCRIPTION 323–34
Part 1: Text 323–8
Part 2: Translation 329–34
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED 335–53
FIGURES 355–68

CHAPTER I

Introduction and Literature Review

Before any analysis of the coronation ritual in ancient Egypt can be undertaken and any statements about its significance made, the term needs to first and foremost be defined. The Oxford Dictionary defines "coronation" as "the action of crowning; the ceremony of investing a sovereign, or the consort of a sovereign, with a crown as an emblem of royal dignity, on or soon after his accession."[1] The term "coronation" has been applied to a number of inscriptions, but this is problematic for several reasons: (1) the standard definition confusingly includes the act itself of crowning, as well as (2) the occasion on which it took place, be it (a) the accession, or (b) a later ceremony. Furthermore, the application of the term "coronation ceremony" to describe the events of a given text assumes that the term is indeed one which could be applied to ancient Egypt. For example, it is known that the kings were crowned on the occasion of the Opet festival as a standard part of this religious occasion, but it would be a mistake to describe every instance of this festival as a "coronation ceremony". In order to avoid confusion, the term "crowning" is henceforth used to refer to the act of crowning in this thesis, and "accession," whether or not it included a crowning, is defined as the rise to the throne on the death of one's predecessor. "Coronation ceremony," in line with the view held by Egyptologists whose views are presented below, is used to refer to an occasion which would have required time for which to prepare, one the main goal of which was to crown the monarch.

The coronation ceremony is a wide-spread phenomenon both geographically and temporally: royal hymns and inscriptions from the Ur III Period in Mesopotamia mention how a divinity gave royal power and its insignia (one of those being the crown) to the ruler,[2] and coronations are still celebrated in modern times, as was the case with Queen Elizabeth II in 1953. As interesting and fruitful a comparative study of coronation in ancient Egypt and in other cultures would be in terms of finding parallels and perhaps shedding light on the ceremony as it was celebrated in ancient Egypt and on its significance, such a study lies beyond the scope of this thesis, however; the

[1] *OED Online* March 2015, s.v. "coronation, n."

[2] Renger, *Reallexikon* V, s.v. "Inthronisation", 129; Caplice and Heimpel, *ibid.*, s.v. "Investitur", 139.

"coronation ceremony" is studied from a culture-specific point of view, as it would have occurred in the 18th Dynasty, for despite the coronation's universality, its elements—such as the ruler, the officiants, the crown, and the throne—and the events that would have constituted it need not be, or have been, the same everywhere, nor would they have, or have had, the same significance. The culture-specific approach is, to be sure, the more important one at this point in time, for little is known about the coronation ceremony in ancient Egypt, and this would take precedence over any comparative study. Even this, however, is too great an aim, given how long-lived ancient Egyptian civilization was, and the large number of sources which could be used. These sources are diverse, but fall into two categories: pictorial, and textual. Numerous temple reliefs include depictions of the crowning of the king, some of which occur in the context of specific festivals theoretically distinct from a coronation ceremony, such as the Opet festival, and others which appear without any reference to their religious occasion. The focus of this thesis is therefore on the textual sources which have been described in Egyptological literature as coronation inscriptions, for there at least it is certain that each text under examination relates the events that took place on a specific occasion.

As the literature review presented in this chapter demonstrates, it is debatable whether a coronation ceremony even existed in the Dynastic Period. The aim of this thesis is to present a critical re-evaluation of both sides of the argument on the matter through an in-depth analysis of the three most detailed texts from the Dynastic Period which have been described in Egyptological literature as coronation inscriptions: the so-called *Historical Inscription* of Hatshepsut, the *Texte de la jeunesse* of Thutmose III, and the inscription on the back of a statue of Horemheb and Mutnedjmet in the Turin Museum. These respectively form the subjects of the third, fourth, and fifth chapters. The main publications relied on for the transliteration and translation are presented in Part 1 of the appendix pertaining to each chapter, and running translations in Part 2.

These texts are quite detailed in how they expound the account of events they offer: aside from presenting them as a narrative, with the unfolding events being told in a chronologically sequential manner, they also refer to the main agents, usually Amun and the king, as well as the specific settings of various key episodes. Among the aims of this thesis is to analyse these inscriptions, to correlate these place names with real-world locations, to identify the various actors involved, and to explain the sequence of

succeeding steps and rituals the inscriptions record. Most importantly, the aim is to point out similarities, as well as differences, in an attempt to establish the "regular" procedure of a coronation ceremony, to determine whether the texts can accurately be described as giving accounts of events which could accurately be labelled as such, and based on that whether or not it is even accurate at all to speak of a Dynastic Egyptian "coronation ceremony." The term "coronation inscription" is used to refer to the texts themselves purported to be accounts of such events.

Another term, "coronation sequence," is applied to reliefs depicting ritual scenes which can be understood to have taken place consecutively. These are usually (1) the purification and (2) crowning of the king, (3) his being led, ordinarily by two divinities, (4) into the presence of the main godhead of the temple while Thoth writes down his royal titulary (e.g. Philip Arrhidaeus' Karnak barque sanctuary; see fig. 1). The third scene, before it culminates into the encounter with the main deity, is often labelled in its caption as a *bs-nsw.t* "royal induction," *bs* being the term usually used to describe an individual's introduction into an office.

That the coronation inscriptions of Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and Horemheb all date to the 18th Dynasty unfortunately means that sources from other periods are scarcer, and also less detailed. Fortunately, however, this very fact allows for multiple sources from a single time period to be studied, and for the events they relate to be seen as reflecting instances of a potential "coronation ceremony" as it would have taken place specifically during this period. Parallels can then safely be drawn between them without fear of projecting any similarities across more than one time period.

The purpose of this chapter is to trace the history of the research done on the subject of the coronation ceremony during dynastic Egyptian times, and through it, to introduce and define important terms and concepts which are used throughout this thesis, the most important of all being the verb *ḫʿi* "to arise, to appear."[3] It is concluded at the end of this thesis, as evidenced by the coronation inscriptions under examination, that the arguments made by Redford (presented below) are the most convincing, in that there does not appear to have existed, at least during the 18th Dynasty, a coronation ceremony *per se*. Rather, it is concluded that there may have existed a similar concept,

[3] *Wb.* III, 239–41.

but only in function—legitimisation—rather than in form: it would have been an event of extreme importance for the new king to publicly "appear" on a great festival occasion for the first time, over the course of which he (or she) would have been bestowed with the crowns of their office as a part of the standard ritual procedure of the event; the king's first crowning, on the other hand, would have already taken place on the day of accession.

It is for this reason that the term "coronation ceremony" is henceforth carefully placed between quotation marks when the nature of the events described in a given text is uncertain, typically before a conclusion is reached toward the end of each chapter on this matter: their presence signals the usage of this term as a temporary placeholder until its validity can be ascertained. In other words, the absence of quotation marks has the term allude to the standard definition of "coronation (ceremony)" presented above, and their presence has the term refer to the hypothetical instance(s) of such a ceremony in Egypt's Dynastic Period. It is ultimately proposed, given the concluded inapplicability of this designation to Egyptian pre-Ptolemaic practices (at least based on the three texts discussed in this thesis), that a new term, "appearance ceremony," be used instead. This would appropriately place the emphasis on the *ḫʿi* of the king rather than his being crowned. The act of being crowned, on the other hand, is referred to with another distinct term in this thesis: "crowning."

I. The Coronation Ceremony During the Ptolemaic Period

1. The coronation ceremonies of the later Ptolemies

a. Ptolemy V Epiphanes

At this point some attention needs to be given to the coronation ceremony during the Ptolemaic Period, many of the aspects of which have relatively clear answers. This subject is worthy of its own extensive study, but I present here a short discussion on the matter to provide examples of details known about Ptolemaic Period coronation ceremonies. The existence itself of such a ceremony in this period is beyond doubt.[4] The first unambiguously attested one is that of Ptolemy V Epiphanes,[5] and it has been argued that from his reign onward "the Ptolemies regularly underwent the traditional

[4] Cf. Helck, *LÄ* V, s.v. "Rituale", 279.

[5] Koenen, "Ptolemaic King", 71.

ceremony, crowned by the high priest of Ptah."[6] According to the synodal decree of Memphis—the so-called Rosetta inscription—which commemorated the coronation of Ptolemy V Epiphanes, a golden shrine which was to house the image of the deified Epiphanes was to be decorated with ten gold royal crowns, with the Double Crown in the middle, *ḏr-ntt psḏ ḥm=f ỉm=f m ḥw.t-kɜ-Ptḥ m-ḫt ỉr*(*.w*) *n=f ỉr nb n bs-nswt r ḥw.t-nṯr ḫft šsp.n=f ỉɜ.t wr.t* "since his Person arose in glory with it (the Double Crown) in the estate of the ka of Ptah[7] when every ritual of the royal induction was done for him in the temple when he received the great office."[8] This sentence plainly states that the crowning took place in the sanctuary of the temple of Ptah at Memphis, and even tells us with which crown he was crowned. Furthermore, not only is it known that it was the high priest of Ptah who crowned the Ptolemies, but even their individual names are known.[9] It is also known who would have attended the ceremony; according to the Memphis decree:

> (6) *ỉw ỉmy*(*.w*)*-r gs*(*.w*)*-pr* (7) *ḥm.w-nṯr ḥry.w-sšṯɜ ʿb.w-nṯr ʿḳ*(*.w*) *r b*(*w*)*-ḏsr r smʿr nṯr*(*.w*) *m sṯ.t=sn ḥnʿ sš.w mḏɜ.t-nṯr ḥ*(*n*)ʿ *ṯ.t pr-ʿnḫ ḥnʿ* (8) *nɜ ky*(*.w*) *wʿb*(*.w*) *ỉỉ*(*.w*) *m ỉtr.ty šmʿ mḥw r ỉnb-ḥḏ.t m ḥb n šsp nswy.t m-ʿ ỉt=f ỉn ḥm nswt-bỉt nb tɜwy Ptwrmys-ʿnḫ*(*.w*)*-ḏ.t-mr*(*.y*)*-Ptḥ-nṯr-pr-nb-ɳfrw ʿb=sn r sḥḏ*(*.t*) *n.t* (9) *mḫɜ.t tɜwy*
>
> (6) The overseers of the temples, (7) the god's servants, the masters/keepers of the mystery, those who purify the god who enter the sanctuary in order to clothe the gods with their clothing, together with the scribes of god's books, together with the staff of the House of Life, together with (8) the other *waab*-priests, having come from the temples of Upper and Lower Egypt to the White Wall (Memphis) for the festival of the reception of kingship from his father by the Person of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the Lord of the Two Lands, Ptolemy-living-forever-beloved-of-Ptah, the-god-who-has-come-forth/appeared

[6] Thompson, *Memphis*, 129.

[7] The temple of Ptah in Memphis, which could also designate the city itself as a whole (*Wb*. III, 5,20).

[8] Hieroglyphic version l. 9: Sethe, *Griechisch-römischen Zeit*, 192, 6–7.

[9] Thompson, *Memphis*, 129 and 135. Harmachis crowned Ptolemy V Epiphanes (*ibid.*, 111), Petobastis IV crowned Ptolemy IX Soter II on the occasion of his second coronation (*ibid.*, 116), and Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos was crowned by Psenptah III (*ibid.*, 101; Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 196 and no. 137 in p. 336).

> (i.e. Epiphanes), the lord-of-beauty, having assembled in the temple/shrine of the Balance of (9) the Two Lands (i.e. Memphis).[10]

The last question that remains, in the case of Epiphanes, at least, is when his coronation ceremony took place, and even that is known: on Mecheir 17 of the Demotic calendar, regnal year 9 (March 26 196 BCE).[11] According to Koenen, the choice of this date was not an accidental one: it was the date "on which Ptolemy I began to use the title of king in Egypt and, perhaps, was crowned."[12]

Stadler has more recently called the coronation of Epiphanes, and indeed that of any Ptolemaic king, into question.[13] I here discuss his views on the texts from the reigns of three Ptolemaic kings most often cited to support the fact that coronation ceremonies did occur during this time: Ptolemy V Epiphanes, Ptolemy IX Soter II, and Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos.

In the case of Epiphanes, Stadler problematically bases his arguments on the following passage from the Memphis Decree: "the gods let him (Epiphanes) overcome them (the rebels) at Memphis during the festival of the Reception of the Rulership which he did from his father."[14] Firstly, he argues that it is uncertain according to the conventions of which culture Ptolemy V's coronation ceremony was conducted. This may have been a tenable position based on the passage he cites, but this is ignoring the one presented above, where it is explicitly stated that it was with the Double Crown that Epiphanes was crowned.[15] It would be surprising for the coronation to have been with an Egyptian crown, while the ceremony was conducted according to Greco-Macedonian tradition. Secondly, whereas it has been argued that the *anakleteria* (a

---

[10] Memphis Decree, hieroglyphic version ll. 6–9, equivalent to ll. 4–5 of Demotic version and ll. 6–8 of Greek: transliteration and translation based on Sethe, *Griechisch-römischen Zeit*, 172, 3–9. Since this section does not survive on the Rosetta Stone itself, Sethe completed it using another version from el-Nibeira (*ibid*., 167).

[11] Koenen, "Ptolemaic King", 75, 77. Phaophi 17 (November 26, 197 BCE) is the date recorded in the hieroglyphic section of the text (Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 124 no. 69 in p. 310). For precedence given to the Demotic date over the hieroglyphic, see: Koenen, *Agonistische Inschrift*, 74–5 no. 160.

[12] Koenen, "Ptolemaic King", 73.

[13] Stadler, "Krönung", 61–73. I am indebted to Prof. John Baines, who very thoughtfully brought this article to my attention.

[14] Demotic version ll. 22–3: Sethe, *Griechisch-römischen Zeit*, 183, 4–5. Translation by Simpson (*Demotic Grammar*, 265).

[15] Koenen, *Agonistische Inschrift*, 73.

Macedonian coming-of-age celebration) of Epiphanes was celebrated in Alexandria shortly before his Egyptian coronation ceremony in Memphis, Stadler proposes that the *ḥb n šsp nswy.t* in question may have been in Alexandria "denn … sind die Rebellen in Memphis geschlagen worden, als die Krönungsfeier stattgefunden hat."[16] This too may have been a possible interpretation based on the only passage he cites, but he does not take the passage translated above into consideration, where it is explicitly stated that priests came from everywhere in Egypt to Memphis in order to attend the *ḥb n šsp nswy.t*. Furthermore, Stadler's interpretation, the apparent implication being that the rebels were defeated in Memphis, while the coronation of Epiphanes took place in Alexandria, cannot be reconciled with his own argument that coronation and victory over rebels were closely interrelated:[17] the supposed simultaneity of the coronation ceremony with the defeat of the rebels would have had to have been an accident, given that, as Stadler himself points out, the former was an event which required time and planning to organise.[18] The rebels must therefore have already been captured, and merely executed at the coronation ceremony. Stadler's explanation hinges on his reading of "schlagen" (*ir-sḫy* in Demotic)[19] specifically as "to defeat," but an alternative interpretation is possible. Simpson's more neutral "to overcome" fits with the scenario of Epiphanes commanding that the rebels be punished with the death penalty, symbolically placing the king in his role of upholder of order. This interpretation, of capital punishment as opposed to victory in battle is supported by the text itself, for according to the sentence which directly follows the passage cited by Stadler: "(the gods let him overcome them at Memphis … which he did from his father,) and he had them slain on the wood (i.e. impaled)."[20] Based on this, it is clear that it is not the victory over the rebels that is stated to have taken place at the same time as the coronation ceremony, but the execution (as ordered by the king himself) of the rebels who had been captured and transported to Memphis after having already been

[16] Stadler, "Krönung", 69. *Contra* Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 124; Huß, *Ägypten*, 504; Thompson, *Memphis*, 110–11. Koenen, on the other hand, in agreement with Thompson, Huß, and Hölbl believes that the *anakleteria* took place in Alexandria and the coronation in Memphis, but that the latter took place first (*Agonistische Inschrift*, 73–5; cf. "Ptolemaic King", 75, 77, 80).

[17] Stadler, "Krönung", 68.

[18] *Ibid.*, 60 (based on: Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 37–8).

[19] Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar*, 451–2.

[20] Demotic version l. 23: Sethe, *Griechisch-römischen Zeit*, 183, 6. Translation: Simpson, *Demotic Grammar*, 265.

defeated, as Crawford had argued.[21] This better fits Stadler's own viewpoint that victory and coronation were intertwined. This being the case, it would certainly be strange that Epiphanes would have arranged it in such a way that the executions took place in Memphis, while he celebrated his coronation ceremony in Alexandria. The Greek version of the decree settles the matter of both events having taken place in Memphis: "Those who had led the rebels in the time of his father … when he (Epiphanes) came to Memphis, defending his father and his kingdom, all he punished fittingly at the time that he attended the celebration of the proper ceremonies for the assumption of the kingship."[22]

It is therefore certain that Ptolemy V Epiphanes celebrated a coronation ceremony and, given the temple of Ptah as the setting, along with the fact that he was crowned with the Egyptian Double Crown, it seems relatively certain that this ritual was not conducted in accordance with Greco-Macedonian tradition.

b. <u>*Ptolemy IX Soter II*</u>

Whether this king was crowned on the occasion of a coronation ceremony has also been called into question by Stadler, according to whom there are no sources for this.[23] There are actually two sources for his coronation however: a passage from the inscription on the outside face of the western external wall of Edfu temple,[24] and a stela discovered in the Serapeum, now in the Louvre.[25] The Edfu inscription mentions Soter II's coronation after his return from Cyprus while Ptolemy X Alexander I ruled Egypt itself: *Sꜣ Rᶜ Ptwrmys-ḏd(.w)-n=f-ỉrksntrs-ᶜnḫ(.w)-ḏ.t-mr(.y)-Ptḥ wᶜr(.w) r Pwnt sn=f wr šsp=f Bꜣḳ.t wḥm.n=f ḥᶜ m nsw.t* "The son of Ra, Ptolemy-to-whom-is-said-Alexander-living-forever-beloved-of-Ptah, fled to Punt, (while) his older brother, he received Egypt, and he repeated an appearance as king." As for the stela, it describes Soter II as having been crowned anew, for what would have been the second time (the first presumably having

[21] Crawford, "Ptolemy", 32–3. See Stadler, "Krönung", 69 no. 48.

[22] Greek version ll. 27–8: Sethe, *Griechisch-römischen Zeit*, 183, 1–6. Translation: Quirke and Andrews, *Rosetta Stone*, 19.

[23] Stadler, "Krönung", 70–1 no. 55.

[24] Chassinat, *Edfou* VII, 9, 7–8.

[25] Brugsch refers to both of these sources ("Apis-Kreis", 32–3; mentioned in: Thompson, *Memphis*, 116 no. 105; Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 191 no. 163 in p. 325). For the Demotic inscription of the stela, see: Brugsch, *Historisch-biographische Inschriften*, 871, 986.

taken place at the start of his first reign): *i.ir wḥm nsw nꜣ sḫn.w n ʾIs.t ḥnꜥ Wsir* "the one who repeated the king(ship), the crowns of Isis and Osiris."[26] Furthermore, if it is correct to assume that the mention of the "the crowns of Isis and Osiris" indicates that it was with this/these Egyptian crown(s) that Soter II was crowned, it seems likely that this coronation was conducted according to Egyptian rituals. The possibility, however, that this phrase is merely a figurative expression for kingship, with no reference to any real crowning cannot be excluded.

c. <u>*Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos*</u>

Based on the evidence from stela BM EA 886, this is the third Ptolemy most commonly described as having celebrated a coronation ceremony.[27] Whether this did take place however, is difficult to determine. According to Huß, Neos Dionysos was crowned with the Double Crown, but as Stadler correctly points out, this is not mentioned in the text.[28] The relevant passage is the following: *ink rdi wsḫ(.t) n.t nṯr(.t) ḥr tp n nsw m hrw smꜣ-tꜣ.wy ir n=f ir.w nb.w m ḥw.wt ḥb-Sd* "I am the one who placed the (broad) collar of the Uraeus on the head of the king on the day of the Unification of the Two Lands, and who did for him all the rituals in the houses of the *Sed*-festival."[29] The noun *wsḫ* "breiter Halskragen"[30] is written only with a collar-hieroglyph (number 16, 25 in Kurth's sign-list),[31] and the genitive *n.t*, written with the *nw*-bowl (Gardiner W 24) and uniliteral *t* (X 1), is under it.[32] Stadler, however, misreads the *nw*-bowl as the uniliteral *ḫ* (Aa 1) acting as a phonetic complement for *wsḫ*, and the *t* as the feminine ending *.t*.[33]

---

[26] Brugsch, *Thesaurus*, 986 (Inschrift no. 50b,5–6). I am thankful to Ann-Katrin Gill, whose knowledge of Demotic was invaluable in my ability to read this passage.

[27] Crawford, "Ptolemy", 39–40; Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 196, 258; Derchain, "Pique-nique", 1155–8. For literature on this stela, see: Hölbl, *Geschichte*, no. 137 in p. 336; Derchain, "Pique-nique", 1155 nos. 1–2; Stadler, "Krönung", 71 no. 57.

[28] Stadler, "Krönung", 71–3; *contra* Huß, *Ägypten*, 677.

[29] Stela BM EA 886, l. 8.

[30] Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 216; *Wb*. I, 365,16.

[31] Kurth, *Einführung* I, 377.

[32] It is attested, albeit rarely, for *n.t* to follow a masculine noun; see: Kurth, *Einführung* II, 674 no. 15 (§ 123).

[33] That the hieroglyph in question is the *nw*-bowl, expressing the phonetic value *n*, is clear from the photograph of the stela in: Walker and Higgs, *Cleopatra*, 185. Reymond's copy of the inscription also has the genitive written with the *nw*-bowl and the *t* (*Priestly Family*, 142). Derchain's transliteration of *wsḫ.t* indicates that he, like Stadler, also read *wsḫ* with phonetic complement *ḫ* and feminine *.t* instead of *wsḫ* followed by genitive *n.t* ("Pique-nique", 1157–58 a).

His resulting translation of "Ich war der, der den Wesech-Halskragen und die Göttliche (= Uräus) an das Haupt des Königs … gab," therefore does not work.[34] According to Derchain, in contrast: "C'est moi qui ai passé le collier à l'uraeus par-dessus la tête du roi le jour de l''Unification des deux terres' et qui ai accompli pour lui tous les rites dans les temples du jubilé."[35] While his translation is accurate, he does not provide a transliteration, so his precise reading is unclear.[36]

These differing translations have led both scholars to come to divergent interpretations. Stadler argues that although Neos Dionysos was indeed bestowed with a royal diadem, this did not occur on the occasion of a coronation ceremony, but a *Sed*-festival.[37] While it is true that the mention of Neos Dionysos being crowned does not necessarily mean that this happened on the occasion of his coronation ceremony, the mention of the events having taken place "in the houses of the *Sed*-festival" does not entail that it was during this other festival either.[38] It is clear from the text, however, that the high priest of Ptah, Psenptah III, did not bestow the king with a crown, but only the *wsḫ*-collar. In this, I agree with Derchain. He also argued, referring to the mention of the *smꜣ-tꜣ.wy* in the *Légende de la jeunesse* of Hatshepsut in the Middle Colonnade of her temple in Deir el-Bahari, that this ceremony was therefore also the coronation of Neos Dionysos.[39] Bergman was of the same opinion: he translated "Ich war es, der den Uräuskragen am Haupt des Königs anbrachte" and, despite the lack of the mention of a crown, saw the event being related in the text as a coronation ceremony.[40] This cannot be disproven, but this does make the assumption that "(the day of) the Unification of the Two Lands" is an unambiguous reference to a coronation ceremony.

Derchain, furthermore, described these events as a "récit détaillé du couronnement de Ptolémée XII Néos Dionysos"[41] and saw the *smꜣ-tꜣ.wy* as referring to

[34] Stadler, "Krönung", 72 (underlining not in original text).

[35] Derchain, "Pique-nique", 1157.

[36] His transliteration for the collar is *wsḫ.t* (*ibid.*, 1157–8 no. a), however.

[37] Stadler, "Krönung", 72.

[38] Cf. Bergman, who believed that the text tells of Ptolemy XII's coronation ceremony, and not his *Sed*-fesival, stating that "[b]ei der engen ideologischen und kultischen Berührung der Inthronisation under Sedfestfeier wäre das Entstehen einer solchen Sitte nicht unverständlich" (*Ich bin Isis*, 114).

[39] Derchain, "Pique-nique", 1158 no. b.

[40] Bergman, *Ich bin Isis*, 110–20.

[41] Derchain, "Pique-nique", 1155.

the "[r]ituel de l'intronisation."[42] This latter term, however, is an ambiguous one as, strictly speaking, it refers to the installation of a king on the throne, without specific reference to accession or coronation ceremony. If the usage of *intronisation* by Bonhême and Forgeau is any indication, however, then he would have seen this term as synonymous with *couronnement*.[43] While it is unclear here whether Derchain differentiated between "accession" and "coronation ceremony," this is a crucial distinction which has not always been made, as the literature review presented below demonstrates.

If the passage in question does indeed tell of the coronation ceremony of Neos Dionysos, then this term must be seen in the more liberal sense of being bestowed with a royal insignia rather than specifically a crown. This, combined with the mention of the Uraeus and the fact that the performer of the ritual is the high priest of Ptah, suggests that this could indeed be seen as an instance of a coronation ceremony according to Egyptian tradition that a Ptolemaic king underwent. Given that there are only two other known certain cases of Ptolemies being crowned, it is difficult to define what a "typical" coronation ceremony was like during this time. Regardless, however, the bestowal of Neos Dionysos with a collar rather than a crown is potentially a notable difference, especially considering the fact that the crescendo of each of the three 18th Dynasty coronation inscriptions consists of the king being bestowed with a crown(s), as will be seen over the course of this thesis. While it cannot be said with certainty that the events described in stela BM EA 886 do not consist of a coronation ceremony, in light of the arguments presented here, I propose an alternative interpretation.

These events are stated to have transpired "on the day of the Unification of the Two Lands," a symbolic event which would have theoretically taken place for the first time at the inception of the reign of a new king—his accession. In this light, it becomes possible to argue that the occasion was not necessarily a coronation ceremony, but perhaps a celebration of the kingship of Neos Dionysos on the occasion of the anniversary of his accession or coronation ceremony.

[42] *Ibid*., 1158 no. b.

[43] Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 245.

2. The Coronation Ceremonies of the Argead Dynasty and the Early Ptolemies

It is far more uncertain whether any of the rulers of the Egyptian Greco-Roman period before Epiphanes, including Alexander the Great, were crowned. Many scholars, including Burstein and Stadler, are skeptical, whereas according to Koenen, "there is little doubt that Alexander and subsequently all of the Ptolemies had been crowned."[44] The evidence for the coronation ceremonies of the first four Ptolemies, however, ranges from the indirect to the non-existent.[45] The goal of this discussion on the coronation ceremony, however, is not to verify its existence for the Argead Dynasty and the earliest Ptolemaic kings, but to simply show that there indeed was such an event at some point during Egyptian history that matches the definition of "coronation ceremony" given above. This was already done for Ptolemies V, IX, and XII above, but for the sake of completeness, I here present a short discussion on the likelihood that Alexander the Great was crowned Pharaoh.

Koenen's conclusion that Alexander the Great did indeed undergo an ancient Egyptian coronation ceremony is mostly based on calendrics; in addition to lying outside the scope of this thesis, his arguments are too detailed and complicated to cover here. In short, he calculates that the dates for the celebration of special occasions by Alexander and the first four Ptolemies were taken up by the later ones: Ptolemy II, for example, celebrated his *basileia* on the twelfth of the Macedonian month of Dystros, which was when Alexander, according to Koenen, had celebrated his own and been crowned in Memphis.[46] The notion that Alexander was crowned in Memphis is based on the following passage from the *Alexander Romance*:

> Then Alexander hastened with his army towards Egypt. When he reached Memphis, the Egyptians put him on the throne of Hephaestus (i.e. Ptah) as king of Egypt.[47]

The *Alexander Romance* by the Pseudo-Callisthenes, however, is the only source mentioning a coronation or enthronement ceremony in Memphis. Furthermore, it is a

---

[44] Koenen, "Ptolemaic King", 71 (cf. 60); cf. Quaegebeur, "Documents", 245 no. 41; Huß, *Makedonische König*, 51–2. *Contra* Burstein, "Pharaoh Alexander", 139–45.

[45] See: Stadler, "Krönung", 61–8.

[46] For more details, see: Koenen, *Agonistische Inschrift*, esp. 29–77; "Ptolemaic King", 71–81.

[47] 1.34: Stoneman, *Alexander Romance*, 68 (clarification of Hephaestus as Ptah in parentheses not in original). Bergman (*Ich bin Isis*, 92–4), Koenen ("Ptolemaic King", 60, no. 79), Huß (*Ägypten*, 58, no. 14; *Makedonische König*, 52) believe that Alexander underwent a coronation ceremony in Memphis.

decidedly unhistorical source in which Alexander is fathered not by Philip, but Nectanebo II, and meets the Amazons.[48] It has also been argued that Alexander's possession of a fivefold titulary implies his having undergone an ancient Egyptian coronation ceremony.[49] Burstein, however, points out that both Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV had formal titularies, even though neither were ever crowned as Pharaoh.[50] He therefore argues that a "titulary, therefore, is evidence not of the coronation of a ruler of Egypt but of the acceptance of his rule by the priests."[51] Burstein also shows that Alexander had multiple Horus Names, and that his *nomen* was used where his *praenomen* would be expected. This latter, furthermore, occurred only early in the reign of Alexander, before his titulary achieved its eventual form, but only after Alexander had left Egypt. It is therefore highly unlikely that he was crowned Pharaoh in a coronation ceremony in Memphis.[52]

---

[48] Nectanebo: Ps.-Callis. 1.1–12 (Stoneman, *Alexander Romance*, 35–44); the Amazons: Ps.-Callis. 3.25–6 (*ibid.*, 143–5). Another indicator of the unreliability of this source is its alleged author: fifteenth century manuscripts attribute it to Callisthenes, Alexander's court historian, who was disgraced and executed before the latter had even completed his campaign in Asia, and can therefore not be credited with complete authorship of the *Alexander Romance* (*ibid.*, 8). The term "historical" should be applied with caution to the other sources for the life of Alexander, however: Diodorus Siculus, in his *Historical Library* (D.S. 17.49), Plutarch, in his *Life of Alexander* (Plu. *Alex.*, 27), and Arrian, in the *Anabasis of Alexander* (Arr., *An.*, 3.3), all mention how Alexander and his army, when they got lost in the desert on their way to Siwa, were guided by the cawing of crows/ravens.

[49] Huß, for example, states that Alexander received his titulary at his coronation in Memphis (*Ägypten*, 58).

[50] Burstein, "Pharaoh Alexander", 140. The same may be said of Cambyses II and Darius I of the Persian 27th Dynasty as well, both of whom had full titularies (Leprohon, *Great Name*, 167–8), but did not undergo any Egyptian coronation ceremony.

[51] Burstein, "Pharaoh Alexander", 141; cf. Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 13. Philip Arrhidaeus, for example, was in Egypt only during the ill-fated campaign of Perdiccas in Egypt in 320 BCE (Stadler, "Krönung", 62), while Alexander IV never went to Egypt, as he and his mother Roxane were Cassander's hostages in Amphipolis (Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 18). Other cited examples of rulers who did not undergo an Egyptian coronation ceremony are the Roman emperors and, more controversially, the first four Ptolemies.

[52] Burstein, "Pharaoh Alexander", 141–4. He cited a source from regnal year 1 of Alexander in which his *nomen* is used following the title *nsw.t-bìty*, where his *praenomen* would have been expected, as evidence of his full titulary not having been developed yet. Bosch-Puche, however, argues against this, pointing out that this was deliberate. Furthermore, while this source does mention year 1 of Alexander, it actually dates to year 4 of Philip Arrhidaeus, at a time when the former's titulary had already been fully developed (other examples of the use of the *nomen* in place of the *praenomen*, and vice-versa, are attested as well: "Titulary of Alexander" I, 151–2). This, however, does not affect Burstein's overall argument that Alexander most likely received his titulary not at a coronation ceremony in Memphis, but after he had already left Egypt (Bosch-Puche, "Titulary of Alexander" II, 101).

Thompson and Hölbl do not believe this was the case either, but point to a passage from Arrian's *Anabasis*, widely considered the most reliable source on the life of Alexander the Great:

> Thence he (Alexander) crossed the river and went to Memphis, where he sacrificed to the gods, especially Apis, and held athletic and musical games.[53]

Both believe that Alexander's presentation of offerings to Apis was tantamount to his having become Pharaoh. According to Thompson: "Arrian, unlike the later *Alexander Romance*, makes no mention of an actual enthronement ceremony here in the temple of Ptah, but it is clear that in Memphis, sacrificing to the Apis bull in its native form, Alexander was claiming acceptance as pharaoh among the Egyptians, whom he now ruled."[54] It is concluded in this thesis that, while, based on the three examined inscriptions at least, in the 18th Dynasty, there was no event equivalent to the standard definition of the term "coronation ceremony" presented above, the close Egyptian equivalent appears to have been the new king's first "appearance" in public as Pharaoh, performing the cultic duties expected of his/her office—a view coinciding with Thompson and Hölbl's on the alleged "coronation" of Alexander in Memphis.

Notwithstanding the uncertainty as to whether Alexander or the Ptolemies before Epiphanes were crowned, much is known about the coronation ceremony during the Ptolemaic Period, and in far greater detail than in Egyptian dynastic times. The Ptolemaic rulers, being non-Egyptian, saw the importance of adhering to what the ancient Egyptians expected from Pharaoh, and certainly did everything in their power to secure the loyalty of Egyptian temples and their priesthoods. These were certainly one of the channels through which the Ptolemies could legitimise their rule: it was there that they were depicted as Egyptian kings, and it was also there that many of their decrees (e.g. the "Rosetta Stone") were displayed. It is certainly telling that the first Ptolemy whom we know for certain to have been crowned, and the details of whose coronation are well known, was Ptolemy V Epiphanes, during whose reign not only the Thebans were in revolt, but other cities as well.[55] That Ptolemy V made public knowledge, and mentioned explicit details, of his coronation as Egyptian king in

---

[53] Arr., *An.*, 3.1 (translation from: Brunt, *Arrian*, 223).

[54] Thompson, *Memphis*, 99. Hölbl is of the same opinion (*Geschichte*, 9); cf. Huß, *Ägypten*, 59.

[55] See: Hölbl, *Geschichte*, 135–40.

Memphis through the legitimising power of the Memphite priesthood does not therefore seem to be a coincidence; Epiphanes, more than ever thus far in the Ptolemaic Period, needed the legitimising power of the temples, and this may have been the reason for the performance of the coronation in the presence of the priests who had come from many other Egyptian temples for the occasion.[56]

Perhaps it is also for this very same reason, legitimisation, that we have any sources at all which deal with the coronation ceremony from the Dynastic Period: looking at the rulers who have recorded their "coronation ceremonies," one would find that these were all rulers who needed to legitimise their rule.[57] From the New Kingdom, Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and Horemheb, whose coronation inscriptions form the subject of this thesis, come to mind. In an attempt to shed light on the "coronation ceremony" in the New Kingdom's 18th Dynasty, the relevant sections from each of these inscriptions are transliterated, translated, and discussed in order to determine whether they relate their respective kings' accession, coronation ceremony, or perhaps even simply their crowning on the occasion of a given religious festival.

II. Literature review

The first to attempt a comprehensive reconstruction of the coronation ceremony was Alexandre Moret.[58] He did this using both pictorial and textual sources, the former consisting of what is called the "coronation sequence" in this thesis, discussed in detail below. A wide range of textual sources were used: (1) Hatshepsut's coronation scenes and inscriptions from the Middle Colonnade in Deir el-Bahari (the so-called *Légende de la jeunesse*) carved on the wall of the northern half of the Middle Colonnade of her temple at Deir el-Bahari;[59] (2) Horemheb's coronation inscription carved on the back of a group statue of this king with his wife Mutnedjmet currently in the Turin Museum

[56] Stadler sees the recording of a coronation inscription by Epiphanes and an account of what could tentatively be described as such by Ptolemy III Euergetes (the Canopus Decree, ll. 3–4: Sethe, *Griechisch-römischen Zeit*, 127, 1–4) as evidence for political difficulties. According to him, that each stressed the fact of having received his kingship from his father (instead of underlining divine descent, as would have been the norm earlier in Egyptian history) is especially significant in this regard ("Krönung", 67, 69).

[57] Redford, *History*, 21; cf. Stadler, "Krönung", 89, 91.

[58] Moret, *Caractère*, 75 f. (chapter III).

[59] *Deir el Bahari* III, pls. 56–64; *PM* II, 347–8 (16–21); *Urk.* IV, 241,10–265,5. Similar scenes were also carved by Amenhotep III in Luxor Temple: Gayet, *Louxor*, pls. 72–5; *PM* II, 327 (154).

(Cat. 1379);[60] (3) Ramses II's Great Dedicatory Inscription carved on the south section of the west wall in the Second Court of Sety I's temple at Abydos;[61] and (4) another text by Ramesses II, the Ptah-Tatenen Decree.[62] There are four known copies of this last text dated to his reign: (1) a stela between the two westernmost pillars of the south row in the main hall of the Abu Simbel Great Temple;[63] (2) on the southern face, at the western end of the west wing of the 9th Pylon in Karnak;[64] (3) on the east side of a niche in the south wall of the court before the temple at 'Amara West;[65] and (4) on the face of the south wing of the pylon of the temple at Aksha/Serra West.[66] A copy from the reign of Ramesses III is also known, carved on the east face of the south wing of the 1st Pylon of his temple in Medinet Habu.[67]

Moret used the Hatshepsut sources the most frequently to reconstruct the different phases of the "rituel d'intronisation," bringing in others for support, or in cases where the Hatshepsut sources are lacking. This, however, ignores the differences between the "coronation ceremonies" of different kings despite the chronological gaps separating them. He divided the "rituel d'intronisation" into several episodes, primarily purification and presentation of the royal candidate to the gods and the people of the court by the reigning king or principal god, announcement of the titulary, crowning, and presentation of offerings.[68] The crowning-episode would have included the king's "royal introduction" (*bs-nswt*) into the presence of the principal god inside the temple sanctuary, who would have proceeded to embrace him.[69] Moret also mentioned other rituals apparently connected with the coronation rites, such as a goddess' breast-feeding of the king, and the ritual of shooting four arrows in the four cardinal directions.[70]

---

[60] *Urk.* IV, 2113,7–2120,17; Gardiner, "Coronation", 13–31. There also exists another, fragmentary, copy of this text, carved on a quartzite stela discovered near the temple of Ptah at Memphis: *Urk.* IV, 2121,5–2124,8; Gardiner, "Coronation", 28–31.

[61] *PM* VI, 3 (34–7); *KRI* II, 323–36; plates: Mariette, *Abydos* I, pls. 5–9, pp. 11–13 (no. 4).

[62] *KRI* II, 258–81.

[63] *PM* VII, 106, between pillars III and IV (see map on p. 96).

[64] *PM* II, 181 (541), plan 15.

[65] *PM* VII, 159 (2).

[66] Vercoutter, "Aksha 1961", 109–12, pl. 35 a–b.

[67] *PM* II, 489 (47), plan 47; *MH* II, pls. 104–06.

[68] Moret, *Caractère*, 76–113.

[69] *Ibid.*, 99–101.

[70] *Ibid.*, 104–8.

Aspects of this interpretation have been echoed in later research, especially regarding the coronation sequence.

Taking Hatshepsut's account of her own coronation inscription at face value, Moret argued that Thutmose I was present for the "coronation ceremony" of Hatshepsut.[71] It is now known that this text, carved years after the death of Thutmose I, is fictitious,[72] if not merely due to dates mentioned on another monument by Hatshepsut which exclude the coronation date of I *ꜣḫ.t* 1 mentioned in this inscription.[73]

In Sir Alan Gardiner's review of Sir J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough*[74] is stated for the first time the theory that the first day of each season of the Egyptian calendar was considered favourable for the accession,[75] such as New Year's Day or the Khoiak festival (followed by the first day of the *Nḫb-kꜣ.w*).[76] In a later study on methods used for reckoning kings' reigns,[77] he argued that in the 18th Dynasty, this was done by "reckoning each regnal year from accession day to accession day, no attempt being made to bring regnal and civil year into harmony with one another."[78] The first to distinguish between accession (*Antritt der Herrschaft*) and coronation ceremony (*Krönung*)[79] was Ludwig Borchardt, according to whom the former would have occurred at the death of the king's predecessor, while the latter would have occurred after the 70-day mourning period. He was also the first to astutely observe that these two events could also have occurred simultaneously, namely, in the case of coregencies.[80] The distinction between accession and coronation ceremony, as well as the selection of auspicious dates on which to celebrate the latter, have since been taken

[71] *Ibid.*, 78–81.

[72] Derchain-Urtel, *LÄ* VI, s.v. "Thronbesteigung", 530.

[73] Schott, *Krönungstag*, 203–5. The key passage from the inscription in question is carved on the north side of the base of Hatshepsut's standing northern obelisk in the *wadjyt* in Karnak (*Urk.* IV, 367,3–5).

[74] Gardiner, "Notices", 121–6; Frazer, *Golden Bough*.

[75] Note the term "accession" instead of "coronation;" the distinction between the two had not been made yet.

[76] Gardiner, "Notices", 122–5.

[77] Gardiner, "Regnal Years", 11 ff.

[78] *Ibid.*, 23.

[79] Borchardt, *Mittel*, 68–9.

[80] *Ibid.*, 69.

up by Gardiner[81] (who also discussed the word *ḫʿw*, arguing that it can be understood as referring to any formal appearance of the king, including his accession),[82] Frankfort,[83] and Fairman[84] (the latter two, like Moret, used sources from different periods to reconstruct the "coronation ceremony"), who noted that "it is not known to what extent he [the new king] was entitled, at this stage, to carry or wear the usual crowns and insignia," a question discussed later by Redford.[85]

Leclant studied scenes which depict the suckling of the king by a goddess, concluding that they all narrowly associate the themes of suckling, coronation and domination.[86] This crucial observation, the article's most lasting contribution, is confirmed throughout this thesis, along with the notion that the coronation was also to be seen as a birth (and hence the link with breast-feeding) into "une vie nouvelle, celle de souverain," a "nouveau cycle d'existence."[87] Leclant had, in an earlier publication, listed what he called the "suite des épisodes du couronnement" based on the reliefs carved on the "entrecolonnements" of the "colonnade éthiopienne,"[88] and repeated them here.[89] This series of scenes which appears quite commonly among reliefs carved in temples, in different variations,[90] is called the "coronation sequence" in this thesis; its constituents are referred to as "episodes." The most common, exemplified by the "sequence" on the south external wall of the granite shrine of Philip Arrhidaeus, are (1) purification, (2) imposition of the crowns, (3) royal induction (*bs-nsw.t*), and (4) final confirmation of kingship by Amun, termed the "culmination" scene in this thesis (fig.

[81] Gardiner, "Regnal Years", 11 ff.

[82] *Ibid.*, 24.

[83] Frankfort, *Kingship*, 101 f. (Book I: Egypt, Part III: the Passing of Kingship), esp. 102–4.

[84] *Ibid.*, 74–104, esp. 78.

[85] *Ibid.*, 78. Cf. Redford, *History*, 19.

[86] Leclant, "Suckling", 135 ff., esp. 140 f.

[87] *Ibid.*, 136–7 f. The king would have undergone two other births, the first in the sense of being born in the literal sense, the second into his new life as king, and the third his (re)birth into the afterlife.

[88] Leclant, "Colonnade", 113 ff., esp. 123 f.

[89] Leclant, "Suckling", 137–8; cf. "Purification", 48.

[90] Cf. Leclant, "Suckling", 137.

1).[91] This last scene includes a depiction of the suckling of the king by Amunet, which Leclant saw as "l'équivalent exact de l'intronisation conférée par le dieu Amon."[92]

Regarding this final step, *intronisation*, Leclant notes that "le roi est agenouillé en avant du dieu Amon qui pose ses mains sur la couronne" while, later, Bell distinguished between two different instances in which the king would have been crowned by Amun (during the Opet festival), kneeling in front of him in each, but turned away from the god the first time, and facing him the second.[93]

Both Fairman and Leclant, primarily bearing the coronation sequences in mind, commented on how there is no textual or pictorial source which relates all the rituals involved in the "coronation ceremony:" "nous avons certaines séquences partielles, mais les détails varient et considérablement."[94] Crucially, Leclant also remarked that these scenes do not always represent the "coronation ceremony," but "se rapportent à des fêtes jubilaires ou à des scènes d'apparition royale," and that "[p]lus encore que les cérémonies effectivement exécutées, ce sont d'ailleurs sans doute des allusions symboliques qui évoquent des thèmes en rapport avec le couronnement."[95] This is the main reason why coronation sequences are not discussed independently in this thesis, for the analysis of each would have necessitated the examination of their ritual contexts in various festivals which, in some cases, such as the one on the sanctuary of Philip Arrhidaeus, are not mentioned at all. Indeed, an examination of the "coronation ceremony," centred on the pictorial, rather than strictly textual, evidence, is deserving of its own study. In this thesis, similarities between coronation inscriptions and sequences are cautiously referred to when relevant, but the same conclusion is reached that not every sequence depicts a coronation ceremony.

By this point in time, the very existence of a coronation ceremony as a separate event than that of the accession to the throne was put in doubt: according to Hornung, there is "kein sicheres oder wahrscheinliches Beispiel einer 'Krönung,' die von der

[91] E.g. *PM* II, 100 (290 I 1–4). Kees discusses the coronation sequence ("Kapelle", 197).

[92] Leclant, "Suckling", 138–9.

[93] *Ibid.*, 138; Bell, "Divine", 173–4.

[94] Leclant, "Suckling", 137; cf. Fairman, "Kingship", 78.

[95] Leclant, "Purification", 48; cf. "Suckling", 138.

Thronbesteigung nach dem Tod des Vorgängers oder von der Erhebung zum Mitregenten verschieden wäre."[96]

In his discussion on *ḫꜥi*, Redford compiles and categorises attestations of the term, and attempts to determine whether the Egyptians themselves felt and expressed a difference between the two senses of the word *ḫꜥi* as meaning "accession" or "coronation."[97] Used of the sun or any celestial body, the basic meaning of the term is "to appear in glory, to arise" and, "[s]ince the king was also a god, closely related mythologically to the sun, he too could 'appear in glory' on certain festive occasions."[98]

He concluded that often the meaning of *ḫꜥi* is ambiguous, and that it "could, in a given example, conceivably refer either to accession or to coronation."[99] Other examples seem to refer to the *Sed*-festival, and even others seems to be synonymous with "reign."[100] Similarities between the "coronation ceremony" and the *Sed*-festival were noted by Redford, as well as Gardiner and Leclant, the last of whom stated that "les fêtes jubilaires répètent les couronnement avec des épisodes à ce point semblables qu'il est le plus souvent presque impossible de distinguer entre couronnement et fête Sed."[101] It is interesting to note, as seen later in this thesis that, in several sequences, among the aims of the depicted rituals, is the promise of the performance, as king, of numerous *Sed*-festivals. In an episode of a sequence in the Great Hypostyle Hall in Karnak, for example, Horus and Seth are depicted purifying Sety I; Seth's caption reads: "(I) purify you with life and power so that you may become young like yo[ur] father Ra and so that you may accomplish (*ir*) *Sed*-festivals like Atum, you having appeared (*ḫꜥ*) as ruler of joy"[102] (fig. 2). The culmination scene depicts Amun, Hathor behind him, touching the kneeling king's crown, while Thoth inscribes on a *rnp.t*-

[96] Hornung, *Untersuchungen*, 5; cf. Helck, *LÄ* V, s.v. "Rituale", 279.

[97] Redford, *History*, 4.

[98] *Ibid.*, 4–5.

[99] *Ibid.*, 8.

[100] *Ibid.*, 12–13.

[101] Leclant, "Suckling", 138; cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", 23; Redford, *History*, 12. It is also interesting to note that it has been argued that dates on which the coronation ceremony could be celebrated were appropriate for the *Sed*-festival as well (Fairman, "Kingship", 78; Gardiner, "Coronation", 23; Frankfort, *Kingship*, 79).

[102] *PM* II, 44 (151) II, 7; Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 148 col. 4.

hieroglyph the Horus and *praenomen* of Sety I, who is described as "given life and a million, a hundred thousand *Sed*-festivals" (fig. 4).[103]

Redford's examination of *ḥꜥi* made several important contributions to the study of the "coronation ceremony." Redford concludes, through attestations of the terms *ḥꜥi-nsw.t* and *ḥb n ḥꜥw* that, in the New Kingdom, they "designate the accession day or its anniversary."[104] He also convincingly addresses the question of whether the heir apparent really appeared as king after acceding to the throne immediately at the death of his predecessor, or whether he did not "fully warrant the title *nsw*[*t*]-*bit* and others, until he had undergone at a later date a coronation." It would have been the accession, not the coronation ceremony, which would have made a king, otherwise the existence of those who ruled for only a short period of time would be "inexplicable:"[105]

> [T]he 'appearance' of a king refers to a single indivisible occurrence, viz. his entry into the kingship on his accession day, at which time ideally he was to be outfitted with the crowns.
>
> One is permitted to wonder whether the ideal did not work out in practice more often than scholars have thought. The presupposition that … the Hatshepsut reliefs, and the Haremhab coronation inscription reflect the normal round of ceremonies at every king's accession has coloured many recent scholarly investigations … Each of the monarchs in question came to the throne under far from normal circumstances, and it is not unlikely that rare rituals were resurrected or new ones instituted for them.[106]

Hatshepsut was a usurper, and Horemheb was "the first 'orthodox' monarch after the Amarna heresy."[107] In contrast to the picture which has emerged based on the discussion on the subject thus far, therefore, Redford does believe that coronation ceremonies could have been held in the Dynastic Period, but that they were exceptional (such as those of Hatshepsut and Horemheb), rather than evidence representative of what would have been a common practice:

> Undoubtedly, if the heir was present in the palace at the time of the death of the predecessor (which situation must have obtained), he would have sat upon the throne and undergone a formal coronation at once … Actually, then, it may be misleading to speak of accession and coronation s taking place always on two

[103] *PM* II, 44 (151) II, 9; Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150 col. 5.

[104] Redford, *History*, 22–7.

[105] *Ibid.*, 19.

[106] *Ibid.*, 20–1.

[107] *Ibid.*, 21.

> different days. Under abnormal circumstances this may have been the case, but surely not always.[108]

This thesis, too, reaches the conclusion that coronation ceremonies were not a standard event that every ruler would have ideally undergone; however, it is also concluded that both Hatshepsut's and Horemheb's coronation inscriptions describe their respective accession to the throne, their actual transformation into Pharaoh—and not a delayed (exceptional) event following this one on the occasion of which they would have worn the royal crowns for the first time. This does not preclude the following belief stated by Redford, but neither is it supported by the admittedly small amount of evidence—three texts from one specific time period—examined in this thesis: "Undoubtedly the accession was followed months later by an elaborate rite dramatizing the myth of the kingship but there is no evidence to connect such a celebration with the *ḫʿy-nsw*, 'the appearance of the king.'"[109]

Following the trend to call into question the very existence of a coronation ceremony, there was a return to the theory that this was in fact a regular event celebrated by most kings. This is the point of view held by Barta in his 1980 article in which he attempts to determine the dates on which various kings celebrated their coronation ceremonies.[110] He too sees *ḫʿi* as able to express a king's accession (at the death of the predecessor), coronation (for which time would have been needed to prepare), or any public appearance.[111]

One of Barta's article's axial assumptions, and most lasting contributions, is the following: "Außerdem wird die Krönung des neuen Herrschers wohl stets erst nach dem Begräbnis seines Vorgängers angesetzt worden sein und damit im dogmatischen Sinne das Interregnum beendet haben, d. h. Bestattung und Krönung waren beim Regierungswechsel ebenso ursächlich miteinander verbunden wie es zuvor Tod und Thronbesteigung gewesen sind."[112] Just as the coronation ceremony of the new king would have required time for preparation, so would have the deceased king's burial,

---

[108] *Ibid.*, 22.

[109] *Loc. cit.*

[110] Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 33–53.

[111] *Ibid.*, 34.

[112] *Ibid.*, 37, cf. 50–1. The association of accession with the death of the predecessor, and the coronation with his burial, as *Ereignispaare*, can be traced back to Frankfort (*Kingship*, 104) and Borchardt (*Mittel*, 69).

one of the main reasons being the seventy-day mummification process. As opposed to the date of the accession then, that of the coronation ceremony could be predetermined, for which a festival day would have been selected.[113] Barta, like Redford, notes that, in the case of coregencies, the accession proper (to sole rule) would have come after the coronation, that is, the occasion on which he was raised to the status of coregent.[114] One of the problems with Barta's article is the ambiguity of the term *Krönung*, used interchangeably with *Krönungsfeierlichkeiten*. This latter is more specific, but the former can ambiguously refer to the ceremony or the act of crowning itself, the result being that it is unclear whether he thinks kings could wear crowns during the interval between accession and coronation ceremony.[115] In a later article, Barta states that "unbestritten ist die Tatsache, daß die ägyptischen Könige gekrönt worden sind, also beim Herrschaftsantritt Kronen empfangen haben."[116] Regardless of what Barta himself meant, his article has influenced more recent Egyptological literature: "while accession days (and thus regnal years) during the New Kingdom invariably coincided with the day after the death of the previous king, kingly regalia was not immediately bestowed."[117]

Barta's other main argument is that "coronation ceremonies" during the New Kingdom were celebrated on the second days of lunar-calendar months, calculating those of five kings.[118] Relevant to this thesis is his discussion on the accession date of Thutmose I, who sent a decree to the King's Son of Kush Turi containing the much-discussed date of III *pr.t* 21 to let him know that he has "appeared as King of Upper and Lower Egypt," and to inform him of his titulary so that offerings and oaths could be

[113] Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 37–8.

[114] *Ibid.*, 35, 38–9; cf. Redford, *History*, 18.

[115] In British monarchy, for example, it is customary to be crowned with St. Edward's Crown only at the coronation ceremony after the accession. The coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, for example, whose accession was on 6 February 1952, took place on 2 June 1953. British and ancient Egyptian events relating to royal succession bear striking similarities, such as the accession taking place in a palace (public proclamation by an Accession Council in St. James' Palace) and the equivalents of "coronations" in religious buildings (Westminster Abbey), the rituals involving anointing and bestowal with regalia, and the subsequent travels made by the new monarch.

[116] Barta, "Rituale", 6.

[117] Dorman, "Early Reign", 56 no. 120 in p. 68. Cf. Derchain-Urtel, *LÄ* VI, s.v. "Thronbesteigung", 529; Schade-Busch, *Königsideologie*, 42–3; Beylage, *Stelentexte* I, 687 no. 2500; Shaw, *Pharaoh*, 63–4.

[118] Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 39 f.: Amenhotep I (*ibid.*, 43–5), Thutmose I (*ibid.*, 46–7), Amenhotep II (*ibid.*, 39), Akhenaten (*ibid.*, 41–3), and Ramses II (*ibid.*, 40). Cf. Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 248.

made in his name.[119] Clearly, the titulary was essential for both ritual and administrative purposes, for which reason the view held in this thesis, in agreement with most Egyptologists, is that the date in the decree must be Thutmose I's accession date.[120] Barta, among others,[121] in contrast argues that the date in question is that of his coronation ceremony.[122] It would certainly seem strange that kings would have waited until their coronation ceremonies to promulgate their titularies, necessary for the proper conduction of rituals, the appointing of officials, and diplomacy, especially considering the time which would have been required for such despatches to reach distant destinations like Nubia. Additionally, such more straightforward considerations aside, Barta's own arguments for III *pr.t* 21 as the coronation date, based on his own arguments for the death and burial of Amenhotep I, are debatable: (1) he argues that III *pr.t* 19 was the day of this king's burial which, based on his theory, would therefore have taken place at around the same time as Thutmose I's coronation (the existence of such a ceremony in itself already being debatable). (2) The evidence he uses, furthermore, such as Manetho, is controversial, otherwise largely consisting of ostraca from Deir el-Medina (and therefore unofficial sources of uncertain date). The interpretation of the written evidence further complicates matters; to illustrate with an example: Papyrus Turin 1961+2006, col. 2, l. 5, mentions the *sš* "spreading" of Amenhotep I's *ḥnky.t* "bed" on III *pr.t* 15, the latter term therefore translated as "Balsamierungsbett" by Barta,[123] but interpreted as his deathbed by Helck, Redford, and Gardiner, this last also tentatively suggesting that this commemorates the king's wedding.[124] (3) As calculated by Barta, III *pr.t* 21 as the date of the coronation ceremony of Thutmose I on the 22nd of March in 1504 BCE would have fallen on the second day of a lunar-calendar month.[125] Other, more recent, publications on

[119] *Urk.* IV, 79–81. The text occurs twice: on a fragmentary stela acquired in Kubban, now in the *Ägyptisches Museum Berlin*, and on a better preserved one, apparently from Wadi Halfa, now in the Egyptian Museum. More recently, Klug ascribed a fragment of a stela's lunette discovered in Buhen to the latter ("Neues Fragment", 124–8).

[120] Redford, *History*, 52; von Beckerath, *LÄ* III, s.v. "Königsnamen", 540; Schunck, *Wortstamm*, 66–7; Klug, "Neues Fragment", 124; Hornung, "New Kingdom", 199–200.

[121] Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 312–14 (cf. 248); Leprohon, *Great Name*, 10–12.

[122] Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 46–7, 52.

[123] *Ibid.*, 46.

[124] Gardiner, "Regnal Years", 25; Redford, "Chronology", 115; Helck, "Chronologie", 71. For papyrus: Rossi and Pleyte, *Papyrus de Turin*, p. 134 in text-volume (pl. 98, col. 2, l. 5).

[125] Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 46.

chronology however, propose different dates which, if correct and demonstrated not to have coincided with the second day of a lunar-calendar month, would refute Barta's suggestion that the celebration of coronation ceremonies on these days would have been the norm.[126]

In a more recent 1985 article, Barta, in keeping with the notion that not only did a "coronation ceremony" actually exist, but that it was also a regular event, attempts to fully reconstruct it by compiling a familiar list of twenty-two rituals.[127] Like Moret, Frankfort, and Fairman, he relies mostly on the Hatshepsut evidence from the Middle Colonnade, using other sources to complete the list of rituals where Hatshepsut's fail, including coronation sequences.[128] Arguing that Thutmose III, for his coronation inscription, at least partly copied a text by Senusret I, and that Hatshepsut's Middle Colonnade inscription agrees *verbatim* with a very fragmentary account of Amenemhat III's promotion to kingship as Senusret III's coregent,[129] he concludes that "wird das für das Neue Reich zu postulierende Krönungsritual in gleicher oder doch sehr ähnlicher Form bereits im Mittleren Reich existiert haben."[130] The fragments of this Middle Kingdom text were recently studied by Müller, however, who demonstrated that while some passages are identical (minor pronoun changes notwithstanding), the overall texts are different enough that it cannot be said that Hatshepsut's was a direct copy, or even an elaboration thereof, but also that "immerhin ist genügend gleich lautender Text erhalten, so dass ein Zusammenhang nicht ganz von der Hand zu weisen ist."[131] There is furthermore no reason to necessarily assume that Thutmose III had copied, even partially, a coronation inscription by Senusret I, given that only a part of

[126] E.g. Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, *Chronology*, 492.

[127] Barta, "Rituale", 6–13. This article, as well as the other one by Barta discussed above, influence current views on the Egyptian coronation ceremony in that such an event certainly existed, as well as in terms of the rituals which would have constituted it (e.g. Shaw, *Pharaoh*, 63–9).

[128] Middle Colonnade: *supra*, no. 59. Among others, he refers to: the *Historical Inscription* (Helck, *Hist.-Biog. Texte*, 7–33; Lacau and Chevrier, C*hapelle*, 92–153; Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 15–28); Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse* (*Urk.* IV, 156,8–162,8); Horemheb's Turin inscription (*supra*, no. 60); coronation sequences (e.g. figs. 2–4 of this thesis: *PM* II*,* 44 (152) II, 7–9; Murnane and Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 148–50; *LD* III, 124 d).

[129] *Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin* I, 138, 268 (15801–15804).

[130] Barta, "Rituale", 7; cf. "Thronbesteigung", 39; *Records* I, 222 no. c (§ 462); Breasted, *Records* II, 95 (§ 233); Schott, *Krönungstag*, 201.

[131] Müller, "Umgang", 187–97 (esp. 193–7; quote: 196); Wegner, "Nature and Chronology", 270–1, no. 84.

its first line survives, and it consists of a variant of a well-attested introductory caption-sentence for so-called *Königsnovelle*s, including sitting (*ḥms.t*) in the audience-hall (*ḏꜣdw*) and summoning (*sṯꜣ.t*) of court officials.[132]

In 1985, Schunck published a detailed discussion on the word *ḫꜥi*, discussing all aspects of the word from the hieroglyph itself to its meaning and usage in various contexts; pertinent to this thesis are the accession (*Thronbesteigung*) and coronation (*Krönung*) sections.[133] Like others before her, she also assumes that these were two different events, the former being a private matter of the palace, while the latter a public event which the people would have witnessed.[134] It is wondered whether the modern distinction between accession and coronation, based on the theory proposed by Borchardt, can truly be applied to ancient Egypt: in practice, the accession could have been a ceremony abbreviated to its essentials, after which preparations could be made for the funeral of the deceased king and the "Fest der Epiphanie" of the new. These, in turn, could have been celebrated in conjunction with a festival of renewal of nature, as previously postulated by other scholars. Noteworthy is the emphasis on the "Epiphanie" (*ḫꜥ*) rather than the crowning of the new king.[135]

The framework of Bonhême and Forgeau's (1988) study of the coronation ceremony exemplifies, and is based on, the ideas of most of the others who have discussed the topic: like Barta, she distinguishes between accession (*avènement*) at the death of the predecessor, and a later coronation (*sacre*/*couronnement*/*intronisation*), arguing that there indeed was such a thing as a coronation ceremony as a standard event and set of rituals, stating that this would have taken place seventy days after the burial of the predecessor, by which time preparations could have been made for the ceremony.[136] She also states that throughout ancient Egyptian history, the ideal date for the coronation ceremony was New Year's Day, the standard in the Middle Kingdom, while new moon days, as well as days marking a change in the natural cycle, were the

[132] E.g. Hatshepsut's Punt Inscription: *Urk.* IV, 349,10–14 (see also: Hermann, *Königsnovelle*, 10; Shirun-Grumach, *Offenbarung*, 101–17; Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 170–7).

[133] Schunck, *Wortstamm*, 64–90.

[134] *Ibid.*, 65. Cf. Redford, *History*, 22.

[135] Schunck, *Wortstamm*, 78, cf. the discussion on Nekhtnebef's Naucratis Stela in p. 83. Borchardt, *Mittel*, 68–9.

[136] Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 247–8.

norm for the New Kingdom.[137] As with Leclant, she also stresses the themes of *passage* and *triomphe*.[138]

Using coronation sequences and previously-discussed coronation texts (including the *Texte de la jeunesse* and *Historical Inscription*), a familiar list of eight rituals is provided which would have, generally speaking, constituted the "coronation ceremony," including purification, crowning, *montée royale* or (*bs-nsw.t* "royal induction"), installation on the throne, and announcement of the titulary.[139] One hitherto unused primary source she uses is the *Brooklyn Papyrus* "conservant le livret liturgique des cérémonies d'intronisation," using it to flesh out the eight overall steps of the ceremony.[140] The publisher of this papyrus, Goyon, described it as an "aide-mémoire du cérémoniaire pour les cérémonies anniversaires d'accession au trône" celebrated on New Year's Day, and dated it to the late 5th to early 4th centuries BCE.[141] Due to the fact that it relates a ritual which is similar, but not identical, to a coronation ceremony *per se*, as well as due to its late date, this papyrus is not covered in this thesis.

Due to several factors, such as the fact that the primary sources, omitting various hymns and recitations, describe only the most essential moments of the "coronation ceremony," and "qui ne correspondent pas nécéssairement à une cérémonie réelle," it is correctly stated that any reconstruction is therefore hypothetical.[142] Regarding the sequences, "les représentations du cérémonial qui entourait l'entrée du roi dans le temple," she adds however that it is unclear whether they "correspondaient à un *sacre effectif* ou s'il s'agissait soit d'une *allusion symbolique*, survenant lors d'une visite cultuelle du roi au temple et s'accomplissant en vue de réactualiser la puissance acquise lors su sacre … soit encore d'une *cérémonie d'anniversaire*."[143] Similarities between the coronation (*investiture royale*) and priestly inductions (*investiture sacerdotale*) are noted as well.[144]

---

[137] *Ibid.*, 116, 248, 251.

[138] Passage: e.g. Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 267–68; triumph: *ibid.*, 283–5.

[139] Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 245.

[140] *Ibid.*, 251 (249–52 f.).

[141] Goyon, *Confirmation*, 13 and 18.

[142] *Ibid.*, 252. Cf. Fairman, "Kingship", 78; Leclant, "Suckling", 137.

[143] Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 251.

[144] *Ibid.*, 266, 283.

It will indeed be seen that many similarities do exist between coronation inscriptions (which themselves differ from one another) and sequences discussed in this thesis. The claim that there did in fact exist an occasion which could safely be labeled a coronation ceremony, that is, an occasion which took place after the accession and on which a new king was bestowed with a crown(s), however, remains to be seen.

CHAPTER II

The Karnak Complex in the Early 18th Dynasty

The events of Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*, Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse*, and Horemheb's Turin inscription all have real-world locations as their settings, some rather general, like Luxor Temple, and others more specific, including individual structures within the Karnak precinct for example, such as *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, a palace structure built by Hatshepsut.

These specific references to places, some even by name, help with the reconstruction of the described events. In most cases, however, their actual locations are not certainly known due to the ambiguity of both textual and archaeological evidence. Horemheb's inscription mentions fewer specific place names than those of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III; these are discussed in chapter five. Attention is here devoted to attempting to locate where some specific events of these two texts took place, the setting of both of which is Karnak temple.

I. Overall layout of the temple

The Karnak complex was a hub of building activity during the New Kingdom, Thutmose III and Hatshepsut being among the most notable rulers in this respect, so much so that it would have looked quite different during the childhood of Thutmose III than it would have even towards the end of his reign.

In the fourth chapter, it is argued that the events of the *Historical Inscription* would have taken place only around a decade after those of the *Jeunesse*, before any of the major construction projects of either ruler had been completed, or even initiated, signifying that the temple was roughly in the same stage of development in both texts (fig. 8).[145] For this reason, the state of Karnak temple at the time of the purported events of these two texts is presented here as one unit.

Traditionally, the 4th and 5th Pylons have been seen as the works of Thutmose I. He has also been credited with the construction of a roofed hypostyle hall with wooden

[145] Chapter 4, 126–7 (s.v. "The lay of the land"). Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle Rouge* II, 332–41) provide a series of maps which trace the development of the east-west axis starting the reign of Amenhotep I; it is the "Thoutmosis II–Hatshepsout"-phase which likely corresponds to the one at the time of the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription* (*ibid.*, 334).

wadj-columns in a single row between them, which would have been replaced with sandstone ones, also in one row, still bearing a wooden roof. Hatshepsut, in turn, would have erected her obelisks. Thutmose III, with his construction of the so-called *chemisages* around them, would have roofed the *wadjyt* with stone, rearranging the columns into two rows, and accordingly adding more to support the weight.[146] Later, Carlotti and Gabolde, in contrast, argue that there never was a *wadjyt* of Thutmose I, but an *iunyt*, which Hatshepsut would have later replaced with a *wadjyt*-portico to make room for her obelisks. Thutmose III would then have made all the sandstone columns for the new roofed hall he built, in conjunction with the *chemisages*.[147]

The study of the development of Karnak temple relies on the interpretation of both archaeological, as well as textual evidence which is either laconic, ambiguous, or both. Over the course of my research on the subject, one over-arching theme which stood out was the constant reinterpretation of the textual material in light of archaeological evidence. For example, in contrast with Laboury, Carlotti, and Gabolde, Spencer argues that the terms *ỉwny.t* and *wꜣḏy.t* encountered in Hatshepsut's inscriptions on the northern obelisk and the Chapelle Rouge respectively, do not necessarily refer to the colonnade in different stages, and leaves open the question of its designation in the reign of Thutmose I, as it cannot be determined on textual grounds alone.[148]

Indeed, due to recent archaeological research undertaken by the CFEETK, new interpretations have been put forward. The latest evidence shows that the 4th and 5th Pylons were not built at the same time, the building of the 4th Pylon itself having taken place in the same phase of construction as the erection of the two pairs of obelisks in front of it, which occurred after Hatshepsut's accession in year 7 (see fig. 7 for plan of

[146] Barguet, *Temple*, 87, 96–106; Borchardt, *Baugeschichte*, 10–14, 24–8, figs. 7, 14, 15, 19.

[147] Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 255 ff. Cf. Laboury, *Statuaire*, 25.

[148] Spencer, *Temple*, 63–71. Some of the other primary texts which are often cited in conjunction with the development of the *wadjyt* during the early 18th Dynasty include: two palimpsest inscriptions by Thutmose III on columns III (by extension VI as well) and IV (by extension the column to which the Fortier-Loeben fragment belonged) of the *wadjyt*, carved over an older inscription bearing the name of Thutmose I (Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 92–7: texts 18/6 C and D; Larché, "Observations", 468; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 278–82, texts κ and λ); a passage from the autobiography of Ineni (*Urk.* IV, 55,16–56,5); from the base of the northern, standing, obelisk of Hatshepsut (*Urk.* IV, 365,1–5); from block 302 of the Chapelle Rouge (*Urk.* IV, 374,10–11; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 232 (§369)). For a list of primary sources which refer to this *wadjyt*, see: Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 273–83. Larché provides a list of primary sources which mention the obelisks in Thutmose II's festival court ("Observations", 463–5).

temple during reign of Thutmose I without 4th Pylon).[149] That she built the pylon in her father's name suggests that she may have finished a project which he had initially envisioned. The passage in the biography of Ineni mentioning their construction as having occurred under the reign of Thutmose I need therefore not be contradictory.[150] These projects could simply have been referred to as having been completed in anticipation, for all posterity to see. Indeed, the rapid westward development and expansion of the Karnak complex between the reigns of Thutmose I and Thutmose III seems to have been the logical extension of a project started, or at least envisioned, by the first kings of the dynasty, from before the reign of Amenhotep I.[151]

Thutmose I may have already begun work on the 4th Pylon, Thutmose II continued work on it, and Hatshepsut would have completed it.[152] The *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* "festival court" (discussed below) was thought to have been the work of Thutmose II,[153] but its walls lean on the 4th Pylon; the festival court – as it was until the construction of the 3rd Pylon – was consequently built only later.[154]

II. Conclusions and interpretations

The 4th Pylon, whether or not already under construction, would therefore not have been completed yet. Neither would have any of the obelisks been standing yet. Pending further archaeological progress, whether or not one adheres to the more widely accepted view that Thutmose I built the current sandstone 5th Pylon, or Wallet-Lebrun's that Hatshepsut is its author (having replaced the older limestone pylon of her

[149] Larché, "Observations", 451, 489, 492–3; plans in: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 333–6.

[150] *Urk.* IV, 56,1–2.

[151] Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 60; Larché, "Observations", 482–3. Cf. Gabolde, "Cour", 62.

[152] Larché, "Observations", 450, 492.

[153] Gabolde, "Cour", 1 ff. (esp. 61–2); Spencer, *Temple*, 82; Letellier, "Péristyle", 69–71, pl. XI A. Note, however, that neither Barguet nor Borchardt seem to have been aware of Thutmose II being the author of, or involved with, the *wsḫ.t ḥby.t*. In the latter's *Baugeschichte*, for example, figures 7, 14, 15, and 19, which show the state of Karnak temple under Thutmose I, Hatshepsut, and Thutmose III, do not indicate the presence of any structures (apart from obelisks) in front of the 4th Pylon.

[154] Larché, "Observations", 493; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 256; Gabolde and Zimmer, "Sondage," 161–2; Gabolde, "Cour", 18–19 and 29 (*contra* Wallet-Lebrun, "Contribution", 236–56). Prior to Larché's "Observations" in 2007, it was largely believed that the 4th Pylon was built by Thutmose I. Nevertheless, the earlier conclusion that the 4th Pylon predates the festival court remains valid. This does not exclude the fact that Thutmose II may have commissioned the construction of the festival court, which would have been completed only after his death or, alternatively that he had commissioned repairs and embellishments to a pre-existing (?) *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* (Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 61–5, 179; Gabolde, "Cour", 29).

father),[155] the fact remains that there stood on this site a pylon, one which would have constituted the entrance to the temple proper.[156] I also conclude, in agreement with Spencer, that the terms *ỉwny.t* and *wꜣḏy.t* are ambiguous in meaning.[157]

The wadjyt

This architectural feature, referred to once in the *Historical Inscription*, plays a greater role in the *Texte de la jeunesse*. That there did exist in this area of the temple a *wsḫ.t wꜣḏy.t* "court/hall of papyriform columns," even before Thutmose I, is clear: a stela from the reign of Sobekhotep IV states his contributions to the temple, among which was *ỉr.t n=f sbꜣ m mꜣw.t … m wsḫ.t wꜣḏy.t n.t ḥw.t-nṯr tn* "the making for him (Amun) anew of a door … in the court/hall of papyrus columns of this temple."[158] This *wsḫ.t wꜣḏy.t* was therefore already in place when Sobekhotep decided to carry out his projects, and may even have been a feature of the Middle Kingdom temple.[159] This *wadjyt*-court was probably dismantled later as part of the transformations of the temple at the start of the New Kingdom, to be replaced by a grander one, perhaps a construction of Thutmose I's (see below). In his palimpsest text on Column IV of the *wadjyt*, Thutmose III states that thanks to him, there were now six papyrus columns in its northern wing, when there used to be two before, and on Column III, he states that

[155] Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 57, 85, 180.

[156] Larché's views on the author of the 5th Pylon: "Observations", 449–50, 489. On Wallet-Lebrun's views on the development of Karnak between Thutmose I and III, see *Livre*, 53–172; for a summary of the development of the *wadjyt* in the early 18th Dynasty: *ibid.*, 178–81. See also Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 332–41, for the *hypothèse de restitution* maps of the east-west axis of Karnak from Amenhotep I to Amenhotep II.

[157] Spencer, *Temple*, 63–71, 87–8. She also argues that the term *wꜣḏ.yt*, as a noun, from its first attestation in the reign of Hatshepsut, refers to the papyriform colonnade between the current 4th and 5th Pylons. The distinction of "noun" is made to contrast it with the use of *wꜣḏy.t* as an adjective modifying *wsḫ.t* in an inscription of Sobekhotep IV (*ibid.*, 71). The oldest are on the Chapelle Rouge, mentioned twice: once on block 302 (Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 231–3 (§ 369–72)), and another on block 184 from the *Historical Inscription* (col. 22: Helck, *Hist.-Biog. Texte*, 9). Since it has been discovered that the events of this text took place before the construction of the 4th Pylon, then it could be argued that the term *wꜣḏ.yt*, as a noun, does not necessarily strictly refer to the area that was eventually delimited by the 4th and 5th Pylons.

[158] Cairo Stela JE 51911; *PM* II, 52; Helck, "Stele Sobekhoteps IV.", 194–200, pl. XVII; Wallet-Lebrun, "Contribution", 239.

[159] Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 41–2 (text 13/24 A); Larché, "Observations", 457 no. 225, 493, no. 388; Spencer, *Temple*, 71; Helck, "Stele Sobekhoteps IV.", 199 (11), pl. XVII (11); *PM* II, 52. This *wsḫ.t* is probably the same as the one referred to in another text, this time by Sobekhotep VII or VIII (Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 43 no. 8; Spencer, *Temple*, 74–5).

the repairs for the *wadjyt* which he commissioned were for his grandfather.[160] There is some disagreement on the development of the *wadjyt* between the reigns of Thutmose I and Thutmose III: according to Larché, Hatshepsut built the original two columns of the north side of the *wadjyt*, and Thutmose III added the remaining four; Wallet-Lebrun agrees with Thutmose III's contributions, but argues that Thutmose I himself was responsible for the wood-covered north portico supported by two *wadj*-columns.[161] Each author's interpretation influences the analysis of the *Texte de la jeunesse*: Wallet-Lebrun's entails that the *wadjyt* in question is Thutmose I's portico, while Larché's entails that it would not have existed yet at the time of the events of the text, suggesting therefore that the setting was one of the older *wadjyt*-colonnades or porticos, the locations of which are unknown. For the sake of simplicity therefore, it is Wallet-Lebrun's interpretation which is followed in this thesis.[162]

In the 19th Dynasty, the hypostyle halls of Ramesside temples were ritually intertwined with the annual ritual regeneration of the king through the roles they played on important religions occasions such as the Opet and Valley festivals, legitimising the king in the process.[163] As the reliefs illustrate, over the course of these festivals, the king would have, as a part of their ritual procedure, been crowned, and (publicly) *ḫˁ*

[160] Column IV: Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 92–4 (text 18/6 C); Larché, "Observations", 468; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 280–2, text λ. Column III: Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 94–6 (text 18/6 D); Larché, "Observations", 469; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 278–80, text κ.

[161] Wallet-Lebrun: Thutmose I as author of two *wadj*-columns (*Livre*, 59, 179); Larché: Hatshepsut as author ("Observations", 493). For Thutmose III adding the four columns: Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 170, 180; Larché, "Observations", 465, 495 (for specific references to the texts of Columns III and IV, see preceding footnote). For a summation of Wallet-Lebrun's views on the development of the *wadjyt* in the early 18th Dynasty, see: *Livre*, 178–81.

[162] This decision, however, is not without its problems, given that it goes against Hatshepsut's own claims that she erected her two obelisks in (*m*) an *iunyt*, and not a *wadjyt* (*Urk.* IV, 365,3), this possibly being one reason why Wallet-Lebrun translates *m* not as "in," but as "en dehors de" (*Livre*, 70). I disagree with this translation, this being one of the main reasons why Spencer's view that the terms *ỉwny.t* and *wsḏy.t* are ambiguous is adhered to in this thesis, another being the eventual inevitable re-interpretation of the textual evidence as a result of the ongoing research on the archaeological. This, however, is not to take away from the fact that Wallet-Lebrun had already advanced, on textual grounds, many of the same interpretations she does in the *Grand Livre de Pierre* well before it was realised, thanks to archaeological work, that the 4th and 5th Pylons were not actually constructed at the same time ("Contribution", 223–56; *Notes 2*, 317–33; *Notes 1*, 355–62). It is interesting to note that Carlotti and Gabolde have rejected her views in the past on the very basis that these two pylons were built at the same time (Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 256, 289 no. 93) – which is now under question (Larché, "Observations", 450; it does, however, seem that Gabolde had his reservations with ascribing the 4th Pylon, or at least its facing masonry (*parements*) to Thutmose I: "Cour", 61 no. 223).

[163] Refai, "Function", 393 ff.

"appeared."[164] On such occasions, these hypostyle halls were also partially open to the public.[165] We have here a scenario very similar to that encountered in Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*, Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse*, and Horemheb's Turin inscription: a processional appearance of the god, over the course of which crowns are received and worn. Furthermore, the events in the *Historical Inscription* and the *Texte de la jeunesse* take place in semi-public spaces with functions identical (and crucial) to Ramesside hypostyle halls. The *wꜣḏy.t* of the 18th Dynasty and its precedents seem therefore to be the prototypes of the hypostyle halls of the 19th Dynasty.

According to Gabolde, the role of the later *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* was to accommodate divine processions and members of the public, and to act as the venue for the performance of various public rituals like the sacrificing of animals and presentation of tribute and offerings.[166] This court is called a *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* in the section of Thutmose II's dedication-text for this monument recarved by Amenhotep III, and as a *wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr* "forecourt" and *wsḫ.t ꜥꜣ.t* "great court" by Thutmose IV.[167] As Wallet-Lebrun argues, however, "sans doute les qualificatifs de 'cérémonielle" et d''axiale' ou de 'grande' n'ont-ils rien de contradictoire."[168] The *wadjyt* mentioned in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, it will be seen, was located in an at least partially accessible area of the temple, therefore most likely in the equivalent of the temple's then-forecourt.[169] Due to the ambiguity of the archaeological evidence, it is unclear what the contributions of Thutmose II to the festival court were.[170] There can be little doubt, however, that the open court ahead of the 5th Pylon, at the time of the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription*, had the same function as the later festival court in front of the 4th Pylon: In accordance with the phenomenon that Barguet called "dédoublement" or "transposition," as Karnak temple grew, the temple forecourt would have been pushed further and further to the west. Similarly, the original forecourt, after the erection of the

[164] Crowning scenes: Nelson, *Hypostyle*, e.g., 7, 74. cf. Refai, "Function", 394–5.

[165] Arnold, *Wandrelief*, 95; Bell, "Divine", 163–8; Bell, "Luxor", 275–6, no. 128.

[166] Gabolde, "Cour", 55–61; Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 62–3.

[167] Dedication-text: Gabolde, "Cour", 30–4; Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 61–5 (text 18/4 A). Thutmose IV references: Barguet, *Temple*, 95; Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 193–7 (texts 18/8 G and I).

[168] Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 62, 195.

[169] *Ibid.*, 59, 63, 179.

[170] Wallet-Lebrun, for example, argues that Thutmose II's projects in the forecourt of the temple may have been limited to repairs and embellishments (*ibid.*, 65, 179).

4th Pylon, along with their accompanying construction projects (such as the *chemisages* around the obelisks and the statues of Thutmose I in the *wadjyt*), was eventually no longer able to play its role, and was therefore replaced by the *wsḫ.t ḥby.t*, the "festival court" (in the name of Thutmose II) in front of the current 4th Pylon (which, at one time, was itself the new main entrance to the temple).[171]

At the time of the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription*, therefore, there undoubtedly was a *wadjyt*, possibly fronting the (current) 5th Pylon, but certainly in a forecourt (*wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr*) which functioned as a festival court (*wsḫ.t ḥby.t*). It is unclear whose it was, however, or in what stage of construction it would have been. If Thutmose I had indeed completed a *wadjyt*, then it would be his in question in this text. Regardless of the author of the eventual, current, papyrus hall between the 4th and 5th Pylons, it is clear that a court, or hall, of papyrus columns had existed in the temple for a long time. Furthermore, starting the early New Kingdom at least, the *wadjyt* gained mythological associations with royal aspects of the cult, as discussed in the third and fourth chapters. Whether or not the physical location of the papyrus hall in the case of Sobekhotep IV, Thutmose III, or Hatshepsut is one and the same, the picture that emerges is that such an area was an old feature of the temple, which was at least later connected with the cult of the king.

[171] Cf. Hegazy and Martinez, "Palais de Maât", 55–6. Regarding the phenomenon of "dédoublement" or "transposition" of Karnak's forecourt according to Barguet, see: *Temple*, 24–5, 314, 326, 329–30; cf. a similar situation at Luxor Temple: Bell, "Luxor", 276 no. 128. It is interesting to note that this – admittedly hypothetical – scenario would be foreshadowing the further shrinking of the space of the festival court in Thutmose IV's reign due to the addition of his colonnade (cf. Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 196) as well as in Amenhotep III's to make room for the 3rd Pylon (Gabolde, "Cour", 16, 64). For the role of the *wsḫ.t-ḥby.t*: Gabolde, "Cour", 55–61. This *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* was itself later "replaced" by the great Hypostyle Hall of Sety I and Ramesses II (also a *wadjyt*, due to its columns, and referred to as (*m*) *ḫft-ḥr* (*KRI* II, 560)), which took over many of the former's functions, which in turn, more hypothetically, may have also been replaced by, or perhaps simply shared some functions with, the court between Pylons I and II, the temple's *wbꜣ* (Spencer, *Temple*, 4–13). Ramses II's dedication-text for the forecourt of Luxor Temple informs us that he built *wsḫ.t=s m ḫft-ḥr ỉp.t=f pḫr.tỉ m wꜣḏ.w* "its (the temple's) court in front of his (Amun's) sanctuary, surrounded with *wadj*-columns" (*KRI* II, 607,11; Spencer, *Temple*, 76–7). As with the festival court at Karnak, the public nature of this area is well-known as well (Kruchten, *Djéhoutymose*, 257–8).

CHAPTER III

The *Historical Inscription* of Hatshepsut

The coronation inscription of Hatshepsut, and the events it describes, hold as special a place among other such accounts as she does among other rulers. The exceptional circumstances in which she found herself compelled her to legitimise her rule on a scale seldom mirrored in ancient Egyptian history. Her efforts for legitimisation were effected both ideologically as well as monumentally, one complementing the other, and lending each other further credence. In this regard, her divine birth scenes, carved in the northern half of the Middle Colonnade of her temple at Deir el-Bahari, come to mind.[172] It is in the register above these that the scenes and texts which relate what has been described as her coronation ceremony were carved.[173] It is now known, however, that this event could not have occurred as described, one of the reasons being that her father, Thutmose I, is depicted taking part in the festivities, such as when he presents her to the royal court,[174] while he must have already passed away before then.[175] It is for this reason that this source for her coronation is considered "fictitious,"[176] and rightfully described by Frankfort as showing "not the ritual procedure but rather the ideal significance of the event."[177]

A second, "historical," account of Hatshepsut's "coronation ceremony" is also known, which was carved on the second course of blocks of her Chapelle Rouge in Karnak, on the external faces of its north and south walls. This text, known as the *Historical Inscription*, forms the subject of this chapter. Lacau and Chevrier were the first to reconstruct, discuss, transcribe, and translate it in full, while the only complete English translation is Gillen's.[178] Another, more fragmentary, copy exists in the Upper

[172] *PM* II, 348–9 (16–21); *Deir el Bahari* II, pls. 46–55; *Urk.* IV, 216–34.

[173] *PM* II 347–8 (16–21); *Deir el Bahari* III, pls. 56–64; *Urk.* IV, 241–65.

[174] *PM* II, 348 (19); *Deir el Bahari* II, pls. 60–2/63; *Urk.* IV, 254–62.

[175] Edgerton, *Thutmosid Succession*, *passim*.; Murnane, *Coregencies*, 116, 230.

[176] Frankfort, *Kingship*, 101–2, 372 no. 5; Gardiner, "Coronation", 22.

[177] Frankfort, *Kingship*, 106.

[178] Lacau and Chevrier, C*hapelle*, 92–153; Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 15–28. Helck has provided a transcription as well (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 7–33). A recent translation into German was done by Matthias Müller ("Krönungsinschrift", 201–11), but his aim was to provide a running translation of this text, with no grammatical commentary (the few existing comments clarify certain passages for a non-

Colonnade of Hatshepsut's Deir el-Bahari temple.[179] The facsimiles of the photographs of the blocks of the Chapelle Rouge published by Burgos and Larché in the first volume of their work (presented here in Appendix A, Part 1) are the main source used for the transliteration and translation of the *Historical Inscription*. Helck's transcription is used to refer to the Deir el-Bahri version. Notes are presented here and, in the case of passages from the text not included in the discussion in this chapter, in Appendix A, Part 2, where a running translation of the entire text is offered.

It is important to mention that the distinction between accession and coronation does not apply in the peculiar case of Hatshepsut, who officially became king (that is to say, acceded to the throne) as a coregent in which case accession and coronation ceremony intersect:[180] according to her *Historical Inscription*, her accession took place on the same occasion as a great celebration in which she appeared in public (*ḫꜥ*), acting as king, and was bestowed with royal regalia, that is, her "coronation ceremony" or, more accurately, appearance ceremony. Indeed, her official "appearance" is referred to with the term *ḫꜥw-nsw.t* (block 164, col. 9)[181] which, as demonstrated by Redford, denoted a king's accession during the New Kingdom.[182] While it is true that she was the true power behind the throne before this, Thutmose III being too young to rule, she was not Pharaoh, but only *de facto* ruler. According to the oft-quoted section from the biography of Ineni, *sꜣ=f ꜥḥꜥ(.w) m s.t=f m nsw.t tꜣ.wy ḥḳꜣ.n=f ḥr ns.t n.t wtt sw sn.t=f ḥm.t nṯr ḥꜣ.t-špsw.t ḥr ỉr.t mḫrw tꜣ tꜣ.wy ḥr sḫr=s* "His (Thutmose II's) son stood in his place as King of the Two Lands, he ruled upon the throne of he who begat him,

specialist audience); his work is therefore not referenced over the course of the transliteration, translation, and analysis presented here.

[179] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 93–4; *PM* II, 356 (77). Egyptological scholarship has been aware of this for longer, already recognising it as a text of Hatshepsut's (*Deir el Bahari* VI, 8–9; Sethe, *Hatschepsut-Problem*, 77–8). Lacau and Chevrier's publication, as well as Helck's, give a transcription alongside the Chapelle Rouge version, thus allowing for one to complete lacuna in the other. The reason why this text is so fragmentary is due to the fact that Thutmose III had it erased, and the wall re-inscribed with a coronation text of Thutmose I's and a scene depicting this king seated on a throne under a pavilion (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 153; see: *PM* II, 356 (77); *Deir el Bahari* VI, 8–9, pls. 166–7). This palimpsest text, in contrast, has been discussed only rarely (Murnane, *Coregencies*, 117; Redford, *History*, 74–6; Sethe, *Hatschepsut-Problem*, 77–83).

[180] Borchardt, *Mittel*, 69; Gardiner, "Regnal Years", 24; Redford, *History*, 18; Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 35, 38–9.

[181] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 19.

[182] Redford, *History*, 22–7.

while his sister, the God's Wife, Hatshepsut, managed the affairs of the land, the Two Lands being under her leadership."[183]

A question of high importance is when this switch from *de facto* ruler to Pharaoh might have occurred, for nowhere on the extant blocks of the *Historical Inscription* is the date of the events of the main narrative mentioned. It is now known that Hatshepsut counted her regnal years starting from the accession of Thutmose III,[184] so it is a question of in which regnal year of his it was that Hatshepsut actually became king. Since Schott's discussion in 1955 of the then-unpublished *Historical Inscription*, who argued, based on block 287 of the text, that Hatshepsut was crowned in the second regnal year of Thutmose III, having first undergone a coronation ceremony in Karnak followed later by another one in Luxor,[185] scholarly opinion has been divided into two camps on the subject: those advocating a coronation in the second regnal year, and those arguing for the seventh. Current Egyptological consensus is that a date closer to the latter is likelier.[186] Dorman offers an excellent synopsis of the history of the discussion on this topic (see also Appendix B for history of discussion on block 287).[187]

The *Historical Inscription* is a long text, carved on the north and south façades of the second course of blocks of Hatshepsut's Chapelle Rouge, relating her official coming to power. It describes a ritual procession of the god Amun in and around Karnak temple, its movements, Hatshepsut's actions, and also gives long speeches of various participants, including Amun and Hatshepsut. The inscription is carved in retrograde columns, with an even number of columns on each block.[188] The hieroglyphs in each individual column are therefore read normally: from right to left on the south façade and left to right on the north, in accordance with the direction they are facing. Nevertheless, one needs to move in the opposite direction to pass from one column of text to the next, so therefore from left to right on the south façade, and right to left on the north.

---

[183] *Urk.* IV, 59,16–17—60,1–2.

[184] Dorman, "Early Reign", 54; Redford, *History*, 55.

[185] Schott, *Krönungstag*, 212–13.

[186] Dorman meticulously examines a wide range of evidence, pictorial and textual, dated and undated to come to this conclusion (*Senenmut*, 18–45; cf. Dorman, "Early Reign", 42–9; Roth, "Models", 9, 12–13 no. 1; Murnane, *Coregencies*, 33–4; Seipel, *LÄ* II, s.v. "Hatschepsut", 1045, 1049 nos. 16–17).

[187] Dorman, "Early Reign", 42–9; *Monuments*, 18–45.

[188] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 61.

François Larché explains that the direction of the hieroglyphs is based on where the narrator of the text, Hatshepsut, would have hypothetically been, for which reason they therefore face the same direction as her, toward the sanctuary of the chapel. This is where (the cult statue of) Amun would have been, which would in turn explain why the text moves in a retrograde fashion from the vestibule of the chapel towards its sanctuary.[189]

In view of the length of this inscription, as well as the fact that the aim of this thesis is to ascertain the nature of so-called coronation texts which are set apart from others such as that of Hatshepsut's Middle Terrace, through the presentation of their events, via references to specific times and places, as actually having taken place,[190] the analysis of this inscription is largely limited to its narrative sections, only occasionally referencing passages from the various recorded speeches.

In order to facilitate putting the different versions and publications of the text in relation with one another, passages from the Chapelle Rouge are cited directly by the block number on which they are carved (e.g. # 287), while, when a reference to a passage from the Deir el-Bahari version is necessary (when this version preserves a passage which is otherwise unattested, for example), it is referred to by the column number from the original text (e.g. *DeB* 18). Also in an effort to make the various publications of this text correlate with one another, the same section titles used by Lacau and Chevrier, picked up by Gillen (in translation), as well as by Burgos and Larché, are re-used here too. Specific line numbers are mentioned in-text in the transliteration; given the fragmentary nature of the text, and since the various surviving parts are not necessarily sequential, the line numbering system used by Lacau and Chevrier, picked up by Helck, are used here as well. This numbering system starts from line 1 of a given block, continues in the case of consecutive blocks, such as # 44 + 143, and restarts from line 1 once more at the beginning of another block or sequence of blocks. The various publications of this text are abbreviated when cited in-text: Burgos and Larché's plate volume as *BL* [page number], Lacau and Chevrier's publication as *LC* [page number and section number], Helck's transcription as *H* [page number], and Gillen's translation as *G* [page number]. Burgos and Larché's plate volume is the

[189] *Loc. cit.*

[190] Spalinger, "Drama", 286–7.

primary source for the transliteration presented here, but Lacau and Helck are cited as well when differences occur.

The Chapelle Rouge blocks forming the *Historical Inscription*, especially those on the north side of the monument, have appeared in slightly varying order in various publications. This is especially the case with the blocks 37 + 147 + 194 on its north side.[191] It is Burgos and Larché's ordering of the blocks, the most recent, that is followed, for the reasons explained below.[192]

I. The Lay of the Land

At the time of the events of the *Historical Inscription*, around the seventh regnal year of Thutmose III, the 5th Pylon or another one which used to occupy the same site built by Thutmose I, would have been the main entrance to the Karnak complex at this point in time (fig. 8). This pylon would have been fronted by a colonnade or portico contained in the temple's then-forecourt which would have acted as the setting for the performance of public rituals in the same manner as the later *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* between the 3rd and 4th Pylons (for more details, see preceding chapter).

The beginning of the *Historical Inscription* contains references to several place names. These passages have been discussed extensively, and many interpretations of these place names and movements of the barque of Amun have been offered.

1. The ꜥḥꜥw nb n nsw.t

The first important study on the matter was undertaken by Gitton.[193] He placed one of the specific locations mentioned in the text, the *ꜥḥꜥw nb n nsw.t* "*Station of the Lord* of the king" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 7; # 222,2), between the 4th and 5th Pylons. Carlotti and Gabolde, too, placed the *Station* from the *Texte de la jeunesse* (col. 7) in the same location.[194] This notion is supported by the fact that this area was accessible to at least some members of the public, as will be seen below, as it would have been located in the temples then-forecourt. The *Station* appears in two more sections of the *Historical Inscription*, where it is discussed further.

---

[191] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 143–53 (§ 184,a–88,b); Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 31–3; Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 23–4.

[192] *Infra*, 117.

[193] Gitton, "Palais", 63–73.

[194] *Urk.* IV, 159,1; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 292.

2. The tp-ỉtrw and wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w

Another term designating a specific feature of the temple is the *tp-ỉtrw* "the head of the river" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8; # 222,6 and *H* 9; # 35,12). Gitton saw this as "le bassin en T qui servait à amarrer la grande barque du dieu," an interpretation which has not been fundamentally contradicted since (fig. 9).[195] Cabrol elaborates the definition, seeing it as not simply designating the basin itself, but "la partie la plus enfoncée du fleuve dans les terres et, par extension dans le cas d'un temple, le complexe situé à la rencontre de ses abords et de l'eau dérivée et qui est aménagé pour permettre le passage de la surface terrestre à la surface aquatique."[196] Indeed, priests carrying the processional barque of Amun are depicted on blocks 40 (north wall, third register)[197] and 126 (north wall, fifth register).[198] These depict the procession leaving Karnak temple and then Deir el-Bahari respectively, on the occasion of the Beautiful Festival of the Valley, once on the journey over to the West Bank of Thebes, and another on the return leg. The captions accompanying these scenes mention that they are proceeding towards the *tp-ỉtrw*. The *Head of the River* of the scene on block 40 must refer to that of Karnak temple, while that of block 126 must refer to the *tp-ỉtrw* of the temple of Deir el-Bahari of Hatshepsut. The scene taking place after block 40 is missing, but by analogy with the scenes taking place after block 126, which depict the river procession back to Karnak (blocks 291 and 279),[199] it would have shown the equivalent fluvial procession toward the West Bank. All of this therefore supports Gitton's conclusion that the term *tp-ỉtrw* refers to canals dug near the entrances to temples to accommodate various ships and barges which would have been used for a variety of occasions, most importantly the various festivals of Amun which would have required riverine processions to transport his image from one cultic site to another.

Gitton added that the *tp-ỉtrw* of Karnak temple must have been located on its main east-west axis, like the one which still exists today in front of the 1st Pylon, but

[195] Gitton, "Palais", 64, 65 (fig. 1, no. 1). Cf. Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 163,m).

[196] Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 631.

[197] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* I, 98; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 169–70 (§ 227).

[198] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* I, 114; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 174–5 (§ 239).

[199] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* I, 112–13; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 175–6 (§ 241).

further to the east.[200] This would be in keeping with Barguet's phenomenon of "transposition" or "dédoublement" in that, as Karnak temple expanded over time, the new structures built in front of the pre-existing ones acted as larger equivalents to the older component architectural features: the Great Hypostyle Hall, for example, being a larger equivalent to the *wadjyt* between the 4th and 5th Pylons which was "transposed" to between the 2nd and 3rd Pylons when its predecessor ceased to be near the entrance, and its interior space became cluttered.[201] Furthermore, the archaeological evidence indicates that the canal and basin of the New Kingdom were eliminated at the construction of the 2nd Pylon and the structures in front of it, therefore after the events of the *Historical Inscription*, supporting Gitton's original idea that the original *tp-ỉtrw* of Karnak would have been closer to the current 5th Pylon.[202]

Another term designating a part of the temple is the *wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w*, the "Way of Offerings (or Offering Tables)" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8; # 222,7). Lacau and Chevrier, like Gitton, assumed that the *wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w* was the part of the main east-west axis of the temple between the *tp-ỉtrw* and what was then the foremost pylon (fig. 10).[203] Cabrol argues that, depending on the context, the word *wḏḥ.w* could refer to the vases on it, or to the table itself.[204] She also states that, in the case of Karnak at least, the term *wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w* refers to "le parcours processionnel qu'empruntent les vases lors de cette sortie."[205] It is with these definitions in mind for the *tp-ỉtrw* and the *wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w* that the text is interpreted.

3. Palaces

Aside from the locations discussed thus far, two place names containing the element *ʿḥ* are encountered toward the beginning of the inscription: the *ʿḥ-nsw.t* (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8; #

[200] He did so by referring to a scene from the tomb of Neferhotep (TT 49) which depicts Karnak temple, at the end of the 18th Dynasty, with a "bassin en T" in front of it (Gitton, "Palais", 64; cf. Blyth, *Karnak*, 106, 112–13 and Kemp, *Anatomy*, 205; for tomb scene, see: Davies, *Tomb of Nefer-hotep* I, pls. 42–3).

[201] Barguet, *Temple*, 24–5, 314, 326, 329–30. For more details, see: Chapter 2, 34–5.

[202] Boraik, "Quays", 76.

[203] Gitton, "Palais", 66 no. 3; Lacau et Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 163,o). Both publications pointed out a contemporary stela from Kom el-Ahmar which also mentions the *wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w* (*Urk.* IV, 133,17).

[204] Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 68. These vases, Traunecker argued, were the ones used in what he called "les rites de l'eau" ("Rites de l'eau", 195–236).

[205] Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 68. She locates this feature on the north-south axis of the temple, however (*ibid.*, 650–2).

222,7) and the *ꜥḥ n wsḫ.t* (*n.t Nn-wꜣ=i̯-r=f* "of *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*") (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8; # 35,11). It also appears later for a third time: *ꜥḥ* (*n Nn-wꜣ=i̯-r=f*) (*BL* 33; *H* 14; # 142,21). Otto, the first to discuss these, saw them as references to the actual administrative palace in Karnak.[206] By itself, the term *ꜥḥ* refers to actual residences of a king or a god, whether permanent, such as a palace or a temple,[207] or occupied for a limited amount of time, such as perhaps temple-palaces for kings,[208] or shrines and chapels for divinities.[209] According to Balanda, the *ꜥḥ*, from the Old Kingdom to the end of the 20th Dynasty, referred to "the dwelling of gods, whether in the world beyond or in the form of statues on earth; and this incorporated the person of the reigning king being a god himself."[210] He also concludes that it was the reception area for the king to receive his officials and subjects (i.e. administration area), as well as where some family activities might have taken place.[211] The combination of *ꜥḥ* and *nsw.t* in the *Historical Inscription* could therefore be seen as expressly referring to the royal palace. The determination of whether the *Nn-wꜣ=i̯-r=f* was an administrative palace, the main residence of the king while in Thebes, lies outside of the scope of this thesis, and discussion of this structure is limited to its relevance to the events in the inscription.[212]

---

[206] Otto, *Topographie*, 25.

[207] Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 549–51; *Wb.* I, 214.

[208] Specific references, where the structure referred to with the term "*ꜥḥ*" can be reliably identified with a temple palace, are rare. See, for example, at Ramses III's temple at Medinet Habu, the captions at three of the corners of the First Court, on the south (left) side of which lies the temple palace (*PM* II, 493 (65), *MH* II, 123 B on 60 A; *PM* II, 494 (71), *MH* II, 123 A on 60 B; *PM* II, 494 (72), *MH* II, 124 A on 58 A); the caption of the scene on the western inside passage of the Window of Appearances (*PM* II, 493 (68) c, *MH* IV, 238 A); and also the caption of the scene on the eastern inside passage of the middle door on the south wall of the First Court (*PM* II, 495 (78) c, *MH* IV, 239 A).

[209] For shrines or chapels, see, for example, the dedication text of Ramses II for his triple shrine in the forecourt of Luxor Temple (*KRI* II, 607,13; 614,7; 616,1,15). For a compilation of instances of this word, along with an interpretation of the cited passages, see: Balanda, *Society*, 128–34.

[210] *Ibid.*, 133.

[211] *Ibid.*, 130, 131.

[212] O'Connor argues that the Theban governmental palace was always located in the immediate vicinity of Karnak temple. He sees the fact that Hatshepsut, in the *Historical Inscription*, became Pharaoh in *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* (see: *infra*, 56) as evidence ("Beloved", 271–2), but this does not necessarily follow. Strictly based on these events, it can merely be said that this structure was at the very least used as the venue for some rituals involving the bestowal of the king with his/her regalia during some festivals. To support his argument, O'Connor refers to a section of another text, the *Duties of the Vizier* from the tomb of Rekhmire (*Urk.* IV, 1105,11–17; "Beloved", 271–2), wherein Rekhmire is said to have reported (*smi̯*) the *ḫr.t tꜣ.wy* "condition/affairs of the Two Lands" to the king in the palace. Such activities do suggest an administrative function, but the text lacks any references to temples. O'Connor points to the term *sn.t mḥt.t* "northern flagstaff," mentioned as where the overseer of the treasury (*i̯my-r ḫtm/sḏꜣwty*; see: van den Boorn, *Duties*, 61 nos. 35–6) would have temporarily stood during these proceedings (*Urk.* IV, 1105,15), as clear evidence of the palace being adjacent to a temple

Two other aspects of the *ḥ-nsw.t* and *ḥ n wsḫ.t* (*n.t Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f*) are relevant to this thesis, however: their location, and whether or not they refer to the same structure or complex. It is here argued that this may not have been the case, but two possible interpretations for the location of this structure will emerge: that (1) it was an actual cultic part of the temple itself, reserved for royal aspects of the cult, or (2) that it was a palace adjacent to a court (*wsḫ.t*) of the temple, as with the "mortuary" temples encountered on the Theban West Bank. While not of great relevance to the goal of this thesis, evidence for both possibilities is presented below, but it must first be demonstrated that the two terms *ḥ-nsw.t* and *ḥ n wsḫ.t* refer to the same structure.

The *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f* is itself described as a *ḥ-nsw.t* in the *procession géographique* carved on the first row of blocks of the chapel,[213] therefore linking it with the mention of the *ḥ-nsw.t* in column 7 of this text. The name of the structure, *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f*, would in turn link it to the *ḥ n wsḫ.t* (*n.t Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f*) in column 11. This is probably the main reason why Gitton and Lacau have argued that the two terms are to be equated, but this does not go without saying. This interpretation depends on how one reads the indirect genitive *n.t* connecting the *ḥ n wsḫ.t* with the *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f*. If the sense is one of equation, "the *ḥ n wsḫ.t* (called) *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*," this would identify the *ḥ n wsḫ.t* with the *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f*, which in turn would identify it with the *ḥ-nsw.t* of the *procession géographique*. This, in its turn, would identify it with the *ḥ-nsw.t* in column 7. This is the view adopted in this thesis, but before proceeding further, a note must be made on the alternative interpretation.

If translated as the genitive "of," the resulting translation becomes: "the *ḥ* of *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*'s court." This would entail that the structure/complex of *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* itself had its own court, which in turn included an element which could be designated with the word *ḥ*. This interpretation was proposed by Lacau as a tentative alternative, and was also suggested by Otto to Gitton.[214]

("Beloved", 272; *contra* van den Boorn, who placed this flagstaff in front of the gates of the palace: *Duties*, 63 n. 9, 67), arguing that only temple pylons are attested to have had flagstaffs (*Wb*. IV, 152,9–10; Konrad, *Architektur*, 40, n. 301 and 303). The reference in the *Duties* is the only known possible exception (*Wb*. IV, 152,11). Through additional remarks too detailed to discuss here, O'Connor argues that the temple in question was Karnak, and that this administrative palace was to its north-west ("Beloved", 272–7). On the location of temple-adjacent palaces (whether administrative or cultic in function) relative to their respective temples, see: *infra*, 46–7.

[213] Block 242; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 78 (§ 126).

[214] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 16,u); Gitton, "Palais", 68.

By this interpretation however, as Gitton has argued, given that in-text it is said that Amun moved to the western *rw.ty* "gates" of the *ḥ n wsḫ.t n.t* ("of") the *Nn-wɜ=i-r=f* (*H* 8, 35,11), the *rw.ty* "gates" in this passage would belong not to an overall large structure called *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, but to the *ḥ* which would have been located in its court (given the translation "the *ḥ* of *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*'s court").[215] Furthermore, it will be added that these gates are specifically designated as the "western" ones, thus suggesting that this *ḥ* had even more than one. It seems unlikely that this hypothetical *ḥ* of a court which itself forms part of a larger structure or complex called *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, not only had a *rw.ty*-gate, but also presumably more than one, because this would suggest that this one component was itself quite large. The passage *ḥ n wsḫ.t n.t Nn-wɜ=i-r=f* should therefore be translated as "the palace of the court *called* the *Nn-wɜ=i-r=f*" (Gitton, 68; *LC* 100, § 163), where *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* is the overall designation of this "palace of the court,"[216] thus identifying it with the *ḥ-nsw.t* in column 7 and the *procession géographique*.[217]

It is clear that the *Nn-wɜ=i-r=f* was at the very least intimately related to Karnak temple: a later passage from the *Historical Inscription* states that Amun entered *ḥ n Nn-wɜ=i-r=f* (*m*)*-pr-ʾImn* "the 'palace' (called) *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* (in)-the-estate-of-Amun" (*BL* 33; *H* 14; # 142,21). Consequently, whether it was (1) inside the temple proper, or (2) a separate ritual or administrative palace, what is clear is that this structure formed a part of the overall Karnak complex.[218]

In Horemheb's Turin inscription, two relevant terms will be encountered: the *pr-nsw.t* (ll. 15, 20) and the *ḥ* (l. 17). Neither of these exactly matches the ones mentioned in this passage (*ḥ-nsw.t* and *ḥ n wsḫ.t*), but it is concluded in the Horemheb chapter that both the *pr-nsw.t* and the *ḥ* certainly referred to the same structure, the identity of which, however, remains unclear: it could either be a palace adjoining Luxor Temple (the preferred interpretation in this thesis), or (a "palatial" area

[215] Cf. Gitton, "Palais", 68. The term *rw.ty*, starting from the Middle Kingdom, usually designated the entrance to a palace or temple (Spencer, *Temple*, 202).

[216] The genitival *n.t* connecting *ḥ n wsḫ.t* and *Nn-wɜ=i-r=f* can therefore be described as expressing the genitive of definition or specialising genitive of the Oxford English Dictionary (*OED Online* March 2015, s.v. "of, prep.," no. 22).

[217] *Contra* Cabrol, who believes that the *ḥ-nsw.t* on the side of the *wɜ.t-wḏḥ.w* (# 222,5–7: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 8) is not the same as the *ḥ n wsḫ.t* on the bank (*mɜʿ*) of the *tp-ỉtrw* (# 35,11–12: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 8–9; *Voies processionnelles*, 650–2).

[218] Cf. Kees, "Kapelle", 201.

within) the temple itself.[219] However, the *ʿḥ-nsw.t* of our text could, despite uncertainties, conceivably similarly be referring to a cultic part somewhere inside the temple reserved for rituals relating to the king and the royal cult.[220]

Based on the analysis of the events of the *Historical Inscription* presented below, it will be seen that the evidence seems to support the second possible interpretation of the *ʿḥ-nsw.t*, namely, as a (possibly ritual) palace which is separate, but connected to a temple (figs. 10–11, 12 no. 7).

This structure, located in *pr ʾImn* "the estate of Amun,"[221] was large enough to have more than one *rw.ty*-gate entrance.[222] The *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f* did not survive the series of dismantlements executed by later rulers,[223] but it has been suggested that the column drums, found reused inside the 2nd Pylon, once belonged to this Hatshepsut and early Thutmose III palace, and their large number has led Wallet-Lebrun to also assert that this was a structure of some size.[224]

It has been argued, referring to an inscription from the reign of Sobekhotep IV, that Hatshepsut's building of a palace, next to a temple *wadjyt* court, in the estate of Amun, was not without precedent.[225]

Several New Kingdom *Mansions of Millions of Years* on the Theban West Bank feature a palace adjoining the left (southern) side of their first courts, the best known example being that of Ramses III at Medinet Habu.[226] By comparison with the location

---

[219] See chapter 5, 215–39. In disagreement with Balanda (*Society*, 131–2).

[220] Cf. Bell, "Luxor", 273–4, esp. notes 111–12. In note 112, Bell thanks Murnane for pointing out that the Coronation Suite in Luxor Temple (Rooms XIII–XIV) has a *ḫkr*-friezle at the top of its walls, "suggesting that this decoration served to designate this part of the temple specifically as a 'Palace'" (*ibid.*, 274, note 112).

[221] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 14, # 142,21.

[222] *Ibid.*, # 222 + 35,6–7 and 11.

[223] Larché, *Observations*, 480 f. If it was not dismantled earlier, then definitely at least when the 3rd Pylon was constructed.

[224] Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 86.

[225] *Ibid.*, 42; for Sobekhotep IV inscription, see: Chapter 2, 32 nos. 158–9. To note is the writing of *wsḫ.t*, the main symbol (Gardiner O 15) for which here includes the hieroglyph for palace *ʿḥ* (O 11), and hence Wallet-Lebrun's translation: *wsḫ.t wꜣḏy.t n.t ḥw.t-nṯr tn* "la cour à portique papyriforme de ce temple attenante au Palais" (*ibid.*, 41). This is debatable however, given that this writing of *wsḫ.t* is not exceptional, the inclusion of the *ʿḥ* hieroglyph (O 11) being well attested (Spencer, *Temple*, 71–3).

[226] Vomberg, *Erscheinungsfenster*, 260–68; Kemp, *Anatomy*, 211–13; Stadelmann, "Tempelpalast", 221–42; Stadelmann, "Totentempel", 694–711; O'Connor, "Beloved", 280. Other known examples of palaces attached to temples to the left of their first courts include those of the *ḥw.t-nṯr n.t ḥḥ.w m/n rnpw.t* of Ay/Horemheb, Sety I at Qurna, Ramses II (the Ramesseum). The exception is Hatshepsut's at Deir el-Bahari, which is located in the upper colonnade, but also on the left; this is probably a separate

of these temple palaces, the "palace of the court" in question would have therefore been located north-west of the 4th Pylon, a notion which seems to find confirmation in the interpretation of Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription* (discussed in the next section).[227] The reconstructed location of the *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t* places it to the north of Thutmose II's *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* "festival court," which probably did not exist yet as such, but whether or not this was the case, this area of the temple would certainly have consisted of its forecourt, and functioned as a *wsḫ.t ḥby.t*.[228] Among the roles of such forecourts was to serve as a "cadre aux présentations des tributs ou butins de guerre à Amon," and as a location to accommodate the "défilé des animaux de sacrifice, la future 'mascarade des boeufs gras.'"[229] Later in the *Historical Inscription*, accordingly, when the presentation of offerings to Amun is being recounted (*BL* 42; *H* 25; # 72,12–13), it is clear that this was taking place most likely in Karnak's then-forecourt.[230]

The *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t*, identical to the *ʿḥ-nsw.t*, is therefore conceivably a term which refers to temple palaces (which adjoin courts, hence *ʿḥ* "palace" of the *wsḫ.t* "court") and, in this specific instance, to the one in Karnak which was located next to this early festival court. Unfortunately, however, apart from one possible exception, this term is otherwise unattested; as copied by Daressy, a caption to a scene at Medinet Habu depicting the king entering the First Court refers to the palace adjoining this court: *ḫ*ʿ[-*nsw.t mỉ Rʿ m*] *ʿḥ.t n*(*.t*) [*ws*]*ḫ.t=f šps*(*.t*) *r sḫʿ ỉt=f ỉmn m ḥb=f nfr n ỉn.t* "Appearance [of the king like Ra from] the *palace of his noble [co]urt* in order to cause his father Amun to appear in his Beautiful Festival of the Valley."[231] In contrast, the Oriental Institute of Chicago's Epigraphic Survey, a more reliable source, instead has *ʿḥ.t n*(*.t*) *ḥw.t*.[232] Nevertheless, this palace is still said to be a part of the overall temple (*ḥw.t*), as

phenomenon, however: Kemp points out that the window is not a part of an adjoining palace, but of the temple itself (*Anatomy*, 213), while Vomberg does not see it as a Window of Appearance (*Erscheinungsfenster*, 250–2).

[227] Cf. O'Connor, "Beloved", 298–9 (figs. 7.3 and 7.4); Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 163,n); Gitton, *Palais*, 64–6, 71–2.

[228] For history of *wsḫ.t ḥby.t*, see: Chapter 2, 32–5.

[229] Gabolde, "Cour", 56–7 nos. 2–3, 58–9 no. 7, 60–1. Cf. the discussion on the phrase *ʿrf.t špss.w n tɜ.w nb.w bɜk.wt šn.t n ỉtn* "which encloses the riches of all lands and the products of the circuit/encompassment of the sun-disk," which is used to describe the purpose of the festival court in a dedication text by Thutmose II (*ibid.*, 33–4,e).

[230] *Infra*, 104.

[231] Daressy, "Notes", 82.

[232] *MH* II, 123 B; *PM* II, 493 (65), plan 47. A caption of a scene carved on the eastern inside passage of a door connecting the First Court at Medinet Habu with its adjoining palace bears the identical phrase *ʿḥ.t*

is the case with the *Nn-wɜ=i̯-r=f* which is said to form a part of its own temple (*pr-ʾImn*). Given the known location of the palace at Medinet Habu relative to the temple, on the left (south) of its first court, it certainly does seem possible that the *Nn-wɜ=i̯-r=f* was similarly located on the left (north) of the early forecourt discussed above.[233]

Further supporting the argument that the *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t* in the *Texte Historique* refers to a palace north of the forecourt, is the fact that the later *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* (which presumably occupies roughly the same location as its predecessor before the construction of the 4th Pylon) was equipped with three doors on its north wall, which might very well have led to the *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t* in question.[234] While it might be simple coincidence, it must also be pointed out that the left (south) wall of the First Court at Medinet Habu, the one with the Window of Appearances, also features three doors.[235] Furthermore, the third, top-most, terrace at Hatshepsut's temple at Deir el-Bahari is called a *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* in the inscriptions on the columns of the court,[236] and it is on the left (south) side of this open court that the adjoining temple palace with (the possible) "window of appearances" lay.[237] These questions also give rise to the possibility that the forecourt at Karnak, too, had a Window of Appearances, but this is highly speculative.

To summarise: the two terms *ʿḥ-nsw.t* and *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t* therefore refer to the same structure, namely (1) a part of the temple itself used for the royal cult, or perhaps (2) a palace built by Hatshepsut on the south side of the main east-west axis of Karnak, in the area between the foremost pylon, and the *tp-i̯trw* (on the side of the *Way of the Offering Tables*).[238] Given that there is more evidence in support of the former, it is under this assumption that I propose the following reconstructed course of events.

---

n(*.t*) *ḥw.t=f* (*PM* II, 495 (78) c, *MH* IV, 239), while the caption of another scene has *ʿḥ.t=f i̯my.t ḥw.t-nṯr=f* (*PM* II, 494 (72), *MH* II, 124 A).

[233] Cf. Gitton, *Palais*, 64–6, 71–2; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 163,n); Kemp, *Anatomy*, 204; O'Connor, "Beloved", 298–9 (figs. 7.3 and 7.4).

[234] Gabolde, "Cour", 21 (fig. 6), 24–8 (doors C–C', D, and E, pls. VI–VII, XV–XVII), 58 no. 5. Note, however, that he suggests that the *rw.ty i̯mn.ty* might refer not to the gates of a palace, but to those of the 4th Pylon.

[235] *PM* II, plan 47.

[236] Niwiński, "Colonnes", 104, fig. 9.

[237] Vomberg, on the other hand, questions whether this actually was a "palace" with "window of appearances" (*Erscheinungsfenster*, 250–2).

[238] Gitton, "Palais", 68; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 163,n,u).

The nature and location of other place names which require less space to analyze, such as the *Palais de Maât*, are addressed over the course of the discussion of their pertaining passages from the inscription.

II. Analysis of Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*

The beginning of the text is missing. However, while the first surviving continuous part of the inscription from the Chapelle Rouge (# 222 + 35 + 184 + 295) coincides with *DeB* 6, the Deir el-Bahari version conserves very small parts of the first five columns (*LC* 161; *H* 7; *G* 16). Too little unfortunately remains for any deductions to be made, but an important detail from *DeB* 5 is worth mentioning: [...] *n=f ỉr=s mr.t.n=f ỉst grt* [...].*n ḥm=f* [...]*=f h*(*ꜣ*)*b r* [...]. Helck restores the gap between *ỉsṯ grt* and *n ḥm=f* with the verb *rdỉ*, and the gap right after *ḥm=f* with the preposition *ḥr*: "He having [verb] (or 'for/to him'?), she did that which he desired, while his Person [charge]d (?) him (lit. "placed upon him") (with) sending/writing to […]" (*H* 7).[239] Lacau, on the other hand, does not provide a restoration, but his translation indicates that he believed that the gap between *ḥm=f* and *=f* would have contained a noun rather than a *sḏm*(*.n*)*=f* form: "Or, le […] de Sa Majesté […] fut envoyé vers […]" (*LC* § 161). This results in a pseudo-verbal construction with the stative, thus giving *h*(*ꜣ*)*b* a passive meaning, but does not account for the *=f*. It will be noted that, throughout the narrative of the text, the two main actors are Hatshepsut and Amun, while there is no mention of any other king or male participant in the festivities. If *ḥm=f* refers to Amun, then it is unknown to whom the suffix pronoun *n=f* refers—and vice-versa. Unless the dative should be understood reflexively, refers back to Amun as well, could this actually be a reference to another king, most likely Thutmose III? If this is indeed a reference to another king, a search for his name would most likely be in vain, as royal texts (and unsurprisingly especially coronation texts) refrain from mentioning "rival" kings, such as Ay in Horemheb's Turin inscription as will be seen in the fifth chapter,[240] or Thutmose II in Thutmose

[239] According to the *Wörterbuch*, Hannig, and Faulkner, *rdỉ m ḥr* (*m*) gives the sense of "to charge (somebody with something)" (*Wb.* II, 468; Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 1539, II, 21; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 155), while the preposition *m* seems to be missing here. Gillen translates: "while indeed his Majesty [made] [for] him a dispatch to […]" (Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 16).

[240] See: chapter 5, 257–8, where it is argued that Ay is not referred to in the section dealing with Horemheb's "coronation." Furthermore, it is known that Horemheb did not even refer to a word meaning "king" in two scribal statues of his—let alone Ay himself by name, even though they date from the reign of this king (Kawai, "Ay versus Horemheb", 281). The two statues in question are: the grey granodiorite one in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, probably from Memphis (catalogue number

III's *Texte de la jeunesse*.[241] It is certain that the *=f* does not refer to Hatshepsut, as she is referred to with feminine forms and pronouns in the rest of the text; the question of whether it refers to a king, a male participant in the festivities, or to a place or object of masculine gender, however, must remain open.

1. *Amun is out on a festival procession, but does not perform an expected bỉɜy.t at the Station (BL 31; H 7–8; # 222 + 35 + 184 + 295,1–5; LC 97–8, 100–2, § 162–3; G 16)*

This section of the text consists of blocks 222 + 35 + 184 + 295. The setting here is one of a grand event which involved a public procession of Amun, with *tɜ r-ḏr=f* "the entire land" attending, as well as the *sms.w* (or *sr.w* or *wr.w*) *ʿḥ* "elders of the palace." This suggests that this was taking place in an at least partially public section of Karnak Temple, most likely the open forecourt in front of the 5th Pylon discussed above. As things were going to plan, something unexpected happened:

[*m ḫt nn*][242] (# 222,1) *wḏɜ ḥm=f ḥr* [*bỉɜ*]*y*[*.t*] *psḏ.t=f m šmsw.t=f*
nn (2) *grt ỉr.t bỉɜy.t=f r ʿḥʿw nb n nsw.t*
tɜ r-ḏr=f (3) *šsp.n*[243] *sgrỉ*
n rḫ.tw ỉn šps.w-nsw.t
wr.w(4)-*ʿḥ wɜḥ*(*.w*)*-n-ḥr*
ỉmy.w-ḫt=f ḥr sy ỉšst
sɜ.w-ỉb (5) *ḫpr*(*.w*) *m tp-šw*
ỉb.w=sn sdɜ(*.w*) *ḫr bỉɜy.t=f*
[After these things,] (# 222,1) his Person (Amun) proceeded, [performing won]de[rs], his Ennead in his following,
without (2), however, performing his wonder (*bỉɜy.t*) at the *Station of the Lord* of the King.
The entire land (lit. 'the land to its limit') (3) received silence,

23.10.1. See: Winlock, "Statue", 1–5, pls. I–IV), and the one from Karnak, first published by Kawai ("Ay versus Horemheb", 279–86, figs. 8–11).

[241] *Urk.* IV, 158. Chapter 4, 135–7.

[242] This phrase is actually not on Block 222, but is a reliable reconstruction of the last section of the previous, missing, block based on later passages (e.g. # 222,7: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 8).

[243] As noted by Lacau, the subject here is omitted (*Chapelle*, 102 (§ 163,e)). For omission of subject, see: Allen, *Egyptian*, 250–1, § 17.5; Hoch, *Grammar*, 200, § 140; Gardiner, *Grammar*, 396–7, § 486–7.

"One does not know" said[244] the royal nobles,
The elders (4) of the palace were bowed-of-face,
Those who were in his (Amun's) following (said): "Why?"
The wise-of-heart[245] (5) became foolish (lit. "empty-headed")[246],
Their hearts trembling beneath his wonder (or *bỉɜy.t*-sign?).

The term *bỉɜy.t* has long been a problematic one to understand; in the first part of his article on the Chapelle Rouge text, Gillen attempts to shed more light on what it means and entails.[247] Of the two most common translations, "oracle" and "wonder," he argues for the latter.[248] He does not exclude "oracle" altogether however, seeing the *bỉɜy.t* ("wonder") as "a confirmation [by a god] of the preceding action or approval of a new situation."[249] "Oracle," therefore, is the word he uses to denote the sum of the "preceding action" and the *bỉɜy.t*.[250]

The second part of this extract indicates that the god was expected to "perform a wonder" at a specific location within Karnak temple called the *Station of the Lord of the King*, but did not. The next few columns of text are devoted to expressing the shock and confusion not only of various attendees, such as the "elders of the palace," but also of those who were in the procession itself: *ỉmy.w-ḫt=f ḥr s(y) ỉsšt* "Those who were in his (Amun's) following (said): 'Why?'" (# 222,4), thus accentuating the surprise everyone felt for this deviation from the norm. This would have truly been an extremely meaningful event. The *Station of the Lord*, as the name suggests, seems to have been the designated location of the king during the conduction of rituals, and based on the mention of *tɜ-r-ḏr=f* to witness Amun's lack of a performance of a *bỉɜy.t*, it is clear that

[244] The speakers are introduced with *in* (Lacau, *Chapelle*, 102 (§ 163,f); Gardiner, *Grammar*, 347–8, § 436).

[245] Lacau translated this as "Ceux qui étaient contents" (*Chapelle*, 100, § 163 and 102, § 163,j).

[246] I here follow Gillen's translation, which was preferred over Lacau's "triste" (*Chapelle*, 102, § 163,k).

[247] Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 7–14. See footnote 13 for a comparison of different ways authors translated this word.

[248] *Loc. cit.*

[249] *Ibid.*, 11.

[250] *Ibid.*, 10–11. Černý's fundamental work on oracles remains a good introduction and reference on the subject, but the term *bỉɜy.t* as such is not discussed ("Oracles", 35–48; cf. Kákosy, *LÄ* IV, s.v. "Orakel", 600–6).

it was situated in a public part of the temple.[251] The space and detail devoted to the description of the attendees' reaction, regardless of whether the reigning king, Thutmose III, was present at these events despite his young age, at the lack of the expected performance of the *bỉꜣy.t* at the *Station* is indicative of the immensity of the significance attached to this event which revealed Amun's dissatisfaction with the way things were with the throne.[252]

The *bỉꜣy.t* at the end of this passage is difficult to understand. It appears that it can refer to either one of two things: (1) as a "normal" *bỉꜣy.t*-sign, as explained above. The reactions described, however, are to Amun's not having performed such a "wonder," so it must follow that, when it is expected, even the lack of Amun indicating his will is seen as *bỉꜣy.t*. This would suggest that this term was a flexible one which did not refer to any specific action of a god, but rather any indication of their will, whether through action or inaction. (2) Alternatively, but perhaps less likely, *bỉꜣy.t* here could be understood as an emotion that a god inspires, in which case the better translation would be that the hearts of the onlookers were trembling through "wonder of him," in a construction akin to *ḥry.t=f* "the fear of him."

At the general shock of everyone attending therefore, Amun skipped making his stop at the *Station of the Lord*, possibly ignoring Thutmose III in the process, who may have been stationed there. It is perhaps for this reason that Thutmose III, in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, made special note of his being "stationed at the *Station of the Lord*" when Amun stopped in front of him, and performed a *bỉꜣy.t*-sign for him. Even though this same location is referred to simply as the *ʿḥʿw n nb* in his text, while here, it has the addition of *n nsw.t* "of the king," it is clear, as demonstrated below and in the following chapter, that whether or not they refer to the same feature of the temple, they would have both been located in the same area of Karnak temple: in the court preceding the main pylon, which would have normally featured a *wadjyt*.[253]

[251] Breasted, too, believed that the *Station* was the designated place for the king to stand during ceremonies, but placed it in the sanctuary of the temple: *Chapter*, 16–17 no. 23.

[252] Murnane, *Coregencies*, 34.

[253] *Infra*, 104; chapter 4, 141.

2. *The procession continues, and reaches the ʿḥ-nsw.t (BL 31; H 8–9; # 222 + 35 + 184 + 295,5–13; LC 98–9, 100, 102–4, § 162–3; G 16)*

(# 222,5) … *spr* (6)[254] *ḥm=f r tp-ỉtrw ḥr bỉɜy.t ʿɜ.t wr.t r rw.ty n* (7) *ʿḥ-nsw.t*

nty ḥr gs n wɜ.t-wḏḥ.w

m-ḫt nn rdỉ.tw (# 35,8) *ḥr m ḫd*

n rḫ.tw nt.t ỉr.ty=fy

nn […] (9) *ḫr* [*ḥr*(*.y?*)] [*tp*][255] *ḏrw m ḫprw nṯr pn*

wn.ỉ[*n ḥm n* (10) *nb-r-ḏr sḫd*][256]*.n ḥr=f r ỉɜbt.t ḥr bỉɜy.t ʿɜ.t wr.t*

(11) *r rw.ty ỉmnt.y ʿḥ n wsḫ.t n.t Nn-wɜ=ỉ-r=f*

nty (12) *ḥr mɜʿ n tp-ỉtrw*

ỉw.ỉn r=s nb.t-tɜ.wy m-ḫnw ḏsrw ʿḥ=s

(13) *wn.ḫr=s ḥr rdỉ.t ỉɜw m ḫsfw nb nṯr.w*

(# 222,5) His Person reached (6) the *Head of the River*, performing a very great *bỉɜy.t*-sign at the double gates of (7) the *ʿḥ-nsw.t*

which are on the side of the *Way of the Offering Tables*.

After these things, the face was turned (# 35,8), going northward,[257]

one not knowing what he would do.

without […] (9) near/under [above ?] an obstacle in the form of this god.

Th[en the Person of (10) the Lord-to-the-Limit], his face [turn]ed to the East,

performing a very great *bỉɜy.t*-sign

---

[254] This column number was not indicated by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 8).

[255] Helck seems to have followed Lacau's tentative suggestions. Regarding this passage, Lacau remarked: "Traces peu sûres" (*Chapelle*, 100 (§ 162 a,α)) and, unlike Helck's transcription, the *ḫ* in *ḫr* is presented between brackets as well (*ibid.*, 98, § 162 a). It remains unclear whether *ḫr* here is the preposition or the particle, and how *ḥr*(*.y?*)*-tp* is to be translated in this fragmentary context (*ibid.*, 103, § 163 a,r). Gillen provides no suggestions ("Historical Inscription", 16). Burgos and Larché have detected no traces of any signs between *nn* (col. 8) and *ḏrw* (col. 9).

[256] This restoration is possible because the equivalent passages from the Deir el-Bahari version (cols. 7–8) have largely survived, where the *ḫ* in *sḫd* is indicated between brackets by Lacau, and the *r* and *ḏr* in "Lord-to-the-Limit" are marked as doubtful (*Chapelle*, 98 (§ 162)). Helck agreed with Lacau, but the reading of *nb-r-ḏr* is not marked as uncertain (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 8). The verb preceding the walking legs determinative (D 54) seems to have contained a sign not present in the Deir el-Bahari version. Based on the traces detected by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 31 # 35), it would appear that it is the quail chick (G 43); this is corroborated by Lacau and Chevrier (*Chapelle*, 98 (§ 162)).

[257] Gitton ("Palais", 66), Lacau (*Chapelle*, 101, 103 (§ 163,p)), and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 16) translated the expression *rdỉ ḥr m* (*ḫd*) as "to command (to go north)" (cf. *rdỉ m ḥr*: *Wb.* II, 468), while *ḥr* should be regarded as a noun ("face"), not a preposition, yielding the translation given above: "to turn one's face (in a direction)" (Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 1724, *rḏỉ ḥr* (a)).

(11) at the western double gates of the palace-of-the-court (called) *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*

which are on (12) the bank of the *Head of the River*.

Then the Mistress of the Two Lands came to it (the court) from the interior of the *ḏsrw* of her palace,

(13) and she gave praise at the approach of the Lord of the Gods.

After describing the surprise felt by those present at Amun's not having made his stop at the *Station of the Lord*, the text goes on to mention the rest of his processional movements. The specific routes that the procession takes, as related by the text, has been the subject of much discussion.[258] Gitton and O'Connor treat only the passages under discussion here, while Stephan provides an overall reconstruction. The views held in this thesis coincide most with those of Stephan, except on two crucial points.[259] While the general layout of the temple at the time of these events is known, any attempt at a reconstruction of the specific stops and movements of the procession is hypothetical, complicated further by the fact that the inscription survives only partially. Even in the case of an identifiable place name, such as the *tp-ỉtrw* (or at least one of them), its precise location and dimensions are unknown, factors which can significantly alter the interpretation of the events of the text at hand. As such, the analysis of the text presented in this chapter focuses more on key features and events, but some attention will be devoted to the movements of the procession.

According to Gitton, the first sentence places double gates of the *ʿḥ-nsw.t* somewhere near the *Head of the River*, and on the side of the *Way of Offerings*. He located these double doors a little to the east of the *tp-ỉtrw*, in a parallel position to and looking onto the *Way of Offerings*, a notion with which O'Connor agrees (figs. 9 no. 3; 11; 12 no. 6).[260] While I agree with this placement of the double gates, the size of the *Head of the River* as envisioned by Gitton seems rather small, roughly having the length of a single wing of the 4th Pylon, which was overall 62.6 m. long. While it is true that its size is unknown, such a small basin seems too small to accommodate the *Userhat*, the riverine barge of Amun, along with the rest of the small fleet which would

[258] Gitton, "Palais", 63 ff ; O'Connor, "Beloved", 270–9; Stephan, *Dekoration*, 30–43.

[259] *Infra*, 70–1, 106 no. 448.

[260] Fig. 1 no. 3 in: Gitton, "Palais", 65; cf. fig. 7.3 no. 6 in: O'Connor, "Beloved", 298.

have docked there, while still giving them room to maneuver.[261] In contradiction, it is worth pointing out, however, that the earliest depictions of the portable processional barques of Mut and Khonsu dates to the reign of Tutankhamun, but it is almost certain that they already existed under Amenhotep III.[262] While this does not exclude the possibility that they did not have their own river barges yet during the early reign of Thutmose III, Karlshausen suggests that their absence from Hatshepsut's depictions of the Opet and Valley festivals could at least indicate that Mut and Khonsu did not travel with Amun to and from Karnak.[263] Either way, this would have reduced the amount of room needed in the *Head of the River* during the reigns of Thutmose III/Hatshepsut.[264]

Based on the verb *ḫd* (l. 8), Lacau saw this as meaning that the image of Amun would have been taken back to the *Head of the River*, where it would have been brought aboard the *Userhat*, to travel northwards a short distance on water, probably down a secondary canal parallel to the main body of the Nile.[265] It is known, however, that *ḫd* could also be used to refer to going north by land, as Lacau himself admits.[266] Gitton suggested both, but left the question open "[f]aute de précision dans le texte lui-même."[267] According to O'Connor:

> This seems a meaningless act, if he is to shortly *disembark* and return … to Karnak temple, from which he has only just emerged.[268] Second, Hatshepsut joins Amun-Re via the west gate of her palace, facing onto the canal referred to above; this also seems unnecessary, for if the pair are then to go into Karnak temple, it would seem more convenient (and more dignified) if Hatshepsut had

[261] Malqata palace's *Birket Habu* was, to say the least, monumental in scale, and would have covered more ground than the entire sacred precinct of Karnak. A comparable size for the *Head of the River* at Karnak should probably be considered. Assuming the size of Karnak's basin is entirely theoretical however, and it may be that it never needed as much room to accommodate incoming ships as *Birket Habu*, which was first dug and later expanded on the occasion of *Sed*-festivals, for which occasion preparations had to be made to accommodate the large number of required ships.

[262] Karlshausen, *Barque*, 47–8, 52. The author also proposes that it is likely that Mut's existed even during the reign of Hatshepsut (*ibid.*, 47–8).

[263] *Ibid.*, 47.

[264] The 2nd Pylon was built during the reign of Horemheb. If the assumption that a new *tp-ỉtrw* kept being pushed further and further west as more pylons were added is true, then we can imagine that a new one was dug outside this new pylon, one which would have been larger in order to accommodate the addition of more riverine barges (cf. Epigraphic Survey, *Festival Procession of Opet*, 17, 68). As with those of Mut and Khonsu just discussed, the barge of the reigning king does not appear in the archaeological record with certainty before the reign of Tutankhamun (Karlshausen, *Barque*, 62).

[265] Lacau and Chevrier, 103 (§ 163,q).

[266] *Wb*. III, 354, 16.

[267] Gitton, "Palais", 65–6.

[268] Cf. Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 651.

> joined Amun-Re via the southern palace-gateway, which opened onto the processional way itself. Moreover, returning to Karnak via the west gate and the palace forces Amun-Re to reenter his temple through side-entrances, a procedure which seems inappropriate for any Egyptian god.[269]

In order to overcome these difficulties, he argues that Hatshepsut and Amun would have embarked, and then sailed south to Luxor Temple. He argues that the *ḥw.t ꜥ3.t Mɜꜥ.t* "Great Mansion of Maat" where Amun takes her very soon afterwards in the text (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,19), was located not in Karnak Temple, its generally accepted location, but in Amun's southern sanctuary, that is, Luxor Temple, given that an architrave inscription there refers to the temple as Amenhotep III's place (*s.t*) of justification (*mɜꜥ.t*).[270] The reference to Luxor Temple with a term which includes "Maat" need not signify an identification between it and the *ḥw.t ꜥ3.t Mɜꜥ.t* of our text, however.[271] O'Connor sees the overall sequence of events related by the *Historical Inscription* as analogous to that in Horemheb's coronation text, in that they both traveled to Luxor Temple during their "coronation ceremonies" (figs. 11–12).[272] His main arguments in favour of this rest on his identification of the *pr-nsw.t* in the Turin text (ll. 15, 20) with Karnak temple's adjoining palace. In the fifth chapter, I point out the evidence from within the Turin inscription that while *pr-nsw.t* could plausibly refer to Luxor Temple itself or its palace, that it could not refer to Karnak's.[273] The evidence from Hatshepsut's text, in its turn, does not support the Opet festival being the backdrop of the *Historical Inscription*. The very occasion of Amun's processional outing is unknown due to the beginning of the text being missing, and nowhere in the

---

[269] O'Connor, "Beloved", 277–8.

[270] *Ibid.*, 278. For *Great Mansion of Maat*, see: Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 87; Laboury, "Portrait", 270; Blyth, *Karnak*, 59–60, 78; Laboury, *Statuaire*, 42 and pl. 2; el-Hegazy, "Palais de Maât", 54–63; Golvin and Goyon, *Bâtisseurs*, 45; Barguet, *Temple*, 319–20, *contra* Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 104 (§ 163,y). There are only four known references to the *Great Mansion of Maat*, and one of these is the one we encounter in the *Historical Inscription*. The others argue in favour of placing it in Karnak. One is on the north side of Thutmose I's southern obelisk: *ꜥ3-pḥty wsr-ḫpš wɜḏ-rnp.wt-m-ḥ.wt-ꜥ3.t-Mɜꜥ.t* (*Urk.* IV, 94,6). For same Horus of Gold name, see: Barguet, *Temple*, 114. This name of Thutmose I is furthermore encountered only at Karnak (*ibid.*, 320). The third known mention of the *Great Mansion of Maat* is on the north wall of the corridor of the Annals (*PM* II, 97 (282); Barguet, *Temple*, 152, 320; Wresz., *Atlas* II, pls. 33 a–b), where Thutmose III is said to be "the beloved of Amun in the *Great Mansion of Maat*." All of these primary sources indicate that the *Palais de Maât* was somewhere in Karnak, and their concentration in the central part of Karnak supports the notion that it was located somewhere in this area, whether or not it did indeed specifically denote the *salles d'offrandes*.

[271] O'Connor, "Beloved", 278; cf. *Urk.* IV, 1683,1–3; Bell, "Luxor", 254.

[272] O'Connor, "Beloved", 278; Figs. 7.3 and 7.4 in: *ibid.*, 298–9.

[273] Chapter 5, 217–39.

main inscription is the Opet festival mentioned.[274] Furthermore, if the evidence from the tomb of Ramose and Hatnefer is taken at face value, Hatshepsut became king in the season of *Peret*, while it is well known that the Opet was celebrated in the second month of *Akhet*.[275]

O'Connor's version of events is also contradicted by the fact that the text simply does not mention the procession toward the south (i.e. Luxor Temple): it simply goes from mentioning the *bỉꜣy.t* at the double gates of the royal palace, to going north, and finally simply turning east, when another *bỉꜣy.t* is performed at the western gates of the royal palace. Regarding Horemheb's Turin inscription, according to him, no mention is made whatsoever of what took place in Luxor Temple.[276] While it is true that many episodes of a given event can be omitted, an important event such as those which would have taken place in Luxor Temple on the occasion of the Opet festival are unlikely to have gone unmentioned altogether. Of the fact that Hatshepsut and Amun in the *Historical Inscription*, on the other hand, were still in Karnak at this point in the text there can be no doubt, for right after his meeting with Hatshepsut, Amun takes her to the *Great Mansion of Maat* (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,19), which was certainly located somewhere inside the *temenos* of Karnak Temple.

I propose a course events closer to that of Gitton (figs. 9–10); the festival procession was limited to Karnak, and his interpretation of the events does seem, on the whole and omitting details, to fit with the textual, as well as archaeological evidence: Amun exiting the temple, proceeding on its east-west axis, along the *wꜣ.t-wḏḥw*, until it ends at the *Head of the River*, where he performs a *bỉꜣy.t* at the double gates of the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f*, at which point he goes north (most likely by land), going along a body of water, until he turns east to face the western gates of this palace.[277] The details of these events cannot be reconstructed in detail with certainty however, pending further archaeological progress on the (hypothetical, but likely) palace adjoining the forecourt and the intricate system of canals which would have surrounded Karnak temple not

[274] In only one part is Luxor Temple mentioned in the *Historical Inscription*, on block 287, which relates a festival procession of Amun in the temple's forecourt, but (1) this is a flashback, and (2) the events are said to be taking place in the second month of *Peret*, when it is know that the Opet Festival took place in *Akhet*. The main narrative of the *Historical Inscription* therefore refers neither to Luxor Temple nor the Opet festival.

[275] See, for example: *Urk.* IV, 742,1–2; 824, 10. Cf. Darnell, "Opet", 1.

[276] O'Connor, "Beloved", 278. Cf. Meyer, *Senenmut*, 23–4; Dorman, *Monuments*, 25–26.

[277] Gitton, "Palais", 63 ff.

only by the time work on the 1st Pylon began, but also in the various stages of development thereof as the temple expanded gradually over time.[278]

Cabrol, on the other hand, suggests an alternative interpretation which also conforms to the available archaeological and textual evidence: that the two mentions of *tp-ỉtrw* refer to separate ones, locating the second where Gitton did, and the first between Karnak and the Mut Temple. This, however, as she acknowledges, rests on the existence of an archaeologically unattested canal linking the first, southern, *tp-ỉtrw* on the north-south axis of the temple with the second on the east-west axis, and by extension also on the assumption that the palaces referred to in these passages are two separate ones.[279] Admittedly, it is not impossible for there to have been two palaces, one on each axis for the convenience of the king and perhaps the procession, but it must be borne in mind that this is entirely hypothetical, and an explanation would need to be provided for why only the second of these structures is named. Furthermore, according to Cabrol:

> Si Amon était sorti du temple par l'issue ouest, pourquoi la barque processionnelle se serait-elle embarquée pour s'adresser à la porte ouest d'un palais dont elle vient de dépasser la porte sud (non sans la saluer)? Un tel parcours est d'autant plus invraisemblable qu'il s'agit pour Amon d'aller chercher la reine pour retourner ensuite en sa compagnie dans Karnak … Il nous semble plus plausible d'envisager que … la complexité du trajet suivi par le dieu et l'emploi de divers modes de transport s'expliquent par le fait qu'il a non seulement une longue distance à parcourir, et qu'il suit à l'aller un itinéraire différent de celui de son retour dans le temple.[280]

As pointed out regarding O'Connor's interpretation, the movement northward need not necessarily have been by boat, thus reducing the assumed complexity of the procedures involved. Furthermore, Amun "reaching" the *tp-ỉtrw* need not imply that he actually went to the boarding area of the *Userhat* at the *Head of the River*, but it does follow that the double gates simply lay in close proximity.[281] While it is indeed to be wondered, in the case of one *tp-ỉtrw* and one *ꜥḥ-nsw.t* (the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f*), why Amun would have performed a *bỉꜣy.t* at the double gates of the palace without entering through them (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8; # 222,6–7), to go and enter from a presumably lesser entrance on the west side of the structure (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8–9; # 35,7–12), arguing that this is impossible

[278] Boraik, "Quays", 65 ff.; Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 646–52.

[279] Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 650–2.

[280] *Ibid.*, 651.

[281] Fig. 1 no. 3 in: Gitton, "Palais", 65.

simply because it seems unlikely or less efficient is certainly not reason enough to discard this view. Two critical pertinent factors are unknown, factors which, had they survived or been included in the inscription, could have provided satisfactory reasons for the trajectory of the procession. The first regards the festival occasion, knowledge of which may have explained the conduction of certain (unmentioned) rituals at specific locations, even if it seemed unlikely. The second is the lack of information on the layout of the palace: it need not have been one simple rectangular structure, as opposed to a larger complex of buildings, as the presence of the more than one double gate would suggest (assuming that the *ḥ-nsw.t* on the *wꜣ.t-wḏḥw* and *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* are one and the same). For example, the first factor could have clarified why Amun performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs at the south gates of the palace without passing through, instead going around the building (or complex) to enter through the western gates. Future discoveries on the layout of the palace and its position in relation to Karnak, on the other hand, could reveal that Amun did indeed go through the *rw.ty n ḥ-nsw.t* in order to reach the western gates: it could highly tentatively be suggested that Amun, after having crossed the southern double gates (which are on the side of the *wꜣ.t-wḏḥ.w*: fig. 10 nos. 1–2), went along the basin (therefore heading north), and turned to the east, where he would have found himself facing another entrance, the western double gates of the royal palace (fig. 10 no. 3), this time designated by the term *ḥ n wsḫ.t* "the palace of the court."

Until more pertinent archaeological evidence is uncovered, the question must remain open, but the *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f* (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8; # 35,11), as demonstrated above, is a *ḥ-nsw.t*, like the *ḥ-nsw.t* encountered first (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8; # 222,7), so it could at the very least be said that the identification of the two palaces cannot be excluded with certainty.

Regarding the performance of *bỉꜣy.t* in these passages, it is clear that they function as the god's means to indicate his will. Amun's not having performed his expected *bỉꜣy.t*-sign at the *Station of the Lord* (presumably a regular stop), which seems to have been located in a public area of the temple (and perhaps even where Thutmose III might have stood), and therefore perhaps its forecourt, was received with great shock by those present. In the confusion which ensued, the god decided to gradually reveal his intentions, known only to him, to make Hatshepsut king; he did so by

performing *bỉꜣy.t*-signs at key areas of the temple to guide the movement of the procession, slowly leading them to the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f*, where Hatshepsut was.

Once Amun had finished performing his *bỉꜣy.t* at the western double gates of the *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t* (*I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*), the text states that Hatshepsut stepped out of her palace, and came to meet Amun at "it." The suffix pronoun *=s* can only be referring to the *wsḫ.t*, since it is the only feminine word in the preceding sentence.[282]

As for the word *ḏsrw*, Hoffmeier sees it as simply an epithet for "throne room," building on its sense of being "segregated" or "secluded."[283] He refers, for example, to how "segregated" the throne room of the palace adjoining the First Court of the temple of Medinet Habu is, and demonstrates via passages he cites how much of an honour it was for a private individual to be admitted into the *ḏsrw* of a given *ʿḥ*.[284]

The evidence from the First Court at Medinet Habu, as well as Horemheb's Turin inscription support the notion that the first meeting-place of the king and the god at the beginning of a festival was (at least in these cases) inside a temple's court: according to a scene and its caption, pertaining to the doors communicating the First Court with the palace on its left (south) side, Ramses III, in a *ḫʿỉ-nsw.t* "royal appearance," enters the temple from the palace ([*m*] *ʿḥ.t n ḥw.t=f*), *r sḫʿỉ ỉt=f ỉmn m ḥb=f n ỉn.t* "in order to cause his father Amun to appear in his Festival of the Valley," while in the Turin inscription, it appears that Horemheb also first met Amun in a public area of Karnak temple, at his *bs-nsw.t* "royal induction."[285] It therefore appears that the king had to first join the festival, enter the temple and into the forecourt to meet with the processional image of Amun, after which the festival could resume.

---

[282] While it is a dual, *rw.ty* would have been treated as a masculine word (Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 511,1), which is supported by the fact that the relative pronoun referring to it is the masculine *nty*. While *nty* was also later used to refer to feminine, as well as plural antecedents (*ibid.*, § 199), this does not apply to our text, where gender is generally respected (see, for example, the *n.t* in: *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t n.t Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f*).

[283] Hoffmeier, *Sacred*, 181, 183.

[284] *Ibid.*, 179 (for temple palace at Medinet Habu) and 178–83 (for instances of *ḏsrw*).

[285] Medinet Habu: *PM* II, 493 (65), *MH* II, 123 B; cf. *PM* II, 495 (78) c, *MH* IV, 239 A (col. 1) and *PM* II, 495 (78) d, *MH* IV, 239 B (col. 1). Turin inscription: *Urk.* IV, 2116,15–18 (l. 13) and 2117,4–6 (l. 14). Similarly to Horemheb's text, another scene on the inside passage of one of the doors on the south wall of the First Court at Medinet Habu depicts Ramses III entering the forecourt/temple to *mꜣ* "see/meet" Amun: *r mꜣ ỉt=f ỉmn-Rʿ m ḥb=f tp n ỉp.t* "in order to see/meet his father Amun-Ra in his festival at the beginning of Opet" (*PM* II, 495 (77) d, *MH* IV, 237 A). See chapter 5, 209–12.

In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, too, the first meeting between Thutmose III and Amun took place in a public part of the temple, most likely the *wadjyt* which was a part of the temple's forecourt (fig. 8: in front of 5th Pylon).[286] This meeting took place after an unexpected action by Amun, when he started to go around the *wadjyt* for unknown reasons, until he stopped in front of Thutmose III. In the *Historical Inscription* as well, the first meeting between Amun and Hatshepsut took place in the temple's forecourt, after an interruption of the expected course of the festival. If the ritual events of a given festival were to be triggered with the entrance of a king into his presence in the temple forecourt, then it must be imagined that in the case of the *Historical Inscription*, Thutmose III, or a substitute (due to the king's young age) would have done this for Amun to have already been in procession by the time he first met Hatshepsut. Similarly, in the following chapter, it is demonstrated that it was the reigning king at the time of the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, Thutmose II, who was the main officiant in the festival before Amun's meeting with Thutmose III.[287]

It seems that the overall chain of events is the following: Amun, probably after having met with Thutmose III or a substitute in the forecourt of the Karnak complex, did not stop at the *Station of the Lord*, possibly overlooking him in the process, but went directly to the palace of Hatshepsut, where she was staying, and performed a *bỉɜy.t* at its western gates, therefore marking her as the true intended recipient of his "wonders" (fig. 10 no. 3). Hatshepsut, realising this, stepped out of her palace and onto a court (fig. 10 no. 5 shows its suggested location), where she praised Amun (*ḫr rdỉ.t ỉɜw*) as he was approaching her (*m ḫsfw nb nṯr.w*). If the temple and palace were in a configuration similar to Ramses III's mortuary complex in Medinet Habu, in that it is shared by both Karnak temple (on its south and east sides) and *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* (to the north), these two features would have been connected by the three doors discussed by Gabolde mentioned above (at fig. 10 no. 4).[288]

It is unfortunately left unstated whether Amun actually stepped through the western gates of the *ʿḥ n wsḫ.t* (fig. 10 no. 3) after having performed his *bỉɜy.t* there,

[286] Chapter 4, 135–7.

[287] In this vein, I would like to draw attention again to the fragmentary start of the *Historical Inscription*, preserved only in the Deir el-Bahari version, where there seems to be a reference made to a male agent qualified with the pronoun *=f*. While it is tempting to see this as a reference to Thutmose III or, more likely, a substitute (given the lack of *ḫm* before *=f*), this is entirely hypothetical.

[288] The Medinet Habu temple's First Court also had three doorways connecting it to its palace (*PM* II, plan 47 nos. 77–9).

but it is logical to assume that this was so. This, however, raises the question: did Amun enter the *ḥ* via its "western gates" and then leave it, without Hatshepsut coming to meet him there? This seems disrespectful to the god. Furthermore, this seems contradictory with the statement that Hatshepsut "came to it (the court)," and "gave praise at the approach of the Lord of the Gods," which seems to imply that Hatshepsut was already waiting for Amun in the court (fig. 10 no. 5), or had started to position herself there at hearing of the divergence from the normal course of the festival, and Amun's coming to meet her at her palace.

These difficulties seem to disappear however if one imagines that the former was fronted by its own forecourt to its south (which would have been located to the north fig. 10 no. 4), in which case it could easily be imagined that Amun went through the western gates (fig. 10 no. 3), crossed them into this forecourt, where Hatshepsut was already waiting for him, after which they both crossed over to the temple's *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* (fig. 10 no. 5). This seems to be the only argument in favour of differentiating between *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* from the *ḥ n wsḫ.t*, but does not take into account the fact that Amun is stated to have stepped into a *ḥ* "palace" (of a *wsḫ.t* "court" or "hall"), and not into a *wsḫ.t*.

Before venturing further, a final note on Cabrol's interpretation: the god took matters into his own hands by diverging—as planned by Hatshepsut in reality—from the expected programme of the festival by not performing an expected *bỉꜣy.t*, meaning that the movements of the procession were dictated by the festival occasion only up until this point, beyond which it can be assumed that they were conducted in accordance with Hatshepsut's designs. Even though Cabrol does not specifically mention in which palace the first meeting between Hatshepsut and Amun took place, it is clear from the text that this would have been in *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* which, according to her and in accordance with general Egyptological consensus, was located on the east-west axis. It must therefore be wondered, if Hatshepsut indeed had free reign on the planning of the movements of the procession, why she would have decided, as argued by Cabrol, to have the procession exit the temple from the north-south processional route to go to the *ḥ-nsw.t* there, when she could have planned for it to go to the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f*, where she was. If Cabrol is correct in assuming that Amun would have visited that palace on the north-south axis, where Hatshepsut was not, an obvious explanation would be the same (unknown) considerations of constrictions of

correct ritual action during a given festival occasion (argued for above), a factor which applies just as well to this interpretation as to Gitton's. In other words, the movements of the procession as presented by Cabrol, no less than those of Gitton's interpretation, exhibit the same apparent inefficiency and lack of logic she criticised, an inefficiency which can simply be explained with an attempt to conform to correct ritual procedure.

Returning to the view adopted in this thesis, that only one palace, on the east-west axis, is featured in the *Historical Inscription*: the exact mechanics of how Hatshepsut exited the *ḥ-nsw.t*, presumably around the time Amun was performing his *bỉꜣy.t* at the *rw.ty ỉmnt.y ḥ n wsḫ.t n.t Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f* "the western gates of the palace of the court, *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*," to go to the court which the palace shares with the temple, at which point she was already prepared to receive the divine procession, must remain unknown, especially considering the presently lacking knowledge of the layout of the temple. However this would have taken place, there can be no doubt that, while these events were undoubtedly genuinely surprising to many of those attending, that Hatshepsut must have had a hand in the way things turned out. The evidence from Deir el-Medina suggests a level of "coordination" between judicial courts and divine processions,[289] but it remains unknown "whether the officials could request the god to appear or had to wait until he came out on other business of some sort."[290] There was also awareness of the use of oracular consultations for personal ends.[291]

In the *Historical Inscription*, Hatshepsut could similarly have "rigged" a festival occasion in honour of Amun to have him, by not performing an expected *bỉꜣy.t* at the *Station*, where the young Thutmose III or a substitute would have been posted, express dissatisfaction with matters of the throne, and proceed to raise Hatshepsut to the status of Pharaoh. Certainly the solemn and public nature of these occasions, and even more so the shock at seeing Amun not performing a specific *bỉꜣy.t* for the reigning king, would have lent great credibility to Amun's decision. This would have been the culmination of years of Hatshepsut gradually seizing power, the logical conclusion. A portion of the *Historical Inscription* relates, in flashbacks, two occasions on which kingship was predicted to Hatshepsut, the date of only one of which survives, to the 2nd

[289] McDowell, *Jurisdiction*, 112–14.

[290] *Ibid.*, 113.

[291] *Ibid.*, 110–11.

regnal year of most likely Thutmose III (*BL* 40; *H* 25–6; # 287,1–7).[292] The favourable outcome of the events of the *Historical Inscription* is further consolidated in the text by the numerous speeches which make up the majority of the text. Some are spoken by divinities, while others are by Hatshepsut herself, but both serve to lend further credence to the unfolding events. Amun, for example, in his first speech, reveals his intentions to enthrone Hatshepsut (*BL* 33; *H* 10–13; *DeB* 12–16 and # 166 + 22,1–13; *LC* 105–14, § 164–8; *G* 18), while the Uraeus-goddess, in her first speech, states, among others, that she shall appear on Hatshepsut's head (*BL* 34; *H* 16–17; # 44 + 143,1–15). Hatshepsut, in her part, reminds those present of the *bỉɜy.t*-signs Amun had already performed for her in the past (*BL* 40; *H* 25–6; # 287,1–7; *LC* 133–5, § 179; *G* 22), while asserting that it was the divine will of her father Amun to make her king (*BL* 41; *H* 26–9; # 161 + 19 + 63 + 21, *DeB* 73–80; *LC* 136–40, § 180–1, 145–6, § 185; *G* 21–3).

In this vein, Hatshepsut also claimed ignorance of what was going to happen by attributing all of the events which took place to none other than Amun himself.[293]

3. *Hatshepsut meets Amun, who leads her to the Palace of Maat (BL 31–2; H 9; # 222 + 35+ 184 + 295,14–29; LC 99–100, 101, 104, § 162–3; G 16–18)*

   (# 35,14)[294] *m-ḫt nn rdỉ.t=s s*(*y*) *ḥr ḫ.t=s m-bɜḥ-ˁ ḥm=f m* (# 184,15) *ḏd*

   wr.wy nn r sḫr.w ḥm=k

   ỉt=ỉ pw (16) *kɜ ntt nb.t*

   ỉsšt pw mr.t.n=k ḫpr

   ỉry=ỉ ỉs (17) *ḫft wḏ.t.n<=k>*[295]

   wn.ỉn ḥm n nṯr pn ḥr bỉɜy.t ˁɜ.t wr.t (18) *ˁšɜ sp-sn wr sp-sn*

[292] For the identification of the second regnal year as that of Thutmose III, see *infra*, 115–16 and Appendix B.

[293] It is interesting to note that, according to his courtier, biographer, and personal friend Einhard, Charlemagne, upon entering the Old St. Peter's Basilica in Rome on Christmas Day in 800 CE, had no previous knowledge that the imperial coronation was going to take place (Thorpe, *Two Lives*, § 28, p. 81).

[294] Col. 14 is marked as the first of # 184 by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 9) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 16), when it is the last of # 35; see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 31.

[295] The second person masculine suffix pronoun *=k*, "wickerwork basket with handle" (V 31), appears to not have been written with the handle, resulting in the "wickerwork basket" with phonetic value *nb* (V 30). This is marked with "sic" by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 99 (§ 162)), and as a lacuna by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 9). Based on the photograph by Burgos and Larché, there is no lacuna (*Chapelle* I, 31 # 184).

(# 35,14) After these things, she (Hatshepsut) placed herself on her belly in the presence of His (Amun's) Person, (# 184,15) saying:

"How much greater is this more than the (customary) conduct of your Person!

It is (you), my father, (16) who plans all which is,

What is it that you wish to happen?

I shall truly act (17) in accordance with that which yo[u] have commanded."

The Person of this god then performed very great *bỉɜy.t*-signs, (18) doubly numerous and doubly great.

m-ḫt nn rdỉ.t=f s(*y*) *ḫr-ḥɜ.t=f*

sḫnt s(*y*) (# 184,19) *r ḥw.t-ꜥɜ.t-Mɜꜥ.t*

šsp.n=s ḫkr.w ḥm.t=s ꜥpr.w=s n (20) *ḥm.t-nṯr*

wnn m-ḫnt ḥw.t=f

wn.ỉn ḥm n Nb-r-ḏr ḥr s(21)ꜥ*šɜ bỉɜy.t ḥr=s*

[*r*]*-gs mw.t=s ḳmɜ.t nfr=s Ḥw.t-Ḥr ḥry.t-tp Wɜs.t* (22) *nb.t p.t nb.t ỉdb.wy*

ḫnt.t-s.t m wɜḏ.yt

rnn.t sy m ḫ.t(# 295,23)[*=s*][296]

[…] *mḥ.t ḥꜥ.w=s*

(24) *m ꜥnḫ wɜs*

(25) […]*r*[*n*]*-wr*

(26) […] *bỉɜy.t*[297]

(27)[…] [*m*] *sḥ*[*-nṯr*] *pn* (28) [*n nsw.t wɜḥ ỉṯ*] [(two or three words missing) [*nsw.t-bỉty*][298] ꜥ*ɜ-ḫpr-kɜ-R*ꜥ

[296] The first column of # 295, col. 23, is mistakenly numbered 22 in Helck's publication (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 10). This affected the remainder of the columns on this series of consecutive blocks (# 295,23–29), the correct numbering of which is provided here in order to coordinate them with the original monument.

[297] According to Lacau (C*hapelle*, 100 (§ 162)) and Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 10), only a feminine *.t* ending and plural strokes survive on this block, but Burgos and Larché's examination has revealed the "sledge with head of a jackal" (U 16; see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 32).

[298] The *nṯr* in *sḥ-nṯr* and the *m* before it are missing, as well as the passage *n nsw.t wɜḥ ỉṯ* […] *nsw.t-bỉty* "of the enduring king, who seized/conquered […], the King of Upper and Lower Egypt" are missing, preserved only in the Deir el-Bahari version (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 10 *DeB* 11). Only very faint traces of *sḥ* have survived in Karnak's (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 32 # 295). Lacau suggested some further restorations: [*m*] *sḥ-nṯr … wɜḥ ỉṯ* [*m nḫt ?*] *nsw.t-bỉty* ꜥ*ɜ-ḫpr-kɜ-R*ꜥ [*dỉ*(*.w*) ꜥ*nḫ ḏ.t ?*] *ỉry* […] *mn.w*[*=f n*] *ḥm n nṯr pn* (*Chapelle*, 104 (§ 163,ag)).

[(two or three words missing)] *ỉry* (29) […] *mn.w* [*nfr n*][299] *ḥm n nṯr pn*
After these things, he placed her in front of him,
and advanced her (# 184,19) to the *Great House of Maat*.
She received the insignia of her servant(ship)[300] and her equipment of (20)
God's Wife
which are inside his temple.
The Person of the Lord-to-the-Limit then mul(21)tiplied *bỉʒy.t*-signs for her
[at] the side of her mother who created her beauty, Hathor, the Chief of Thebes, (22) the Lady of the sky and Lady of the Two Banks,
the foremost-of-place in the *wadjyt*,
who nursed her with [her] body,
(# 295,23)[301] […] who filled her body/flesh,
(24) […] with life and power,
(25) […] Great Na[me]
(26) […] *bỉʒy.t*-signs,
(27) […] [in] this divine booth (28) [of the enduring king, who seized/conquered] […] [the King of Upper and Lower Egypt,][302] *Aakheperkara*,
[…] who made (?) (29) […] the [beautiful] monument [for] the Person of this god.

When Amun met Hatshepsut in the forecourt of the temple, she knelt down before him. It is clear from her speech that she was submitting herself completely to the god's plans: he had only to continue to make manifest his divine will, and she was going to abide by it. The seriousness and solemnity of these events cannot be underlined enough. The text has already described at length the shock of all those present, and most especially at the god's not having performed the *bỉʒy.t* at the *Station*, expressing his

[299] This restoration was by Lacau (C*hapelle*, 100 (§ 162)), followed by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 10), but if this passage was still legible before, it no longer was when Burgos and Larché photographed the block (*Chapelle* I, 32 # 295).

[300] As Lacau has argued, this is a reference to her being, as priestess, a *ḥm.t* "servant" of the god (*Chapelle*, 104 (§ 163,z); cf. Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 25 no. 8).

[301] See: *Supra*, 65 no. 296.

[302] The restorations of the *m* before *sḫ-nṯr pn* and the passage *n nsw.t wʒḥ ỉṯ* […] *nsw.t-bỉty* "of the enduring king, who seized/conquered […], the King of Upper and Lower Egypt" were made possible through the Deir el-Bahari version (Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 10, *DeB* 11).

dissatisfaction. The text does not leave out the fact that Amun was, on the other hand, pleased at having met Hatshepsut. If his goal to reach her was unclear, as the god gradually proceeded around the temple, guiding the procession with his *bỉꜣy.t*-signs, the one he performed at Hatshepsut's submitting herself to Amun leaves no doubt that she was indeed whom he sought: unlike the other instances of *bỉꜣy.t* encountered so far in this text, this one is described as *ꜥꜣ.t wr.t* "very great," and also *ꜥšꜣ sp-sn wr sp-sn* "doubly numerous and doubly great." Those present now knew that Hatshepsut had a key part to play in the designs of the god Amun, but it still remained to be seen what his plans for her were.

Hatshepsut, who was unexpectedly roused from her palace, was not yet ritually prepared to enter the inner areas of the temple. Before the religious occasion could proceed, she therefore had to be properly equipped to do so, and presumably also to perform various rituals.[303] He therefore led her to the *Palace of Maat*, in which the regalia of God's Wife, the office then held by Hatshepsut, were apparently kept. While it is clear that the *ḥw.t-ꜥꜣ.t-Mꜣꜥ.t* was in Karnak, its precise location remains unknown. It is generally believed that this term designated the *salles d'offrandes*, the complex of rooms to the north and south of the sanctuary of Philip Arrhidaeus, as well as the two courts between it and the 6th Pylon.[304] Lacau doubted this, but provided no explanation.[305] Wallet-Lebrun tentatively accepts the identification of the *salles d'offrandes*, bearing in mind an inscription from the second part of Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse*: in a list of his contributions to Karnak temple, he lists the three doors of the Chapelle Rouge, stating that this was so that *ꜥḳ n=f Mꜣꜥ.t ỉm=sn* "Maat may go to him (Amun) through them."[306] Maat has been understood as both the concept of order and justice, as well as more literally as simply the offerings which would have actually passed through these doors to be presented to Amun in his sanctuary.[307] The

[303] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 104 (§ 163,aa).

[304] Barguet, *Temple*, 319–21; Laboury, *Statuaire*, pl. 2; Blyth, *Karnak*, 59–60, 78; Laboury, "Portrait", 270. Hegazy and Martinez include the court behind the 5th Pylon as well ("Palais de Maât", 54 ff.).

[305] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 104 (§ 163,y).

[306] *Urk.* IV, 167,6–10; Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 87; cf. Barguet, *Temple*, 128–9 no. 3, 131–2 no. 5, 321. While she admits that this is hypothetical, she puts forward the argument that the south side of the *salles d'offrandes* was called *Nṯry-mnw* (*ibid.*, 113, 117).

[307] This argument was initially put forward by Barguet (*Temple*, 321; Hegazy and Martinez, "Palais de Maât", 56). Wallet-Lebrun also interestingly argues that the reference here could also be to Hatshepsut, whose main element in her *prenomen* was "Maat" (*Livre*, 87).

salles d'offrandes, or more specifically its southern half, furthermore, has been understood as including areas where temple equipment and priestly regalia were stored.[308] This fits well with the textual evidence, where Hatshepsut is said to have donned her regalia as God's Wife inside the *ḥw.t-ꜥ.t-Mꜣꜥ.t*.[309]

After Hatshepsut put on her priestly garb, the text informs us that Amun performed another series of *bỉꜣy.t* as an expression of his pleasure at the correct interpretation and execution of his will: "The Person of the Lord-to-the-Limit then multiplied *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for her" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,20–1). We are also told that this was done "at the side of her mother who created her beauty, Hathor, the Chief of the Thebes" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,21–2). Hathor is one of the so-called "diadem goddesses," in that she could personify the crown and/or Uraeus, which were also seen (among others) as daughters, and mothers, of Ra/Horus.[310] The text refers to Hathor's role in raising Horus by describing her as the one "who nursed her (Hatshepsut) with [her] body" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 10; # 184 + 295,21–2). The archetypal crown goddess is *Wr.t-ḥkꜣ.w*, "the Great-of-Magic,"[311] as seen also in the Horemheb's Turin inscription (ll. 15–16).[312] Maat herself, too, was a diadem-goddess,[313] and this could explain, via identification, Hathor's importance in the sector of the temple called the *Palace of Maat*. Furthermore, the crown, as one of the symbols of kingship *par excellence*, once placed on the king's head, could be seen as bringing the person of the king into being in

[308] Hegazy and Martinez, "Palais de Maât", 58.

[309] This, needless to say, is speculation, and it furthermore raises questions such as how it is that Hatshepsut was taken past the 5th Pylon, the area starting which the temple proper began, to access the area of the *salles d'offrandes* (perhaps the *Nṯry-mnw* at the time: Carlotti and Gabolde, "Observations", 487 no. 363, 490–91) without having been properly equipped to do so first. For a publication of the monument, see: Gabolde, *Monuments décorés*, vols. 1 (Text) and 2 (Plates).

[310] The seventh register of blocks of the Chapelle Rouge bear depictions of coronation scenes in which Hatshepsut is presented with various crowns, embodied interchangeably by various diadem-goddesses (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 79–84, 124–7; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 234–56 (§ 376–406 bis)). As Troy demonstrates, through intricate series of interconnections and identifications, various goddesses—such as Isis, Hathor, Tefnut, Nut, Sekhmet, Bastet, Mut, Weret-Hekau, Wadjit, Nekhbet, Maat, Neith, and Amunet—could be seen as the daughters and mothers of the sun god (and by extension, of the king and the deceased in their respective contexts), his uraeus-eye(s)-crown(s), his protectors who fell his enemies, and even also as creator deities themselves ("Mut", 301 ff.; cf. Troy, "Religion", 125–7, 132). This would also be in parallel with the phenomenon of the king's and Ra's mother being the sky/mother goddess (also identified with the sarcophagus in the case of the deceased), who gave birth to them anew every day (Assmann, "Initiation", 139–42).

[311] Nebe, *LÄ* VI, s.v. "Werethekau", 1221.

[312] *Urk.* IV, 2117,12; Memphite version: *Urk.* IV, 2121,20.

[313] Troy, "Mut", 303.

his new life as Pharaoh, and as such, ideologically as the mother of the king.[314] This further strengthens the notion that Hathor and Isis, whose roles in the birth and rearing of Horus were well-known, were also by extension diadem-goddesses. Hathor is given several epithets here in the *Historical Inscription*, one of which, otherwise unattested, is *ḫnt.t-s.t m wꜣḏ.yt* "the foremost-of-place in the *wadjyt*" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,22). This is the only time that the *wadjyt* appears in the *Historical Inscription*. In the following chapter, in the analysis of Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse*, this architectural feature plays a greater role, and its significance is discussed at greater length, but it is enough for now to point out that the *wadjyt*, as a part of the miniature representation of the cosmos that is the Egyptian temple, was most likely symbolically seen as the marshes of *Khemmis* from the Osiris and Horus stories.[315] There, Horus had once grown up and reached adulthood in hiding, raised and protected by Isis and Hathor, before he went on to become king. Hathor's place of great importance in the *Historical Inscription* here is therefore perfectly fitting with the events taking place. It has been argued that some archaeological evidence seems to support the notion that Hathor held a place of special importance in the later *wadjyt*, but this is highly speculative.[316] Furthermore, one or more unknown female divinities, certainly diadem-goddesses, play a major role in two later sections of the text (*BL* 34; *H* 16–17; # 44 + 143,1–15 and *BL* 40; *H* 30; # 54,1–10) which will be covered below, but it would not be unreasonable to assume that it was still the same goddess, Hathor, in question there too.

The only surviving word in column 26 of block 295, is *bi.ty*, which suggests that Amun performed more than one series of "wonders" at this point, but that is all that can be said due to the poor state of preservation of this block.

---

[314] Goebs, *Crowns*, 186–7; Frankfort, *Kingship*, 108. References to the crowns as the mother of the deceased/king/Ra are ubiquitous (cf. Goebs, *Crowns*, 182–203; Troy, "Mut", 301 ff.). For the act of becoming Pharaoh as being seen as a new birth, see: Goebs, *loc. cit.*; Assmann, "Initiation", 141; Leclant, "Suckling", 135 ff. This is also reminiscent of instances where a diadem goddess embodies the throne, also a quintessential symbol of kingship (Troy, "Mut", 302–3). A good example is Isis, the mother of the king, through a play on the word *s.t*, this best exemplified in statues depicting the king as a child on his mother's lap, such as the alabaster statue of Pepy II (Brooklyn Museum no. 39.119).

[315] Chapter 4, 132.

[316] Carlotti and Gabolde point out a sandstone block mentioning Hathor which was discovered in the southern wing of the *wadjyt* ("Ouadjyt", 273, 292; published by: Le Saout, "Nouvelle fête", 69 ff.; mentioned in: Barguet, *Temple*, 106 no. 1). One block discovered in the *wadjyt* mentioning Hathor seems little reason to assume that she had a prominent place therein. Le Saout, furthermore, believes that the block originated from elsewhere, either to the north of the 6th Pylon or of the Akhmenu, most likely the latter ("Nouvelle fête", 70). There may, however, been a cult of Hathor in Karnak (Troy, "Religion", 125).

As for the location of Amun's *bỉꜣy.t*-sign while Hatshepsut was at Hathor's side, the *Palais de Maât* is one possibility. A more tempting one is the forecourt/*wadjyt*: according to the text, after the end of the speech Amun, the procession exited the temple, implying that they were still inside; having reached the *Palais de Maât*, they would have had to cross the forecourt once more on their way out. This public location would furthermore have been the ideal one for the performance of such a great number of *bỉꜣy.t*-signs by Amun. Based on column 26 of block 295, if another "wonder" was also performed, it would appear likely that it took place in the *sḥ-nṯr* "chapel or booth" in the name of Thutmose I. This monument remains unknown to us, however, but it was most likely located somewhere in the forecourt or *Palais de Maât*.

There is a missing block after # 295, and Stephan argues that it was perhaps at this juncture that Hatshepsut was crowned by Amun, inside the temple, as depicted on the seventh register of the Chapelle Rouge.[317] This, however, is not possible: (1) some of the equivalent passages from the missing block are preserved in the Deir el-Bahari version of the *Historical Inscription*, and it is clear that Amun's speech begins shortly after the break (e.g. *DeB* 13: *wp.t=ỉ* [*n*]*=ṯ* "that which I opened [for] you"), but this is assuming that the bestowal of the crowns was a part of the narrative of the section, rather than related in a speech. In the analysis which follows, it is demonstrated that in the first half of the text, the speeches of deities consist of announcing what was to take place next, while most of the resulting events are related in the text's narrative sections. In the following section, for example, Amun, still inside the temple, promises Hatshepsut that he will have her sit on the throne, which then only takes place later, after the procession had moved to the palace structure *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*. (2) According to the text, when the procession is later inside the palace: "The paraphernalia of God's Wife was removed so that she might don and [w]e[a]r the [re]galia of Ra, the Upper and Lower Egyptian crowns being united with her head" (*BL* 34; *H* 17; # 143, 16–17). If Hatshepsut had worn the crowns earlier while still inside the temple, as Stephan argued, it seems unlikely for Hatshepsut to have removed them in order to put on the garb of her now-previous office of God's Wife again, only to remove it once more to don the royal crowns inside the palace. The more logical and straightforward interpretation is that Hatshepsut, who held the priestly title of God's

[317] Stephan, *Dekoration*, 35–6 (F), 60.

Wife, put on her priestly paraphernalia in the *Palais de Maât* as described in the text (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,19–20), and was continually wearing them throughout Amun's performance of *bỉɜy.t*-signs for her (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,20–1) and the procession toward the palace (*BL* 33; *H* 13–14; # 22 + 142,14–21), where she finally removed them and donned the royal regalia (*BL* 34; *H* 17; # 143,16) after having first been enthroned (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,23–5).

4. *Speech of Amun where he reveals his immediate intentions (BL 35; H 10–13; DeB 12–15 and # 166 + 22 + 142,1–13; LC, 105–7, 109–11, § 164–7; G 18)*

(*DeB* 12) […]

(13) […]*=ṯ pn wp.t=ỉ* [*n*]*=ṯ*

(14) […]

(15) […] [*gg*]*y.t*

wr-pḥ.ty šw m ḫɜḫ ḥr […]

[…] (# 166,1) *ḏ*[*d ḥr*][318] *ḫfty.w=f*

dm.t=f m ḥm.t ḫ.t (2) *h*[*h=s*][319] *ḫpr*(*.w*)

šsp=f s(*y*)

nws[320] *tɜ.w špt.w-ỉb*[321]

(3) *wr* (?)[322] *sw ḫɜs.wt mỉ ỉr*(*.t*) *wɜwɜ.t*

rwḏ.t=f m mɜ n (4) *Ḥr*[323]

[318] The hand *d* (D 46) is missing, but is not marked as such by either Lacau (*Chapelle*, 106 (§ 166)) or Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 11).

[319] The second *h* "reed shelter in fields" in *hh* is missing, but the reading is certain due to the fact that the top half of the variant of the flaming brazier determinative (Q 7) has survived. For unknown reason, marked with "sic" by Lacau, who also suggested the suffix pronoun *=f* instead of *=s* despite *sḏ.t* being a feminine word (*Chapelle*, 106 (§ 166)).

[320] Lacau took the preceding *s* as a causative prefix of *nws*. I otherwise follow his suggestion that *snws* (which I see as *nws*), which is not recorded in the *Wörterbuch*, might be a miswriting of the *snwḫ* "kochen," "verbrennen" (*Wb*. IV, 157; which I see as *nwḫ* "verbrannt warden:" *Wb*. II, 224,10). The sense of burning is clear from the variant of the flaming brazier (Q 7) determinative (*Chapelle*, 110 (§ 167,e)).

[321] Written *štp.w-ỉb* [sic] in the original (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 33 # 166; Lacau, *Chapelle*, 109 (§ 166,α)).

[322] This damaged section is marked as a lacuna by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 11). Based on the photograph and facsimile by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 33 # 166), however, it is clear that a bird hieroglyph occupies this space, but it is unclear which. As with Lacau (C*hapelle*, 106 (§ 166)), I see it as the swallow or martin with the phonetic of *wr* (G 36).

[323] According to the photograph and facsimile by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 33), the damaged section at the top of this column contains a bird hieroglyph next to a small sign that is too damaged to read. I have no suggestions for the latter, but tentatively suggest seeing the bird as the falcon (G 5),

wsr-pḥty r ḳꜣ(.t) n(.t) p.t

nḫt=f r ḥsy ỉm=ỉ

(5) [*sḥ*]*tp*[324](*=ỉ*) *ṯn ḥr ns.wt=ỉ*

ꜣm=ỉ n=ṯ ḥḳꜣ.t nḫꜣḥꜣ

ḫwsỉ=ỉ ṯn (6) [*mr.t*][325].*n*(*=ỉ*) *ỉr.t*

drp=ṯ m-bꜣḥ ḳmꜣ.y ṯn

srwḏ=ṯ ḫm.w (7) *nṯr.w*

snbnb=ṯ tꜣ pw mḫr.w=f

ỉṯ (8) *šʿ.t=ṯ ỉr*(.*y*) *m ḫbn.t*

kꜣ.w(9)-*sbỉ.t n ꜣ.wt*

ỉṯ=ṯ nḫt m nb pḥ.ty

wn.(10)*kꜣ tꜣ pn m ḫfʿ=ṯ*

ḥnmm.t ḫr s.t-ḥr=ṯ[326]

(# 22,11) *rḫy.t dỉ=sn n=ṯ ỉꜣw*

smn=ṯ ḥp.w

dr=ṯ (12) *ḫnn.w*

bḥn=ṯ ʿ ḫr.t ḥꜣʿy.t

wḏ=ṯ (13) *mdw n ʿnḫ.w nḏr=sn ḫft tp-rd=ṯ*

"(*DeB* 12) […]

(13) this, your […] which I opened/separated (?)[327] [for] you […]

---

resulting in the reading of *Ḥr* "Horus." For unknown reason, Lacau saw this as *ḫ.t* "fire," with only the initial *ḫ* being missing (*Chapelle*, 106 (§ 166)), a reading on which both Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 11; the *t* is also marked as a lacuna) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 18) seem to have based theirs.

[324] The restoration of the semi-phonetic *ḥtp* (R 4) was first suggested by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 106 (§ 166)), followed by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 11) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 18). This reading is supported by the survival of the uniliterals *t* (X 1) and *p* (Q 3), as well as the top of the folded cloth *s* (S 29) in the photograph by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 33).

[325] Restoration suggested by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 106 (§ 166)), and picked up by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 11) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 18). The facsimile by Burgos and Larché (*loc. cit.*) supports the *t* (X 1), and shows that the damaged space above it has some space for another sign.

[326] Just enough of this sign survives to ensure its identity as the uniliteral *ṯ* (tethering rope: V 13; see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 33 # 166).

[327] There is no verb *wpỉ* listed either in in the *Wörterbuch* or by Hannig with the forearm holding a stick (D 40) as a determinative, but it is clear, based on context, that this is more akin to *wpỉ* with the knife determinative (T 30) "zerteilen, zerstückeln" (*Wb.* I, 302; Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 656) rather than the more common one with the papyrus scroll (Y 1) or "two sticks crossed" (Z 9) determinative which can mean "trennen," "schlichten," or "richten" (*Wb.* I, 298–301; Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 652–5).

(14) […] I will [subdu]e for you this land upon […].

I […][328] for you […]

(15) […] [sta]re,

the great of might, free from impatience[329] regarding […]

[You are a king (?)][330] (# 166,1) who spe[aks against] his enemies,

whose knife is the servant of fire,

(2) the heat [of which] takes effect (lit. "happens")

when he places it (the fire)

so that the lands of the malcontents[331] may burn.[332]

(3) He is great, the foreign lands burning like braziers (lit. "being like that which makes fire"),[333]

whose success is as the sight of (4) [fir]e,

who is powerful-of-might to the height of the sky,[334]

---

[328] It is clear that a verb, or perhaps relative form, would have filled this short lacuna.

[329] Lit. "schnell sein," "eilen, schnell gehen" (Hannig *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 583).

[330] Lacau, based on context, suggested the restoration "[Tu es un roi] qui parle …" (*Chapelle*, 109 (§ 166) and 110 (§ 167,a)).

[331] This is written *štp.w-ỉb* in the original instead of *špt.w-ỉb* (Lacau, *Chapelle*, 109 (§ 166,α)).

[332] As stated above in footnote 319, Lacau took the *s* as the causative for *nws*. He also understood *šsp* as "to begin" (Chapelle, 110 (§ 167,d)), resulting in the translation: "... dont le couteau est au service (?) de la flamme, dont l'haleine est embrasée quand elle se produit, lorsqu'il se met à brûler les pays des malcontents" (*ibid*., 109, § 167). Gillen translates: "His knife is the servant of the hot flame, and its heat, when it comes into being, is placed to burn the lands of the malcontents " ("Historical Inscription", 18).

[333] Lacau also saw the bird occupying the damaged section at the top of this column as the martin or swallow with phonetic value *wr* (G 36), where he expected it to be the "trussed goose or duck," often used as a determinative for *snḏ* (G 54), to act as a determinative for *špt.w-ỉb* (*Chapelle*, 106 and 109 § 166,β). He also added that "[l]'effacement du pierre ne permet pas d'affirmer s'il s'agit d'une graphie défectueuse ou de l'oubli d'un signe" (*ibid.*, 111 (§ 167,g)). This determinative is not attested for *špt.w-ỉb*, however (Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 2442; *Wb*. IV, 453); if another determinative after the "man with blood streaming from his head" (A 14) were to be expected, it would most likely have been the *Tetrodon fahaka* fish (K 7). Assuming slight error on the part of Burgos and Larché, which is not impossible, given the extent of the damage to this section, this fish determinative is a likely candidate. Another candidate is the sparrow (G 37) which looks similar to the swallow; an understandable, if unattested, determinative for *špt*. I was unable to provide a translation with that in mind, however, and neither was Lacau, whose translation takes the sign in the lacuna as the "trussed goose or duck" (G 54) standing in for *snḏ* acting as a relative form: "[Tu es un roi …] qui parle contre ses ennemis … (Un roi) que craignent les pays étrangers (?) comme l'auteur du feu" (*Chapelle*, 109 (§ 167)). Gillen reads *sw* as *nsw.t* "king," but makes no suggestions for the lacuna: "The king […] the foreign lands like the one who makes the flame" ("Historical Inscription", 18). I took the first sign as the swallow (G 36), the resulting word being *wr* acting as the adjective predicate followed by the third person dependent pronoun *sw* which referrs to whomever the suffix pronouns *=f* of *dm.t* (col. 1), *šsp* (col. 2), *rwḏ.t* (col. 4), and *nḫt* (col. 4) refer in turn.

[334] As stated above in footnote 322, Lacau, whom Helck and Gillen presumably followed, read this as *ḫ.t* "fire." Lacau translated "dont le succès est conforme à l'apparence de la flame, un riche de vaillance àla

whose strength is against that which faces/confronts me.
(5) (I) will cause that you [re]st on my thrones,
I will seize for you the crook and the flail,
I will mould you, (6) whom (I) [desired] to make,
so that you may make offerings in the presence of the one who created you,
so that you may cause the shrines (7) of the gods to flourish,
so that you may protect[335] this land and its affairs,
so that the dread of you may apprehend (8) he who acts in crime
and those who plan (9) rebellion to the times
when you will seize strength as the lord of might.
Then (10) this land will be in your grasp,
humanity under your supervision.
(# 22,11) The *rekhyt*, they will give you praise,
you will establish laws,
you will overpower (12) chaos,
you will cut off the arm of the state of civil war
you will govern (13) the living, and they will observe according to your instructions."

The contents of Amun's speech form a list of well-known duties that were the king's role to perform, such as the upholding of order and Maat, the destruction of Egypt's enemies, and the presentation of offerings. There are unfortunately no verbal endings here to indicate that prospective *sḏm=f* forms are being used, but the textual context supports this notion, given that these are royal duties, and that Hatshepsut was not yet king. It would therefore follow that Amun's speech consists of a statement of his intentions. In order for Hatshepsut to perform these royal duties, she had to first become Pharaoh, and one step toward this process was her enthronement: "(I) will cause that you [re]st on my thrones, I will seize for you the crook and the flail" (*BL* 33; *H* 11; # 166, 5). Indeed, this is precisely what follows in the text's narrative.

hauteur du ciel" (*Chapelle*, 109 (§ 167)), and Gillen "whose success exists at the sight of the flame, who is mighty in power to the height of the sky" ("Historical Inscription", 18). Based on the photograph and facsimile by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 33 # 166), I tentatively read the damaged section as "Horus," and thus *wsr-pḥty* as an epithet describing him, rather than "le roi/the king."

[335] This is written as *snbɜbɜ*, but this word is unattested. I here follow Lacau's suggestion that this is a variation of the verb *nbnb* "to protect" (Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 111 (§ 167,k); *Wb.* II, 245).

5. *The installation of Hatshepsut on the throne (BL 33; H 13–15; # 166 + 22 + 142,13–25; LC, 107–13, § 166–7; G 18–19)*

(# 22,13) *šps.w-nsw.t wnn.yw* (14) *m-ḫt=f šsp.n ḥr.w=sn gɜgɜw*

m-ḫt nn wḏɜ pw (15) *r-ḥɜ*

wn.ḫr ḥm.t=s ḫr-ḥɜ.t ỉt=s

snỉ ḥr pḫrw (16) *m rḫy.t*

šfy.t ỉṯ.n=s p.t tɜ

ḥr nb ꜥḳ (17) *m snw=f*

n kɜ.n=sn ḥꜥ.w=sn ḏs=w ḥr ḏrw

(18) *nn rf ỉb.w=sn*

s nb ḫm.n=f ḏ[*.t*][336]*=f*

m-ḫt (# 142,19) *nn ỉp.n ỉb=sn*

ḏr sḥḏ.t nṯr [*ỉ*]*mn.t.n=f*

spr (20) *ḥm=f r pr-ḥḏ šps rw.ty wr.ty n nb tɜ.wy*

s.t ỉs n.t šms.w-nsw.t r ḥw.t-nṯr n.t (21) [*ʾIm*]*n*

ꜥḳ ḥm=f r-ḫnty ꜥḥ n Nn-wɜ=ỉ-r=f pr-ʾImn

(22) *ṯɜr.n=f ꜥ.wy=fy ḥr swḥ.t=f*

ḫmt.n=f ỉṯ=s (23) *ỉdb.wy*

sḫnt.n=f s(*y*) *r rwdw nb wꜥ*

sḥtp(*.n=f*)[337] *s*(*y*) *m ḥḳɜ* (24) *ɜw.t-*[*ỉb*]

wd=f s.t=s ḥr s.t-wr.t

dỉ.n=f ḥms=s ṯnṯɜ.t (25) *rnn*[*.tỉ*][338] *m Ḥr nb-tɜ.wy ḫft-ḥr tɜ r-ḏr=f*

wn.ỉn ḥm n nṯr pn […]

(# 22,13) The royal nobles who were (14) in his following, their faces received surprise.

---

[336] There is a lacuna where the *.t* should have been (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 33); not marked by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 108 (§ 166)), Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 14), or Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 18).

[337] The subject is omitted because it is clear from context (Allen, *Egyptian*, 250–1, § 17.5; Hoch, *Grammar*, 200, § 140; Gardiner, *Grammar*, 396–7, § 486–7).

[338] This small lacuna (see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 33), not marked Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 15) or Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 19) has enough room for a tall narrow character. I here follow Lacau's tentatively suggested pestle bilateral *tỉ* (U 33) which, aside from considerations of space, fits the context given that it marks the stative suffix for the third person singular feminine (*Chapelle*, 109 (§ 166)).

After these things, there was a proceeding (15) outside.

Then her Person was in front of her father,

passing by while moving about (16) amidst the *rekhyt*.

Awe, it seized the sky and the earth,

Every face turned[339] (17) to its fellow,

they not thinking about their own bodies at all,[340]

(18) having become dumbfounded (lit. "their hearts not existing"),[341]

no man knowing his (own) bod[y].

After (# 142,19)[342] these (things), they collected themselves (lit. "their heart(s) assembled")[343]

since the god revealed (lit. "illuminated")[344] that which he had [hi]dden,

---

[339] This seems to be the only attested use of *ḳ* with this sense: otherwise unknown to Lacau (*Chapelle*, 112 (§ 167,aa)) who translated "chacun abordait son voisin," the only attestation provided by Hannig is this same passage, similarly translating "jedermann wandte sich an seinen Nachbarn" (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 161 (17)), meaning "to turn to somebody (with the intention of speaking with them)".

[340] Lacau saw *n kꜣ.n=sn ḥꜥ.w=sn ḏs=w ḥr ḏrw* "Ils ne pensaient plus à leur proper corps, plus du tout" as an expression denoting fainting (*Chapelle*, 112, § 167,ab). Regarding *ḥr ḏrw*, he stated that it is otherwise unknown to him (*ibid.*, 112 (§ 167,ac)), but his translation of "at all" ("plus du tout") fits the context well.

[341] Lacau compared this expression to the French *perdre connaissance* "to lose consciousness" (*ibid.*, 112 (§ 167,ad)), while Gillen translates "they did not understand" ("Historical Inscription", 18). Given that the heart was seen as the seat of consciousness and intellect, and that it is clear from context that the emotion being felt by those witnessing the unfolding events, I have opted for the translation of "to be(come) dumbfounded."

[342] The point where this block begins is marked incorrectly by Gillen, who placed it where the preceding *m-ḫt nn* is, in # 22,14 (Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 18).

[343] *ỉp* generally means "to count; assess; examine; recognise" (*Wb.* I, 66; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 16). Lacau and Gillen translated *ỉp* as "to understand" (Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 110 (§ 167); Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 18), but did not explain why. This is presumably due to the sense of "verständig, urteilsfähig sein" for *ỉp ỉb* (*Wb.* I, 66,14–17; Hannig, *Handwörterbuch*, 43,7), a suitable translation. Bearing in mind that the heart is the seat of one's senses in ancient Egyptian thought, along with the meaning of *ỉp* as "to muster, assemble" (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 16; "zusammenführen:" Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 164,5), the translation "they collected themselves (lit. "their heart(s) assembled")" is adopted here to express the royal nobles' recovery from their shock at Amun's revelation of his intentions to make Hatshepsut king. This, furthermore, also fits with the attested sense of *ỉp ỉb*, and additionally to that of *ỉp ḏ.t* "Kontrolle über sein leibliches Selbst gewinnen," "sich seines Leibes bewusst werden," and "Bewusstsein wiedererlangen" (Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 165,9; cf. Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 16, and discussion in Chapter 4, 167).

[344] *sḥḏ* is written with the uniliteral *t* (X 1) preceding its determinative; given that: (1) *ḥḏ* is not a *tertiae infirmae* verb; (2) taking *sḥḏ* as stative (with the second person singular and third person feminine singular stative ending *.tỉ* written with its alternative writing of *.t*) does not work grammatically, and neither does it yield a meaning which fits the context; *sḥḏ.t* as a (3) participle or (4) a relative form is not suitable either. I therefore consider the *t* as a phonetic complement for *ḏ*; I am thankful to Ann-Katrin Gill for this suggestion.

when his Person (20) reached the noble chapel and the great gates of the Lord of the Two Lands,

that is, the place of the royal following to the temple of (21) [Amu]n.

His Person entered into the palace of *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* of the estate of Amun,

(22) He extended his arms (in protection)[345] over his egg,

for he had planned that she seize (23) the Two Banks.

He advanced her to the platform of the unique lord

and pacified her as the ruler (24) of jo[y]

so that he may establish her place on the Great Seat,

and he caused that she occupy the throne-dais, (25) having been rear[ed] as Horus, the Lord of the Two Lands, in the presence of the entire land.

Then the Person of this god […][346]

Amun's speech was received with shock by all those present, which was further accentuated by what happened then: after proceeding outside the *Palace of Maat*, in a display of royal privilege, Amun placed Hatshepsut in front of him. As at the start of the text, when Amun did not perform his *bi3y.t* at the *Station*, much space is devoted to describing the reaction of the witnesses to this event.

The procession then reached a chapel, which would have been near a great double gate. This area, the text informs us, seems to have been the designated location from which kings would have proceeded into the temple. The way these places are mentioned, one gains the impression that their respective nature and location were well-known by the reader; none of these three features (the chapel, great doubles gates, and place of the royal following) are known to us, however. The significance of the arrival of the procession at these locations seems to not have escaped the onlooking crowds of people, for it is stated it was at this point that their confusion ended: "After these things, their heart recovered when the god revealed that which he had hidden, when His Person

[345] The *Wörterbuch* gives three possible meanings for *ṯ3r*, where only the third, as Lacau noted, fits here: "mit *ḥr*: Schutz ausüben über (eine Stadt)" (*Wb.* V, 355; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 113 (§ 167,ao)).

[346] Four blocks, equivalent to *DeB* 22–7 and a part of 28, are missing after # 142, before the Karnak version resumes with # 44. The Deir el-Bahari version is badly eroded, but for a part of col. 24, presented in the next section.

reached the noble chapel and the great gates of the Lord of the Two Lands, that is, the place of the royal following to the temple of [Amu]n" (# 22 + 142,18–21). That Amun placed Hatshepsut in front of him and led her to the area of the temple from which kings would have usually entered it on festival occasions was meaningful, and revelatory of what was to come next.

Again, as with the place names encountered earlier in the text, the architectural features mentioned in these passages are unknown, there being no evidence for them outside the inscription at hand, but some guesses can be made. It is important to underline that this is speculative, given the lack of archaeological evidence. The assumption that the Palace of Maat designated the area in and around the central suite of offering rooms, on which the following reconstruction is based, is itself unfortunately hypothetical. According to the previous surviving narrative section of the text, Hatshepsut had been advanced to the Palace of Maat, where she donned her regalia as God's Wife, following which Amun performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for her beside Hathor (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9; # 184,18–21) in an unknown chapel of Thutmose I's (*BL* 32; *H* 10; # 295,10). Now, we are told that they proceeded outside (*BL* 33; *H* 13; # 22,14–15), presumably leaving the Palace of Maat, or perhaps more specifically the small chapel of Thutmose I. The only clue the text gives us as to the nature of the location into which the procession then found itself is from the passage: "… passing by while moving about amidst the *rekhyt*" (*BL* 33; *H* 13; # 22,15–16). The presence of the *rekhyt* argues for one of the semi-public areas of the temple, therefore presumably an open court. As argued above, the 5th Pylon was most likely the main frontal pylon at the time of the events of the text. There would have been some space between it and the central *salles d'offrandes* beyond which may have been an open court, and this may have been the space through which the procession would have travelled. However, the narrative then states that the procession reached the area discussed above, that of the *ḥḏ*-chapel, the *rw.ty*-gates of the Lord of the Two Lands, and the *s.t šms.w-nsw.t r ḥw.t-nṯr n.t* [*ỉm*]*n* "the place of the royal following to the temple of [Amu]n" (*BL* 33; *H* 14; # 22,19–21). The procession is then said to have entered the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f* (*BL* 33; *H* 14; # 22,21). The *place of the royal following* may therefore not have been very far from *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, and may designate the location from which the king would have

entered the temple on festival occasions after leaving the palace.[347] The area in which the divine procession travelled through the crowds of the assembled masses would therefore have also included the main temple forecourt preceding the 5th Pylon, where the narrative of the *Historical Inscription* began.

In short, after exiting the Palace of Maat and passing through the court of the 5th Pylon, the pylon itself, and the forecourt, the procession returned again to the structure known as *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*. There, we are informed that Amun led Hatshepsut "to the platform of the unique lord so that (he) may pacify her as the ruler of jo[y], so that he may establish her place on the Great Seat, and he caused that she occupy the throne-dais, having been reared as Horus, the Lord of the Two Lands, in the presence of the entire land" (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,23–5). There are here more references to locations that would have been familiar to the ancient Egyptian reader, but which must here be examined. As noted by Barguet and Lacau, there were indeed a *rwdw* "platform," or "podium," and a *s.t-wr.t* "Great Seat/Throne" of Amun in Karnak.[348] Barguet referred to a passage from the *Texte de la jeunesse*, where Thutmose III boasts: *smn=i wḏ.w=i r rwdw n nb ỉp.t-Sw.t* "I establish my commands at the *rwdw*-platform of the Lord of Karnak."[349] He argued that this text is carved on the outer face of the south wall of Hatshepsut's *salles d'offrandes*, which were built on an elevated platform, and that this architectural feature is actually the *rwdw* in question. Thutmose III, in this passage, was therefore actually referring to his having the *Texte de la jeunesse* inscribed on the *salles d'offrandes*, and therefore "at the *rwdw*-platform of the Lord of Karnak."[350] In current Egyptological literature, the platform on which the *salles d'offrandes* were built is referred to as Hatshepsut's "podium."[351] According to

[347] Many coronation sequences start with the king leaving the palace (cf. for example, Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 51). Similarly, three scene captions in the First Court at Medinet Habu identify the attached palace as the location from which the king would have joined festivals: (1) [*ḫꜥi*]-*nsw.t* [*m*] *ꜥḥ.t n.t ḥw.t=f šps.t r sḫꜥi ỉt=f ỉmn m ḥb=f n ỉn.t* "[Royal] appearance [from] the palace of his noble temple in order to cause his father Amun to appear in his Valley Festival" (*PM* II, 493 (65), *MH* II, 123 B on 60 A); (2) *ḫꜥi ḥm=f m sfỉ nṯry mỉ Rꜥ … r mɜ ỉt=f ỉmn-Rꜥ m ḥb=f tp n ỉp.t* "Appearance of His Person as a divine child like Ra … in order to see his father Amun-Ra in his festival at the beginning of Opet" (*PM* II, 495 (77) d, *MH* IV, 237 A); (3) *ḫꜥw-nsw.t mỉt.t Rꜥ m ꜥḥ.t n*(*.t*) *ḥw.t=f šps.t r sḫꜥi ỉt=f ỉmn m ḥb=f n ỉn.t* "Royal appearance like Ra from the palace of his noble temple in order to cause his father Amun to appear in his Valley Festival" (*PM* II, 495 (78) c, *MH* IV, 239 A).

[348] Barguet, *Temple*, 320–1; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 113 (§ 167,aq).

[349] *Urk.* IV, 164,11 (col. 21).

[350] Barguet, *Temple*, 321.

[351] Cf. for example, Larché, "Observations", 409.

Barguet, this area was related to the presentation of offerings; he referred to a passage from Hatshepsut's Middle Colonnade coronation inscription at Deir el-Bahari: *i̯ṯ=ṯ ꜥ3b.t m ỉp.t-sw.t r rwdw n nsw.t*[*-nṯr.w ỉmn nb nsw.t-t3.wy*] "May you seize the offerings in Karnak at the platform of the king [of the gods, Amun the Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands]."[352] Lacau, in turn, has referred to an interesting passage in which the two elements of *rwdw* and *s.t-wr.t* are mentioned, and perhaps even equated: in Hatshepsut's Punt oracle inscription, we are told that *spr ḥm n stp-s3 ꜥ.w.s. r rwdw n* (5) *nb nṯr.w sḏm*(*.w*) *wḏ.w m s.t-wr.t nḏ.w.t-r n.t nṯr ḏs=f* "The Person of the Palace l.p.h. petitioned/appealed to the *rwdw*-platform of (5) the lord of the gods, and decrees were heard from the Great Seat/Throne, the oracles of the god himself."[353]

The term *s.t-wr.t* could be used to denote the throne of a king or a god, or the pedestal on which they were placed, and, by extension, the deity's sanctuary in the temple, and even the temple itself.[354] In the oracle inscription, it is clear that the *s.t-wr.t* stands for the throne or sanctuary of the god inside the temple, from where he would make known his oracles when petitioned. The *s.t-wr.t* clearly forms a part of the mentioned *rwdw*. Even though the earliest known sanctuary on this platform is the Chapelle Rouge, it would not have been built yet at the time of Hatshepsut's Punt inscription oracle, but the archaeological evidence indicates that this spot seems to have always been the immovable and sacred site of the sanctuary of Amun.[355]

As noted by Lacau, however, one is forced to admit that the particular *rwdw* and *s.t-wr.t* in this case are clearly not a part of the temple *per se*, but of *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*.[356] This could perhaps suggest that palaces, in imitation of temples or, more specifically, Karnak temple, also featured a throne (*s.t-wr.t*) on a large *rwdw*-platform. The throne itself would have rested on the *ṯnṯ3.t* "throne-platform."[357] The epithet for *rwdw* is indicative: all three passages cited above clearly refer to it as being that of a

---

[352] *Urk.* IV, 248,10–11.

[353] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 113 (§ 167,aq): *Urk.* IV, 342,10–12; cf. Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 160, 163.

[354] *Wb.* IV, 7; Spencer, *Temple*, 108–14. For *s.t-wr.t* as "barque sanctuary," see: scenes at Medinet Habu (*MH* VI, 409 (l. 13), 441 C; *MH* VII, 501 A and B (l. 9); cf. Nims, "Dishonoring", 99 no. 20); Chapelle Rouge: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* I, 53 (block 226), 99 (block 273).

[355] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 98.

[356] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 113 (§ 167,aq).

[357] *ṯnṯ3.t*: *Wb.* V, 384–5.

god—(1) *rwdw n nb ỉp.t-Sw.t*; (2) *rwdw n nsw.t*[*-nṯr.w ỉmn nb nsw.t-tɜ.wy*]; (3) *rwdw n nb nṯr.w*—whereas the *Historical Inscription* has (*rwdw*) *nb wʿ*, a royal epithet.[358] Assuming that the notion that Karnak temple did indeed have an adjoining palace is correct, it is clear that this palace had an important part to play in enthronement rituals.

At her installation on the throne, an interesting passage describes Hatshepsut as *rnn.tỉ m Ḥr* "having been reared as Horus" (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,25). Likewise, at Amun's *bỉɜy.t* for Hatshepsut in Hathor's presence, the goddess was there described, among other things, as "the one who nursed (*rnn*) her with [her] body" (*BL* 32; *H* 10; # 184 + 295,21–3). This is once more a reference to the role of the Uraeus-goddess in the making of the king. It should also be noted that this coincides with Leclant's view that becoming Pharaoh also meant a birth into a new life, that of kingship, as supported by various reliefs depicting the coronation sequence (*épisodes du couronnement*) at the conclusion ("culmination") of which, alongside Amun confirming the kingship, is usually represented a diadem-goddess who is nursing the king (e.g. Philip Arrhidaeus' Karnak barque sanctuary; see fig. 1).[359] The theme of enthronement and nursing in the *Historical Inscription* is also mirrored in a scene caption at Deir el-Bahari, where Weret-Hekau declares: *rnn*(*=ỉ*) *ṯn m ḥr.yt ns.t=f m nsw.t wɜḥ n ḏ.t* "(I) will nurse you, as one-who-is-on-his-throne, as enduring king for eternity."[360]

Hatshepsut, enthroned, was however not yet Pharaoh, and had to undergo more rituals. A gap of four missing blocks follows these passages. This lacuna would most likely have contained more passages furthering the text's main narrative, for it starts with the construction *wn.ỉn=f*. This particular sentence would have most likely recounted another instance of Amun performing a *bỉɜy.t* for Hatshepsut ([*sḏm*]: *wn.ỉn ḥm n nṯr pn* [*šps?*] [*ḥr bỉɜy.t ʿɜ.t wr.t* (*?*)] […] "Then the Person of this [noble?] god [performed very great *bỉɜy.t*-signs] […]" (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,25), who now sat enthroned.

[358] *Wb.* I, 275 (E, II).

[359] Leclant, "Suckling", 135 ff.

[360] *Urk.* IV, 285. Lacau, too, but speaking of another instance, noted that the inscriptions collected in *Urk.* IV, 285–88 "présentent de nombreuses analogies" with events in the *Historical Inscription* (*Chapelle*, 118 (§ 170,g)).

6. *The procession continues, followed by a speech by the Uraeus-goddess (BL 34; H 15–17; DeB 24 and # 44 + 143,1–15; LC 113–19; § 168–70; G 19)*

[...] (*DeB* 24) *wn.ỉn ḥm n nṯr p*[*n*] ꜥ*ḥ*ꜥ(*.w*) *r sbȝ n* [...]*t* [...] *wnw.t* 2

[...]

[...] (# 44,1) *mr.t.n=*⌊*k*⌋

sỉp=k wỉ[361] *n ms.t=k*[362] *nsw.t-bỉty Mȝꜥ.t-kȝ-Rꜥ*

(2) *ḥb.tỉ ḫnm.tỉ ms s*(*y*)

ỉr(*y*)*=k sꜥḥ=s ḳmȝ=k nrw=s m* (3) *rn=k n ḳmȝ nḥḥ*

ḫꜥ(*y*)*=ỉ m tp=s*

ꜥ*ȝ*(*y*)*=ỉ m ḥȝ*[*.t=s*]

(4) *ḫnm=ỉ s*(*y*) *mỉ ḫkr=ỉ ỉt=ỉ*

wr hy=ỉ n=s m (5) *Ḥry.t-tp*

sḫr(*=ỉ*) *n=s ỉwn.tyw Sty spṯḥ*(*=ỉ*) *r-ỉmỉtw wp.t=s*

[*ptpt=ỉ n=s*][363] (6) *Mnṯw Sṯt wnwn=ỉ ḫꜥ.kw*(*ỉ*) *m ḥȝ.t=s*

dr(7)*=ỉ n=s šn.t n*(*.t*) *Km-Wr*[364] *twt*

ỉry(*=ỉ*) [*mr*][365](8)*.t.n=ỉ mr.t.n ỉt=s ỉmn*

dỉ=ỉ šfšf.t[*=s m*] (9) *tȝ.w nb.w*

ḥry.t=s ḫt ḫȝs.wt nb.wt

dỉ=ỉ bȝw=s

---

[361] While it is theoretically possible to also read this as *sỉp.kwỉ* "I have been entrusted," it would seem strange for the Uraeus-goddess to state this using the passive voice while addressing Amun, who is the one who had entrusted her to Hatshepsut. The context, furthermore, as argued in this section suggests a future meaning, for which reason the verbs in this passage are treated as prospective *sḏm=f* forms.

[362] This relative form is written *ms.tywt=k* in the text, with *tyw* expressed with the "long-legged buzzard" (G 4), here normalised as *ms.t=k* "the one whom you (Amun) bore" with reference to Hatshepsut, and hence the feminine *.t*.

[363] Given the overall structure of the sentences immediately preceding and following this one, it is certain that this lacuna would have contained a *sḏm.n=f* form with a first person singular subject *=ỉ*, whether written out or not, followed by a dative *n=s*. The verb *ptpt* is Helck's suggestion, but there does not seem to be enough room for this word (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 34). Lacau, in his translation, suggested the verb "renverser" (*Chapelle*, 117 (§ 170)), and Gillen "subdue" ("Historical Inscription", 19).

[364] According to the epigraphy of # 44, the uniliteral *t* (X 1) is used instead of the crocodile skin with spines hieroglyph *km* (I 6), but the photograph itself seems to show three lines radiating out of the semi-circular shape of this sign, thus resulting in the biliteral *km* (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 34). Even assuming error on the part of the sculptor, however, there can be no doubt as to the reading. This sign is presented with certainty as *km* by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 115 (§ 169)) and Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 16).

[365] Restoration first suggested by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 115 (§ 169)).

sm[*n*][366](# 143,10)*=ỉ pḥ.ty=s*

wʿf=ỉ n=s šn.t n(*.t*) *ỉtn*

ṯs=ỉ n=s (11) *hnw m p.t rsy.t*

dỉ=ỉ ḥʿy n=s (12) *<m> p.t mḥty.t*

ỉḥy=ỉ n=s m sššš.wt=ỉ

mny=ỉ s(*y*) *m* (13) *mnỉ.t tɜ tm*

wpy=ỉ n=s ỉḫm.w-sk

(14) *sỉp=ỉ n=s ỉḫm.w-wrḏ*

ḥtp=ỉ s.t=ỉ m nḫb.t=s

(15) *sḥḏ=ỉ n=s nḥḥ ḫr-s.t ḥr=s*

[…] (*DeB* 24) Then the Person of th[is] god stood at the door of […] two hours, […]

"[…] (# 44,1) that which yo[u] desired.

You will entrust me to the one whom you bore, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *Maatkara*,

(2) (she being) in festivity, having joined with the one who bore her,[367] you will make her dignity, you will create the dread of her in (3) your name of the creator of eternity,

I shall appear on her head,

I shall grow on [her] fore[head],

(4) I will unite with her like I adorn my father,

My jubilation for her is great as (5) *One-who-is-on-the-head*,

---

[366] The restoration of this word as *smn* is fairly certain: upon examination of the photograph and tracing of # 44 by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 34), the very top of the folded cloth *s* (S 29) can be seen just before the lacuna, as well as the short vertical lines which would have formed the top of the biliteral *mn* (Y 5). There are five of these lines, which might at first glance appear too few (six or seven lines: # 166 + 22 + 142,11,19,21; # 44 + 143,6,12–13; # 285 + 24,6; # 109 + 72,7,13; # 161 + 119 + 63,1–2,5–6; # 287,3,6; # 21,2; # 54,3; # 194 + 147 + 37,2,20–1; # 146,1,12), but the same biliteral used to write "Amun" on col. 8 of the same block has just as many (*ibid.*, 34 # 44; see also: # 48 + 164,12–13; # 285,1–2; # 285 + 24,1,2,10,12–13). Lacau (*Chapelle*, 115 (§ 169)) and Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 16) did not supply a determinative, but it is clear that there would have been room for a horizontal papyrus roll (Y 1).

[367] Gillen translates this passage as "You are in festivity, you joining with that which she begets" ("Historical Inscription", 19). I do not agree with this translation, for while it is possible to see the *t* as the suffix pronoun *=ṯ* acting as the subject, the sense of the remainder of this sentence would be unclear. Lacau's translation of "de telle sorte qu'elle est en fête et associée à ton rejeton" fits the context better, with *ḥb.tỉ* as a stative, *ms s*(*y*) as a participle and its object referring to Amun as Hatshepsut's father, and the *ḫnm.tỉ* in combination with *ms s*(*y*) therefore being a play on Hatshepsut's *nomen* epithet of *ḫnm.t-ỉmn* (*Chapelle*, 116 (§ 170) and nos. d and e on p. 118).

(I) will fell for her the tribesmen of Nubia, (I) curling up[368] in the middle of her brow,
[I will trample for her] (6) the Bedouin of Asia, swaying about, having appeared on her forehead
I will [subdue] (7) for her the full encompassment of the Great Black,
I will do [for her] that which I [desire] (8) and that which her father Amun desires,
I will place the respect [of her in] (9) all lands,
the terror of her throughout all foreign lands,
I will place her *bꜣw*-power,
I will est[ablish] (# 143,10) her might,
I will subdue for her the encompassment of the sun-disk,
I will accomplish (lit. "tie," "join")[369] for her (11) the jubilation(-rites) in the southern sky,
I will cause rejoicing for her (12) <in> the northern sky,
I will play music for her with my sistra,
I will moor her as (13) as [sic] the mooring-post of all humankind,
I will judge for her the indestructible stars,
(14) I will inspect[370] for her the unwearying stars,
I will tak[e] (lit. "rest") my place in her titulary,
(15) I will assign to her eternity under her supervision."

Four blocks of the Chapelle Rouge version of the text are missing, and the equivalent passages from Deir el-Bahari (ll. 22–8) are badly eroded. The only surviving line says "Then the Person of th[is] god stood at the door of […] two hours" (*DeB* 24). It is unknown what this means, but what is noteworthy is that movement of only Amun is

[368] Lacau saw this as the verb *ptḥ* "to cast to the ground; put down; be stretched out (in obeisance)" (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 96) or "sich niederwerfen, sich zu Boden werfen" (*Wb.* I, 565–6, II) with the causative *s-*, generating the sense of "to fold" (Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 118 (§ 170,k)).

[369] See: Lacau and Chevrier, C*hapelle*, 118 (§ 170,p).

[370] In agreement with Lacau (C*hapelle*, 117 (§ 170)) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 19, 25 no. 18), I see the two sentences of the two verbs translated here as "to judge" (*wpi*) and "to inspect" (*sip*) as parallels, for which reason I attempted here to provide similar meanings for them. In contrast, however, they translated these verbs as "calculate" and "count," and "décompter" and "dénombrer," respectively. Due to the fact that such a sense to *wpi* is unattested, the translations of "to judge" and "to inspect" were preferred.

mentioned. Hatshepsut would therefore still have been on the Great Seat inside the *Nn-wꜣ=i̯-r=f*. This is not immediately apparent at this point, but later discussion of the text demonstrates this point beyond any doubt.

From context, it is clear that the goddess was addressing Amun, stating to him the actions she was going to perform for Hatshepsut. Her speech has been translated with a future sense; this finds support in the use of prospective *sḏm=f* forms which can be gleaned from the *tertiae infirmae* verb *i̯rỉ* in *i̯ry=i̯* [*n=s mr*](8).*t.n=i̯ mr.t.n i̯t=s ỉmn* "I will do for her that which I and her father Amun have desired" (*BL* 34; *H* 16; # 44,7–8) and, more ambiguously, from the absence of any endings or gemination on the other verbs.[371] In the beginning of her speech, however, another sentence contains the verb *i̯rỉ* written with no markers: "you will make her dignity" (*BL* 34; *H* 16; # 44,2). Even so, it is clear that the verbal form in this sentence, along with those of the rest of the speech, are indeed prospective *sḏm=f* forms. This is supported by the narrative section which follows.

Firstly, it is made clear that the goddess, as the Uraeus, was going to appear on Hatshepsut's head: "I shall appear on her head, I shall grow on [her] fore[head], I will unite with her like I adorn my father, my jubilation for her is great as *one-who-is-on-the-head*" (*BL* 34; *H* 16; # 44,3–5). Instances of the crown/Uraeus(-goddess) appearing, resting, or growing on a king's head by her/its own agency are well-known.[372]

The excerpts from the speech of the Uraeus-goddess also present her in her role as the destroyer of her father's enemies: "I will fell for her the tribesmen of Nubia, coiling up (*spṯḫ*) in the middle of her brow, I will trample for her the bedouin of Asia, swaying about (*wnwn*), having appeared on her forehead" (*BL* 34; *H* 16; # 44,5–6).[373] A caption of a scene at Hatshepsut's Speos Artemidos provides an interesting parallel: a diadem-goddess, Weret-Hekau-Pakhet, addressing initially addressing Amun, and then Hatshepsut, states *sḫˁ.n=k w(i̯) m ḥꜣ.t sꜣ*[*.t*]*=k nsw.t-bi̯ty Mꜣˁ.t-kˁ-Rˁ … di̯=i̯ ḥry.t*[*=t̲*] *m tꜣ.w nb.w wnwn=i̯ i̯mytw i̯nḥ.wy*[*=t̲*] *hh=i̯ m sḏ.t r ḫftyw*[*=t̲*] "You have caused m(e) to

[371] Hoch, *Grammar*, Appendix 1. While Gillen also sees these verbs as prospective *sḏm=f* forms, Lacau translated them using the present tense.

[372] E.g. (altered) Hatshepsut scene from Deir el-Bahari (*ḫˁ*): *Urk.* IV, 285,15 (*Deir el Bahari* IV, pl. 101); Amenhotep II's Great Sphinx Stela (*Wr.t ḥtp=s s.t=s m wp.t=f* "The Great One (cobra determinative I 12 in sign-list), she rested (on) her place on his brow"): *Urk.* IV, 1283,6); Memphite Theology (*rd* "to grow") (cols. 13 c–14 c: Junker, *Götterlehre*, 23; Sethe, *Dramatische*, 32).

[373] On this role of crowns/goddesses: Goebs, *Crowns*, 204–358 (esp. 303–10, 333–49); Troy, "Mut", 308–9, 313–14.

appear on the forehead of your daugh[ter], the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *Maatkara*, … I have placed the terror of [you] in all lands, swaying about between [your] eyebrows, I breathe scorching fire unto [your] enemies."[374] The theme of domination over enemies, which appears often in the same context as the suckling and coronation of the king, has been noted by Leclant.[375]

It should be pointed out that Amun's earlier speech to Hatshepsut, where he declared: "(I) will cause that you rest on my thrones, I will seize for you the crook and the flail" (*BL* 33; *H* 11; # 166,5), was followed by a narrative section describing the god actualising his statements by installing her on the throne (*s.t-wr.t*). The speech of the Uraeus goddess is similarly followed by a narrative section relating Hatshepsut's reception of royal crowns, thus supporting the translation with prospective *sḏm=f* forms presented here.

Interestingly, in the goddess' speech, Hatshepsut is referred to with the royal title "the King of Upper and Lower Egypt," as well as with her *praenomen*, *Maatkara*. What this indicates is that Hatshepsut, now installed on the throne, and about to receive the crowns, could be referred to as a king. The remainder of her transformation immediately after she donned the crowns would have been related in the four unfortunately missing blocks following 44 + 143. It may be the case that a ritual related to Hatshepsut's royal titulary had already taken place, however: after Amun advanced her to the *Palais de Maât* and performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for her, in a column of text only the term *rn-wr* survives (*BL* 32; *H* 10; # 295, 24).

The establishing of the new king's royal titulary is a theme which appears often in so-called coronation texts.[376] The equivalent in the *Historical Inscription* appears later in the inscription, where Amun establishes (*wḏ*) Hatshepsut's titulary (*BL* 35; *H* 19; # 164,13–15), so pending new discoveries, the reason for the *rn-wr* in block 295, and the reference to Hatshepsut as *Maatkara* and *nsw.t-bỉty* in the speech of the Uraeus-goddess, will unfortunately remain unknown. Due to the monumental nature of the text, the possibility of prospectively referring to Hatshepsut as king is not to be

[374] *Urk.* IV, 286,12–16.

[375] Leclant, "Suckling", 140 f.

[376] *Texte de la jeunesse* (cols. 12–14): *Urk.* IV, 160,10—161,12 (chapter 4, 165–70); Horemheb's Turin inscription (l. 19): *Urk.* IV, 2118,11–15 (chapter 5, 247–8); Hatshepsut's coronation text in the Middle Colonnade at her Deir-el Bahri temple: *Deir el Bahari* III, 59; *Urk.* IV, 251–2.

excluded.[377] As argued in the following chapter, it is likely that kings would have prepared and thought out their titularies in advance before they were officially announced at their coming to power;[378] a view which seems to find support in the Uraeus-goddess's reference to Hatshepsut with her *praenomen* before the official instalment of her titulary later in the text.

7. *Hatshepsut receives the crowns (BL 34; H 17; # 44 + 143,15–17; LC 116–17, 119; § 169–70; G 19)*

(# 143,15) *wn.ḫr=s ḥr ỉy sp-sn* (16) *m nyny*

ꜥ.wy=sy ḫr mr.t

sfḫ.t(*w*) *ḫꜥ.w ḥm.t-nṯr*

wṯs=s (17) *f*[*ɜ*] [*ḫ*]*kr.w*[379] *Rꜥ*[380]

šmꜥ.s mḥw.s ɜbḫ(*.w*) *m tp=s*

sḥ[*t*]*p*(*.w*)*=s*[381] *m* (18) [3 blocks missing]

(# 143,15) And then she said: "Welcome, welcome!" (16) with the *nyny*-greeting,

her arms bearing that which is desired.

The paraphernalia of God's Wife was removed

so that she might don (17) and [w]e[a]r the [re]galia of Ra,

the Upper and Lower Egyptian crowns being united with her head.[382]

---

[377] I am thankful to Prof. Mark Smith for this suggestion.

[378] Chapter 4, 184–5.

[379] The top right corner of this block is broken off, with the right sides of what appear to be the uniliterals *f* (I 9) and *ɜ* (G 1), as well as of the *ḫkr*-hieroglyph (Aa 30) being missing (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 34). The result is the attested writing of the verb *fɜỉ* "hoch/aufheben; tragen" without a determinative (*Wb*. I, 572–3; Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 303). Lacau seems to not have detected the traces of these signs, and as a result suggested the restoration of the uniliteral phonetic elements which make up *ḫkr*: *ḫ* (F 32), *k* (V 31), and *r* (D 21; *Chapelle*, 116 (§ 169)). Helck followed this suggestion, but did not mark any lacuna (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 17). It should also be noted that the subject *=s* is omitted for *fɜ*, having just been mentioned for *wṯs* (for omission of subject, see: Allen, *Egyptian*, 250–1, § 17.5; Hoch, *Grammar*, 200, § 140; Gardiner, *Grammar*, 396–7, § 486–7).

[380] Lacau correctly read this circular sign as the sun-disc (N 5; cf. Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 34), while Helck saw it as the plural genitive *n.w* (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 17), whose suggestion Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 19) followed.

[381] There is a lacuna, not marked by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 116 (§ 169)) or Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 17), where the uniliteral *t* (X 1) should be (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 34).

[382] The lacuna and misreading of *Rꜥ* as *nw* (*supra*, nos. 379–80) resulted in inaccurate translations. Lacau: "Elle arbore les ornements de Rê, la couronne du Sud et la couronne du Nord étant mêlées sur sa tête" (*Chapelle*, 117 (§ 170)). Gillen, who followed Helck's suggestions (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 17):

She was pa[ci]fied as[383] (18) [3 missing blocks]

The *nyny* is a welcoming greeting, and diadem/Uraeus-goddesses are often depicted in this pose in coronation sequences, where they welcome the king into the sanctuary of the temple, where he meets the god.[384] Similarly, according to Stadler, Hatshepsut was crowned in the *ḥw.t-ʿɜ.t-Mɜʿ.t* (the complex encloses the barque sanctuary), where she had also put on her regalia of God's Wife.[385] There is, however, an example of a *nyny*-greeting in a scene in Luxor Temple, where its position right next to the central doorway into the temple's "third antechamber" which encircles the sanctuary of Alexander suggests that it was there, at the door before this sanctuary, that a priestess personifying a diadem-goddess would have stood, welcoming the king.[386] Here, too, the deity is a diadem-goddess: Amunet. The remainder of the scenes on the same wall, as well as those on the opposing one, depict the king making various offerings to Amun.[387] It could therefore be argued that it was from there, in front of the sanctuary where the image of the god would have rested, that the king would have presented offerings.[388]

Despite this, however, it is clear that the situation in the *Historical Inscription* is different: (1) Hatshepsut's enthronement is said to have taken place once they had entered *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* (*BL* 33; *H* 14–15; # 142,23–4); (2) based on the speech of a deity, discussed in the next section, Hatshepsut may have still been sitting

---

"so that she may wear the ornaments of the crown of Upper Egypt and the crown of Lower Egypt, they being united with her head" ("Historical Inscription", 19).

[383] Helck suggested the restoration of *wp.t=s* after the text breaks off (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 17), resulting in Gillen's translation of "they being united with her head, it resting on [her brow]" ("Historical Inscription", 19). This, however, shifts from the third person plural to the third person feminine: Hatshepsut must be the subject of *sḫtp*. The sense of this verb as "sich niederlsassen" (on a throne, for example), requires the preposition *ḥr* (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 738,10); I therefore suggest that Hatshepsut was here "pacified" as *nsw.t-bỉty*, or, as in # 142,23–4, *m ḫḳɜ ɜw.t-*[*ỉb*] "as the ruler of jo[y]."

[384] For *nyny*, see: *Wb.* II, 203. Examples of scenes with a diadem-goddess welcoming the king into the sanctuary of the temple include: one on the northern (inner) face of the east wing of the 8th Pylon (*PM* II, 174 (517) I, 1); another on the east side of inner face of the north wall of the Hypostyle Hall (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 199; *PM* II, 45 (154) III, 3). Note that the female deities performing the *nyny* in each scene are Weret-Hekau and Hathor, respectively, both diadem-goddesses. The *nyny*-greeting appears in Horemheb's coronation text as well (l. 16; *Urk.* IV, 2117,13).

[385] Stadler, "Krönung", 80–1.

[386] *PM* II, 323 (137) III, plan XXXII.

[387] *PM* II, 323 (137)–324 (138), plan XXXII.

[388] Bell, "Luxor", 276–9.

on the throne (*BL* 35; *H* 18; # 48,5); this notion is confirmed in a passage where, certainly at some point after Hatshepsut had fully become a king, it is stated that the procession started to move towards the temple proper (*BL* 42; *H* 23; # 109,2), demonstrating that they were not inside the temple before then.

8. *Speech of a deity, the ḫʿw-nsw.t, and the formulation of the titulary (BL 35; H 18–19; # 48 + 164; LC 119–23, § 171–2; G 19–20)*

[…] (# 48,1) *ỉrw.w=ṯ m nfrw=f*

ỉmy.w-p.t snš.n<=ṯ> (2) *sštɜ*

ỉmy.w-dwɜ.t ḥr sšm=ṯ

ḫʿ r=ṯ m ḫpr.w (3) *ỉtn=f*

ḫnm ṯn ḫʿ.w psḏ.t=f

ỉw (4) *nṯr.w m šms.wt=ṯ*

wbn=ṯ m sḫm n Rʿ

(5) *ỉṯ r=ṯ ḥms.t s.t-wr.t ỉmy.t-ḫnt pr ỉt=ṯ*

(6) *ḳɜ ỉr=ṯ m ỉr ṯn*

ḥʿ ỉr=ṯ m sḫʿ ṯn

(7) *wn.ỉn nn smḥr.w ỉb.w=sn šsp*(*.w*) *n m*(8)*h.t*

ỉṯ.n ḥr.w=sn gɜgɜw

ḫnm.n ḥʿ.w(# 164,9)*=sn gḥ.w*

mɜ=sn ḫʿw-nsw.t wɜḥ ỉr.t.n (10) *nb-r-ḏr ḏs=f*

rdỉ.n=sn s.t ḥr ḫ.wt=sn

m-ḫt (11) *nn gm.tw ỉb.w=sn*

wn.ỉn ḥm n nb-r-ḏr ḥr (12) *wd.t nḫb.t ḥm.t=s*

m nsw.t mnḫ m-ḳɜb (13) *Km.t*

ỉṯ tɜ.w smn ḫr.t=sn

ḏd ḥm=f wd=f (14) *nḫb.t m wḥm n=s ḥb.w-Sd*

ʿnḫ Ḥr Wsr.t-kɜ.w (15) [*Nb.ty Wɜḏ.t-rnp.wt Ḥr-Nbw Nṯr.yt-ḫʿ.w Nsw.t-bỉty*]

[*Mɜʿ.t-kɜ-*]*Rʿ* [*Sɜ.t-*]*Rʿ* [*Ḥɜ.t-šps.wt-ḫnm.t-*]*Im*[*n*]

"[…] (# 48,1) your forms in/with his beauty[389].

[389] This word is written with the triliteral *nfr* (F 35) with a stroke (Z 1) and a damaged sign which appears to be a vertical papyrus-roll (Y 1; see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 35 # 48). It should be noted that, according to the *Wörterbuch*, this spelling is more likely for another word, *nfr*, which means, among others "gute Dinge, Schätze" which is expressly stated to be distinct from *nfrw*. Regardless, however,

Those who are in the sky have revealed (lit. "opened") for <you> (2) the secret,
Those who are in the underworld were guiding you.
Arise/appear with the forms (3) of his sun-disk,
the crowns of his Ennead having been united with you,
(4) the gods are in your following,
you rising as the image of Ra,
(5) seize for yourself the sitting (on) the Great Seat which is in the front of the estate of your father,
(6) be exalted from the one who made you,
rejoice through the one who will cause you to appear!"
(7) Then these courtiers, their hearts were seized with forgetful(8)ness[390],
their faces frozen in an expression of (lit. "seized/held")[391] surprise,
their limbs joined (# 164,9) with fatigue,
when they saw the appearance of the enduring king which the Lord-of-All himself (10) made,
and they placed themselves on their bodies.
After these (11) things, they recovered (lit. "their hearts were found"),
the Person of the Lord-of-All then (12) installed the titulary of her Person
as the efficient king in the midst (13) of Egypt,
she who seizes the flat lands, the one who establishes their tributes.
His Person spoke, installing (14) the titulary, repeating *Sed*-festivals for her:
"The Living Horus: the Powerful-of-kas, (15) [She-of-the-Two-Ladies: the Flourishing-of-years, the Golden Horus: the Divine-of-appearances, the King of

"Schönheit is listed as one of the meanings of *nfr* (*Wb*. II, 259), for which reason I here follow Lacau (*Chapelle*, 122 (§ 172)) and Gillen's translation ("Historical Inscription", 19) of "beauty."

[390] Given that *šsp* (taken here in the sense of "ergreifen:" Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 835,2) is a transitive verb and is here a stative form, it must be translated in the passive voice; *contra* Gillen: "their hearts received forgetfulness" ("Historical Inscription", 20). Lacau's translation is different, but valid "leurs coeurs se mettaient à oublier" (C*hapelle*, 122, § 172; see also his remarks on the figurative sense of *šsp*: *ibid.*, 123 (§ 172,e)).

[391] I here take *i̯ṯ* "nehmen" in the sense of "ergreifen (und behalten)" (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 114,1), in that the onlookers took on an expression of surprise which they could not shake off.

> Upper and Lower Egypt:] [*Maatka*]*ra*, [the Daughter of] Ra: [Hatshepsut-joined-with-]Amu[n].”[392]

This speech was clearly addressed to Hatshepsut, but was not delivered by Amun, who is referred to in the third person throughout. All the actors in this text, aside from Hatshepsut, having thus far consisted of deities, it is likely that this one was uttered by one as well. While it was almost certainly once more a/the diadem-goddess, there are no clues to support this view, in contrast with the previous speech, where statements such as “I shall appear on her head, I shall grow on [her] fore[head]” (*BL* 34; *H* 16; # 44,3) allow this conclusion.

The excerpts from the speech contain some interesting statements which are worth noting: “Rise with the forms of his sun-disk, the crowns of his Ennead having been united with you, the gods in your following, you rising as the image of Ra” (*BL* 35; *H* 18; # 48,2–4). These are apparently describing things as they were: Hatshepsut at the front of the divine procession, with the images of the Ennead behind her. Statements such as the description of Hatshepsut as “the image of Ra” were warranted, for she was by then fully equipped with the office, throne, crowns, and regalia of kingship.

The statement “seize for yourself your seat, the Great Seat which is in the front of the estate of your father” (*BL* 35; *H* 18; # 48,5), while clear in meaning, still bears discussion. It was seen that Hatshepsut was already enthroned earlier in the text, in her “palace” *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* where, in similar phraseology, also through the transitive use of the verb *ḥmsi* “to sit,” Amun caused that she “occupy” the *ṯnṯ.t* “throne platform” (on which would have been the *s.t-wr.t*), whose place (*s.t*) on it he “installed” or “established” (*wḏ*) (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,23–5). It was also seen that the *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f* was most likely located somewhere at the front of the temple, a notion which finds support in the statement here describing the *s.t-wr.t* as “in the front of the

[392] The faces of two blocks, # 280 + 286, are severely eroded, and have been carved over, such that traces of only a handful of signs of the original inscription have survived (not included in this thesis for this reason; for photograph and facsimile, see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 36). It had long only been known that their original location was somewhere on the south side of the *Chapelle Rouge* due to the orientation of the hieroglyphs (*Chapelle*, 127, § 175), but it has since come to light that they formed, together with # 48 + 164, the sequence 48 + 164 + 280 + 286 (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 153). Helck’s statement that five blocks are missing after 48 + 164 (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 20) therefore needs updating, with three now being missing before the text resumes with # 285 + 24 (see the plan of the Chapelle Rouge’s second layer of blocks in: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 316).

estate" of Amun. The use of the imperative here suggests that Hatshepsut was expected to sit on the throne at some point after the god's speech, or was perhaps even doing so even while he spoke. Given that this *s.t-wr.t* is known to have been located in the palace structure, then it follows that the speech was being delivered already inside.

That this speech was once more to make known the gods' intentions is clear from the two parallel sentences: "be exalted from the one who made you, rejoice through the one who will cause you to appear" (*BL* 35; *H* 18–19; # 48,6). Both of these follow the same format as most of the speech, [imperative] + (*i*)*r*=*t*, but the structure of these two specific sentences is precisely the same, consisting of [imperative] + (*i*)*r*=*t* + *m* + participle + dependent pronoun (*ḳꜣ ỉr=t m ỉr tn*; *ḥꜥ ỉr=t m sḫꜥ tn*). Both Lacau and Gillen translated the participles with the past tense, however, possibly due to the fact that Hatshepsut had donned the crowns earlier in the text (*BL* 34; *H* 17; # 143,16–17), in which case the use of *sḫꜥ* in *ḥꜥ ỉr=t m sḫꜥ tn* as a perfective participle would be appropriate.[393]

The speech ends there, and what follows is a narrative section describing Hatshepsut's appearance as king (*ḫꜥw-nsw.t*) which is said to have been made (*ỉr*) by the "Lord-of-All himself" (*BL* 35; *H* 19, # 48,7–# 164,13). Analogously to the situation encountered twice already, where (1) the speech of a deity spoke of the enthronement of Hatshepsut (*BL* 33; *H* 11–13; # 166 + 22,1–13), which was actualised in the following narrative section (*BL* 33; *H* 13–15; # 22 + 142,13–25), and (2) the speech of another deity promised her the crowns (*BL* 34; *H* 16–17; # 44 + 143,1–15), which was realised in the succeeding narrative (*BL* 34; *H* 17; # 143,15–18), we could have here a similar procedure where a deity declared that Amun was going to *sḫꜥ* "cause to appear" Hatshepsut. This, as the following passages clearly indicate, is precisely what happened next. The correct reading of the participle *sḫꜥ* should therefore be with a future sense.

Interestingly in contrast to the view posited by Gillen and Lacau, if anything, the other participle, *ỉr*, could also be seen as having a prospective sense, in parallel to *sḫꜥ*. The grammatical form of *ỉr*, though it constitutes inconclusive evidence, does not exclude this view, for prospective active participles do not geminate.[394] The sentence in the narrative section recounting Hatshepsut's royal appearance (*ḫꜥw-nsw.t*) being made

[393] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 122 (§ 172); Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 20.

[394] Hoch, *Grammar*, 136 (§ 121,3,a).

(*ỉr*) by Amun himself could, in fact, be a play on the two parallel sentences. Just as it was said that the god would cause Hatshepsut to appear (*sḫˁ*), which did occur after the speech, so Hatshepsut could have been "made" (*ỉr*), that is, "born" into her new life as Pharaoh by the god at her *ḫˁw-nsw.t*, therefore once more actualising the statement the unknown divinity made to Hatshepsut: "be exalted from the one who will make you; rejoice through the one who will cause you to appear!"

a. *The ḫˁw-nsw.t*

The speaking deity also tells Hatshepsut to "seize" the throne (*s.t-wr.t*). Based on the order alone in which the statements by the god are made, it must be assumed that the procession was then still located inside the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f*, where Hatshepsut was still seated on the throne. After the speech ends, the events which had taken place are referred to as the *ḫˁw-nsw.t* which Amun "made" (*ỉr*). That Hatshepsut "appeared," however, might suggest some sort of movement from one location to another, perhaps from the inner areas of the temple and out onto the public forecourt, but this is not supported by the evidence. Firstly, it was argued above that the setting was most likely the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f* given the mention of the *s.t-wr.t* and its position "in front of" the temple. Furthermore, in the next narrative section, on the north side of the Chapelle Rouge, it is said that *m-ḫt nn wḏꜣ r ḥw.t=f nṯr* "afterwards, there was a procession to his temple" (*BL* 42; *H* 23, # 109,2), implying that no exit had yet been made before this point.

The courtiers, by their presence at the moment of Hatshepsut's appearance as king, would have taken on the mythical role of all of humanity celebrating at the daily glorious rise of the sun at dawn. This theme of celebration would have been accompanied, as argued above, with that of domination. This is discussed further below, but the very action of throwing oneself to the ground at Hatshepsut's appearance, whether or not this was done by the *smḥr.w*, symbolically re-enacted the celebration done by all of creation for the sun in the morning.[395]

[395] Cf. *infra*, 102–3. This theme appears in the text known as *The King as Sun-priest*, or *Der König als Sonnenpriester*, wherein humanity is described as celebrating sunrise: "He (the king) lives in joy, like Re Harakhti, at seeing whom the patricians rejoice, for whom the folk make jubilations, in his form of Youth" (i.e. the sun at sunrise; translation from: Parkinson, *Voices*, 40). Nature, too, was seen as celebrating the same fact, as epitomised in the perceived joyful clamour of baboons at sunrise; this motif appears in *The King as Sun-priest* as well, with the baboons here referred to as "the eastern

It would be tempting in this light to imagine Hatshepsut's *ḫˁw-nsw.t* having taken place from a so-called "window of appearances" in the same manner as Ramses III would have done later in his mortuary temple at Medinet Habu, as evidenced by the scenes and their captions referred to above. However, it is not even known whether windows of appearances existed at all yet during her reign.[396] The likelier scenario was probably that an exit was made from a door or gate, perhaps even one of the *rw.ty* mentioned near the start of the text, out into a public court. The term *ḫˁ-nsw.t*, it will be remembered, was used during the New Kingdom to refer to a king's accession.[397] To note, however, is the fact that it is simply said that it was the Lord-of-All himself who "made" Hatshepsut's *ḫˁw-nsw.t* (*BL* 35; *H* 19; # 164,9–10), without any elaboration on the specifics of the actions involved.

It is unknown how these events played out exactly, but their momentous significance is clear: Hatshepsut, who had heretofore been regent and God's Wife, was now officially Pharaoh, and had completed her *ḫˁw-nsw.t*. The full impact of this event did not escape those present and, once more, the text describes their reaction in great detail. Hatshepsut was now king, the ruler of Egypt, alongside her stepson, Thutmose III. The designation of an heir, done not by the king himself, but through divine intervention, and for a queen no less, truly warranted the reaction recorded in the *Historical Inscription*.

In Horemheb's Turin inscription, it is said that (1) Horemheb was crowned inside the *pr-nsw.t*, which was followed by (2) the making of his titulary.[398] This could match the *Historical Inscription*, in that (1) Hatshepsut's *ḫˁw-nsw.t* was inside her *ˁḥ-nsw.t*, the *Nn-wɜ=i-r=f*, which (2) took place alongside the composition and announcement of her titulary. The final, "culmination," scene in the sequence found on the north half of the west wall of the Great Hypostyle Hall depicts Sety I kneeling, his back turned to Amun, who says: *smn=i n=k ḫˁ.w ḥr-tp=k ḫˁ.ti m nsw.t-bity* "I establish the crowns on your head for you, you having appeared as King of Upper and Lower

Souls:" "King N knows this secret speech which the eastern Souls say, as they sing acclamations to Re as he rises and appears in the horizon" (*ibid.*, 39, no. 4; cf. Störk, *LÄ* IV, s.v. "Pavian", 594).

[396] The architectural feature on the left side of the upper court of her temple at Deir el-Bahari, while certainly a window, did not necessarily consist of a "window of appearances" (Vomberg, *Erscheinungsfenster*, 250–2).

[397] Redford, *History*, 22–5.

[398] Turin cols. 15–16, 19: *Urk.* IV, 2117,10—15, 2118,11–15.

Egypt."[399] The caption of Sety I from the same scene interestingly says: [*praenomen* and *nomen*] *sḫˁ.n ỉt=f ỉmn r ỉr.t nsw.yt=f* "[Sety I] is whom his father Amun caused to appear in order to exercise (lit. "make") his kingship" (fig. 4).[400] Amun's establishing (*smn*) of the crowns (*ḫˁ.w*) at Sety I's appearance (*ḫˁ*) from his caption is therefore to be equated with his act of causing Sety to appear (*sḫˁ*) from the king's caption. This obvious, but key, observation enables the final piece of the puzzle to fall into place. Amun making (*ỉr*) Hatshepsut's *ḫˁw-nsw.t*, akin to his causing Sety to appear (causative *sḫˁ*), consisted of the god either crowning her, or touching the crowns on her head, thus confirming her kingship. It is unfortunately unclear, however, due to the missing blocks between when Hatshepsut first wore the crowns (*BL* 34; *H* 17; # 143,15–18) and the passages under discussion here, whether the *ḫˁw-nsw.t* refers to an action which took place in the meantime, akin to coronation sequences in which the episode of the imposition of the crowns "culminates" in Amun affixing (*smn*) the worn crowns, or whether it is simply synonymous with "accession," referring to the overall result of the rituals Hatshepsut underwent.

It is to note, however, that despite similarities, the Sety I scene is helpful only in illustrating what the act of *sḫˁ* or *ỉrỉ ḫˁ* might have consisted of, for their religious occasions are different. The differences are also clear in that in the *Historical Inscription*, Hatshepsut's *ḫˁw-nsw.t* clearly took place insider her palace, while "culmination" scenes in coronation sequences take place inside the temple. Horemheb's being crowned inside a palace structure, rather than the temple, would be in contradiction with Bell and Gardiner, both of whom argued that the *pr-wr* shrine in the Turin inscription referred to Luxor Temple.[401] Even though this term could indeed refer to the sanctuary of a temple, the presence of the *pr-wr* inside the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f* of Hatshepsut and the *pr-nsw.t* of Horemheb perhaps implies the setting up of temporary shrines mimicking the ancient *pr-wr* in which new kings were expected to be crowned at their accession. The scenes carved on the seventh register of the Chapelle Rouge, as well as those on the tip of her obelisk, the top of which lies broken today near the

[399] *PM* II, 47 (158) II, 4; Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150 col. 8.

[400] *Ibid.*, 150 cols. 13–16.

[401] Bell, "Luxor", 273–4; Gardiner, "Coronation", 25. Meyer and Dorman, on the other hand, argued for the royal palace in Karnak (*Senenmut*, 23–4; *Monuments*, 26).

Sacred Lake, could be seen as symbolic representations of this precise moment.[402] Hatshepsut is kneeling, turned away from Amun, who is reaching out to touch her head; in the case of the pyramidion scene, his arms, it has been noted, together form the *kꜣ*-hieroglyph, thus clearly depicting the moment of the transference of the royal *ka* to his beloved daughter.[403]

In this light, an earlier event in the *Historical Inscription* comes to mind: it was said that after they entered the *Nn-wꜣ=i̯-r=f*, "he (Amun) extended his arms (in protection) over his egg," after which he seated her on the throne (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,21–4). This statement confirms both the notion that (1) the *ḫʿw-nsw.t* did indeed take place inside *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, Hatshepsut having been enthroned all along, and that (2) the enthronement and Amun touching her head, combined with his and the Uraeus-goddess' speeches confirming their will, resulted in Hatshepsut's full transformation into Pharaoh, and consisted of her *ḫʿw-nsw.t*. Interestingly, according to Bell: "The god's embrace of the king from behind … does, in any case, represent the kind of protective gesture which is implied in the motif of the *ka*-arms themselves."[404]

After the description of the reaction of the witnesses, the text goes on to state that Amun "installed" (*wḏ*) her *nḫb.t* "titulary" (*BL* 35; *H* 19; # 48,12–14). The verb *wdi̯*, generally rendered "to establish," is one of several commonly used in constructions with the word *nḫb.t*. Bonhême, in contrast, argues for the likelier translation of "rédiger" or "disposer."[405] The decree of Thutmose I,[406] Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse*,[407] as well as Horemheb's Turin text[408] all contain an episode involving the formulation of the royal titulary. The passage from the *Texte de la*

---

[402] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 79–84, 124–7; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 234–56 (§ 376–406 bis)). Obelisk: *PM* II, 218 (33).

[403] Wilkinson, *Reading*, 49. The final scene in the sequence carved on the south wall of the sanctuary of Philip Arrhidaeus has the same disposition of the king kneeling before Amun, turned away from him, whose arms form the *kꜣ*-hieroglyph as he reaches for his head (Bell, "Divine", 173, note 154 in p. 298).

[404] Bell, "Luxor", 272.

[405] *wdi̯*: "to place, put; (im)plant; lay; appoint" (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 72). *Wb.* I, 389, 11–12; cf. *Wb.* II, 308, 4. Non-royal names could be said to be "established" as well (Breasted, *Chapter*, 19 no. 36). For a detailed list of attestations of *nḫb.t* and constructions in which this term is found, such as *wdi̯ nḫb.t* or *i̯rr̄i̯ nḫb.t*, see: Bonhême, "Désignations", 350–60. This article also contains attestations of other terms or expressions denoting the royal titulary: *rn-wr*, *rn mꜣʿ*, and *rn* (*ibid.*, 360 f.).

[406] *Urk.* IV, 79–81.

[407] *Urk.* IV, 160–1.

[408] *Urk.* IV, 2118,11–15.

jeunesse is the closest parallel, using the same verb *wḏi* to express the establishment of the titulary, which is also expressed with the term *nḫb.t*.[409] In contrast, the Turin inscription uses an alternative expression: *ỉrỉ rn-wr*.[410] The making of Hatshepsut's titulary is depicted in relief in the Middle Colonnade at Deir el-Bahari, where Thoth and Seshat are depicted writing down her names.[411] The main inscription contains a section in which Hatshepsut's titulary is *mɜṯ* "announced."[412] Similarly, a fragmentary older Middle Kingdom text, on which specifically the titulary-section of Hatshepsut's may have partially been based (or, alternatively, both drew from a common repertoire of texts), also mentioned the compilation, and perhaps announcement, of Amenemhat III's titulary.[413]

b. <u>*The titulary*</u>

The formulation of the titulary in the *Texte de la jeunesse* and in Horemheb's inscriptions is preceded by a crowning of the king. As will be seen in the following chapter, the narrative of Thutmose III's text goes from being realistic, akin to the *Historical Inscription* with the mention of real place names and movements of the procession, and moves the unfolding events onto the mythical plane once Amun had chosen him. It will also be demonstrated that it is debatable whether the events of this text even consisted of a coronation ceremony *per se*. In the fifth chapter of this thesis, it will be demonstrated Horemheb's texts, in contrast, do indeed most likely give an account of what may be called his coronation. They also serve as a better point of comparison than the *Texte de la jeunesse*, as they describe events in worldly terms.

The similar sequence found in Hatshepsut's and Horemheb's texts of (1) crowning and (2) titulary was noted above. It bears mentioning however that the two

---

[409] Col. 12: *Urk.* IV, 160,11. The caption of a scene in Hatshepsut's Speos Artemidos temple has Amun declare, in similar phraseology: *wd.n(=ỉ) nḫb.t=ṯ* "I installed your titulary" (*Urk.* IV, 285,6).

[410] *Urk.* IV, 2118,11 (l. 19); cf. the similar inscription on the stela to Ptah from Memphis, l. 8 (*Urk.* IV, 2123,6). For Bonhême's compilation of attestations of *rn-wr*, see: "Désignations", 360–8.

[411] *Deir el Bahari* III, pls. 59–60 and text p. 4; *Urk.* IV, 251–2.

[412] *Urk.* IV, 261,11–13. Here, Hatshepsut's titulary is referred to as *rn.w=s n.w nsw.t-bỉty* "her names of King of Upper and Lower Egypt" (cf. Bonhême, "Désignations", 369 f., esp. 377, and no. 8 a–b in p. 380–1).

[413] Müller, "Umgang", 196–7; *contra* Barta ("Rituale", 7; "Thronbesteigung", 39), Schott (*Krönungstag*, 201–2), and Breasted (*Records* II, 95 (§ 233); *Records* I, 222 no. c (§ 462)), who argued that Hatshepsut's text was a direct copy. For the 12th Dynasty fragments, see: Berlin 15801–15804 (*Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin* I, 138, 268).

sources from Horemheb's reign, the Turin inscription and the Ptah temple stela, do not precisely match in the order in which the main episodes of the occasion took place. The Turin inscription describes (1) the imposition of the crowns, followed by (2) a speech by the Ennead, which is followed by (3) the formulation of the titulary, after which came (4) the exit from the temple, at which point Amun seems to confirm the kingship bestowed upon Horemheb by embracing him.[414] In the Memphite stela, on the other hand, the order of the last two is reversed: (1) bestowal with the crowns, (2) speech of the Ennead, (3) the exit from the temple and embrace, and (4) the formulation of the titulary.[415] In either case, however, it is clear that the public appearance of the king, after the reception of the crowns inside the temple, is intimately related to the formulation and/announcement of the titulary, as well as a public confirmation by the god of the bestowal of the crowns. Coronation sequences typically have their "culminating" scene of Amun confirming the king's kingship taking place at the same time as the composition of the royal titulary. The Hypostyle Hall's west wall's culmination scene equally has Thoth inscribing Sety I's titulary on the *rnp.t*-hieroglyph (fig. 4).[416] With this in mind, it should not be altogether surprising that, in the two Horemheb sources, the order of the two episodes of (1) formulation of the titulary and (2) confirmation of kingship by Amun could be reversed. What this possibly indicates is a close succession of the events of (1) initial imposition of the crown(s), (2) composition/announcement of the titulary, and (3) exit and public confirmation of kingship.

It should also be noted that the making of the titulary seems to have been a more complicated affair than the coronation sequences let on. There seem to have been two episodes pertaining to the titulary: one which would have perhaps involved the formal composition of her titulary, and a second one which would have consisted of its official

[414] *Urk.* IV, 2117,14—2118,18.

[415] *Urk.* IV, 2122,2—2123,3.

[416] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150. The seventh register of the outer walls of the Chapelle Rouge mostly consist of coronation scenes. Block 186 on the north wall depicts the kingship of Hatshepsut being confirmed by Amun and Weret-Hekau. The block bearing the scene preceding it is missing, but its scene caption, a *ḏd mdw ỉn*, makes it clear that Thoth would have been present. A part of the caption has him say, addressing Amun: *smn(=ỉ) gn.wt n.t sꜣ.t=k* "I establish the annals of your daughter" (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 127). This sequence is intact on the equivalent scene on the southern wall, where the depiction of the god Thoth and his caption, where he also states that he is establishing Hatshepsut's annals, carving her names on the *rnp.t*-hieroglyph, survives (blocks 172 + 261; Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle*, 79).

announcement to the public. The evidence for this comes from Hatshepsut's Middle Colonnade inscription. There, the reliefs, before the text, depict the composition of her names by Thoth and Seshat.[417] Afterwards, according to the inscription pertaining to the scene depicting Thutmose I presenting a young Hatshepsut to her court, the assembled officials, upon hearing his announcement inside the palace that he has chosen her as his successor, went forth joyfully announcing (*mꜣꜣ*) *rn n ḥm.t=s m nsw.t* "the name of her Person as King."[418] Several kinds of officials were listed, but it will be noted that the *ḫry.w-ḥb.t* "lector-priests" were not among them. They were later specifically summoned by Thutmose I: *wḏ ḥm=f ỉn.t n.t ḫr.yw-ḥb.t r mꜣꜣ rn.w=s wr.w n.w šsp sʿḥ.w=s n nsw.t-bỉty* "His Person caused that the lector-priests be brought for the announcement of her Great Names of receiving her dignities of King of Upper and Lower Egypt."[419] Even though Hatshepsut's titulary was already known and was being shouted out by the assembled officials, there was still need to summon the lector-priests, possibly involving a required ritual for Hatshepsut's titulary before it was officially announced. Clearly, this was a more complicated affair than the culmination scenes would suggest.

The passage pertaining to Hatshepsut's titulary seems to consist of its first official formulation. Earlier in the text, however, there is a mention of *rn-wr*, but this is unfortunately all that remains of that column of text. It may therefore have been the case that some ritual involving the titulary had indeed already taken place. The very mention of the composition (*wḏ*) of the titulary at the time of Hatshepsut's *ḫʿw-nsw.t* does match the Horemheb texts and the coronation sequences, even if they differed in particulars.

With her *ḫʿw-nsw.t* accomplished, and her titulary announced and ready, Hatshepsut was finally a king in the full sense of the word, a possessor of the royal ka. There unfortunately follows a gap of five blocks, and the text resumes in a speech by Amun termed the "Instructions d'Amon à la reine" by Lacau, and "Amun's Speech: the Divine Demands" by Gillen (*H* 20; *DeB* 46–7 and *BL* 35; *H* 20–2; # 285 + 24; *LC* 124–9, § 173–5; *G* 20).[420] The two blocks # 285 + 24 form the last two on the east end of the

[417] *Deir el Bahari* III, pls. 59–60; *Urk.* IV, 250–2.

[418] Col. 25: *Urk.* IV, 260,2; *Deir el Bahari* III, 62.

[419] Cols. 31–2: *Urk.* IV, 261,2–4; *Deir el Bahari* III, 62.

[420] For translation, see: Appendix A, 295–7.

second register on the south side of the Chapelle Rouge. The text is resumed on the north side of the monument, but the first three blocks are missing.[421] The equivalent passage from the Deir el-Bahari version of the text is highly fragmentary, but it relates a speech being given by a group of deities, most likely the Ennead (*DeB* 52–56; *H* 22–3; *LC* 129, § 176; *G* 21).[422] Neither speech contains any passages relevant to the aims of this thesis, and will not be discussed. After the speech begins a crucial narrative section.

9. *Hatshepsut's appointment at the Station, and the performance of an offering (BL 42; H 23–5; # 109 + 72; LC 129–33, § 177–8; G 21)*

[…] (# 109,1) *m sp wˁ*

wn.i̯n=sn ḥr ḫ.wt=sn ḥr sn tɜ r ˁɜ.t wr.t

(2) *m-ḫt nn wḏɜ r ḥw.t-nṯr=f*

rdi̯.n=f nsw.t pw (3) *ḫr-ḥɜ.t=f*

psḏ.t=f m šms.wt=f

i̯my.w p.t (4) *ḥr rš sp-sn*

tɜ r-ḏr=f m i̯hhy ḥr wšɜ (5) *ḥknw m ḫsf.w=f*

bɜ ˁnḫ n ḥm n Rˁ w[*d*][423] (6) *srḫ=f ḥr-tp tɜ pn*

ḳmɜ.n=f r ṯs nt[*.t nb.t*][424]

(7)[425] *r smnḫ i̯db.wy m* [*ḫ*]*t*[*=f*][426]

bˁḥ(*.w*) *tɜ.wy m ḏˁm*[427] *st.*[*wt=f*][428]

---

[421] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 129 (§ 176).

[422] For translation, see: Appendix A Part 2, 297–8.

[423] The uniliteral *w* (G 43) survives, as do the determinatives of the two sticks crossed (Z 9) and the forearm with hand holding stick (D 40), making the reading of this word as *wd* certain. Its use with *nḫb.t* further confirms the accuracy of this restoration (see: Chapter 4, 169 nos. 639–40).

[424] Restoration suggested by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 130 (§ 177)), which Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 24) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 21) followed.

[425] Not marked by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 24).

[426] Slight damage to the block here has erased the left sides of the branch hieroglyph *ḫt* (M 3) and the uniliteral *f* (I 9).

[427] While this is marked as a lacuna by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 130 (§ 177)) and Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 24), and there is indeed damage, the epigraphy published by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 42 # 109) shows the unmistakable traces of either the *wɜs-* (S 40) or *ḏˁm*-sceptre (S 41).

[428] The block breaks off here, with the bottom of the cow's skin pierced by an arrow (F 29) for the noun *stw.t* being missing as a result, along with any phonetic complements, determinative (the sun with rays: N 8), and an expected suffix pronoun *=f* referring to Amun (see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 42 # 109).

(# 72,8) *wbn=f mỉ ỉtn*

wn.ỉn=f ḥr dhn ḥm.t=s (9) *r ꜥḥꜥw nb n ns.wt*

ḥr sꜥšɜ bỉɜ.wt ḥr=s

ḥr rdỉ.t snḏ=s (10) *m-bɜḥ*

m-ḫt nn wḏɜ nṯr pn ḥtp ḥr s.t=f (11) [*n*].*t ḏꜥm*

psḏ.t n.t ỉỉp.t-S.wt ḥꜥ.w m ḫsf.w (12) *ḥm.t=s*

wn.ỉn=tw ḥr ỉr.t snṯr ḥr smɜꜥ ꜥɜb.t (13) *n ỉỉmn m ỉỉp.t-S.wt*

n psḏ.t ỉmy.t ḫt=f

n nṯr.w nṯr.wt (14) *ỉmy.w pr=f*

nỉs(.*w*) *ḥknw m rn-wr n nb* [*pr*]*=f*

[…] (# 109,1) with one accord.

They were then on their bellies, kissing the earth exceedingly.

(2) After these things, there was a procession to his temple.

He placed this king (3) in front of him,

his Ennead in his following,

those who are in the sky (4) very joyful,

the entire land in acclamation, reci[ting] (5) praises at his approach.

The living *ba* of the Person of Ra, (6) his *serekh* was es[tab]lished on this land

which he created in order to bind [all which] i[s],

(7)[429] in order to perfect the Two Banks under [h]is [gu]idance (lit. "through him")[430].

The Two Lands were inundated with the [elec]trum of [his] ra[ys],

(# 72,8) when he arose like the sun-disk.

He then appointed her Person (9) at the *Station of the Lord* of the king,

multiplying *bỉɜy.t*-signs for her,

placing the fear of her (10) in the front.

After these things, this god proceeded, and rested on his seat (11) [o]f electrum,

the Ennead of Karnak jubilating at the approach (12) of her Person.

One then did the censing and presenting of offerings (13) to Amun-in-Karnak,

to the Ennead which was in his following,

[429] Not marked by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 24).

[430] Translation suggested by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 131–2 (§ 178), which Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 21) followed.

and to the gods and goddesses (14) who are in his estate.
Praises were invoked in the Great Name of the lord of his [estate][431].

a. *The procession*

The speech of the group of deities, probably the Ennead of Karnak, appears to have ended by this point. The missing start of the first sentence may have related another act, most likely one of submission akin to "kissing the earth," perhaps "placing oneself on one's belly," or "doing adoration" (*ỉr.t ỉɜw*). No express mention has survived of who the performers of these actions were. There can be little doubt, however, that they would have been either (1) the *smḏr.w*, given that it appears that most of the preceding lacuna consisted of speeches, and that the following sentence states that "after these things, there was a procession to his temple," the implication being that they were still inside what was presumably the *Nn-wɜ=ỉ-r=f* at this point, or (2) the population at large (*tɜ r-ḏr=f* or simply *rekhyt*). This, however, seems less likely for the two—admittedly inconclusive—reasons given above, that (1) the *ḫʿw-nsw.t* took place inside the palace, and (2) that the first attested mention of the public ("the entire land in acclamation") appears once more only after the exit from the palace was made ("after these things, there was a procession to the temple").

Comparing the *Historical Inscription* once again with Horemheb's accounts, one finds that the similarities that the sequence of (1) crowning and (2) titulary share fit within a larger similar sequence of events. According to Horemheb's texts, after he was crowned inside a *pr-wr* shrine in what most likely was a palace structure, the *pr-nsw.t*, a speech was given by the Ennead.[432] This was followed by an exit from the *pr-nsw.t*, after which Amun placed Horemheb *ḫr-ḥɜ.t=f* "in front of him," at which point *ḥpt.n=f nfr.w=f ḫʿ.w m ḫprš* "he (Amun) embraced his beauty, he (Horemheb) having arisen with the *khepresh*-crown."[433] This, it has been demonstrated, would have involved the titulary in one way or another, whether it was being composed, or simply announced.

[431] Lacau here has a lacuna with no suggestions (*Chapelle*, 131 (§ 177)), and Helck has only *pr* with a stroke between brackets (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 26). According to Burgos and Larché, the right extremities of *pr* and *=f* are still visible, but there is no room for a stroke (*Chapelle* I, 42).

[432] Turin cols. 17–18: *Urk.* IV, 2117,19—2118,10. The speech in the Ptah stela version starts off the same and, after a lacuna, it shares only one more sentence before briefly diverging from the Turin version (ll. 6–7: *Urk.* IV, 2122,8–16).

[433] Turin cols. 19–20: *Urk.* IV, 2118,16–18; Ptah stela ll. 7–8: *Urk.* IV, 2123,1–3.

Hatshepsut, similarly, after having been crowned in what also was a palace structure, *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, had her titulary officially composed, which was received with a glorifying speech by a group of deities, most likely also the Ennead. This was then followed by her exiting her palace in procession, and Amun placing her in front of him, which was greeted with great celebration by the population at large: "those who are in the sky very joyful, the entire land in acclamation" (*BL* 42; *H* 24; # 109,3–4). Horemheb's public appearance and embrace were equally received with great joyousness, this expressed very similarly: *p.t m ḥb tꜣ ḫr rš.wt psḏ.wt n.wt Tꜣ-Mry ib=sn nḏm.w ỉs.t rf tꜣ ỉdb tm.w m rš.wt sgb=sn r ḥr.t wr.w kt.t ṯꜣỉ=sn nhm tꜣ-r-ḏr=f ḥꜥ.w* "the sky was in festivity, the earth was joyful, the Enneads of the Beloved Land, their heart was pleased, while the land, the bank, and all the people were joyful, they cheered to the heavens, while great and small, they seized shouting, while the entire land was rejoicing."[434] In another so-called coronation text of his, this time from the temple of Montu in Karnak, it is stated that "the Ennead is rejoicing (*m ḥꜥꜥ.w*)."[435]

These passages describing celebration after the public appearance of the new king mirror closely those at the end of the *Contendings of Horus and Seth*, when Isis declares: *tꜣ psḏ.t m ḥb p.t m rš.wt ṯꜣỉ=sn mꜣḥw m-ḏr ptr=sn Ḥr sꜣ ỉs.t ỉw=f ḥꜥ.w ḥḳꜣ ꜥ. w. s. n Km.t tꜣ psḏ.t ỉb=sn hr.t-ỉb tꜣ r-ḏr=f m ḥꜥꜥ.wt* "'The Ennead is in festivity, the sky is joyful, they don the garlands when they see Horus the son of Isis having arisen/stood as ruler l. p. h. of Egypt, the Ennead, their heart was pleased, and the entire land was rejoicing."[436] While ultimately inconclusive, these passages support an identification of what took place in these various texts with one another: Horus,

---

[434] Turin cols. 20–1: *Urk.* IV, 2119,2–7. The Ptah Stela does not contain a precise equivalent, but it does appear that there was mention of some celebrating in a highly fragmentary part of the text: *psḏ.t m ḥꜥꜥ.w* "the Ennead was rejoicing" (l. 9; *Urk.* IV, 2116,4). To note is that the descriptions of celebrating occur twice in the "coronation" part of the Turin inscription, where the ones referred to here are from the second (ll. 20–1). The first instance (ll. 16–17) is the one that contextually matches the instance from the *Historical Inscription*, in that it is the first crowning of the king which is being described. It is the second instance which was chosen for the comparison with the *Historical Inscription* here in the thesis because it mirrors more closely the instances found in Hatshepsut's text and in the *Contendings*. This comparison of three instances of celebrating is not fallacious however, since every appearance (*ḫꜥ*) of the king was symbolically seen as the daily rise of the sun at dawn, which was also believed to have been greeted daily with much celebrating across the entirety of creation. In short: (1) the celebrating in this part of the *Historical Inscription*, (2) the second instance in the Turin inscription, and (3) the one at the end of the *Contendings*, even though the specific event being celebrated in each may differ, they are still symbolically one and the same, for which reason the comparison presented here is valid.

[435] *Urk.* IV, 2126,4.

[436] Papyrus Chester Beatty I (recto), page 16, ll. 6–7.

Hatshepsut, and Horemheb, had all just become king, news of which was greeted with great celebration. While it is clear that Horus and Hatshepsut (through events which culminated in her *ḥʿw-nsw.t*) had officially just become king, the same may not be so readily said for Horemheb, for whom the occasion would have consisted of his "coronation" rather than his accession, but this is immaterial: any *ḥʿi* "appearance" of the king mirrored that of the sun god at dawn,[437] and would have been accompanied by mass celebration. Another similarity between Hatshepsut's and Horemheb's accounts will be noticed toward the end of this passage; for now, attention must first be devoted to what happened next.

The exit from the palace and procession toward the temple is described in typical terms: as in the start of this text, we are informed that "his (Amun's) Ennead is in his following" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 7; # 222,1), while his rays shone in the eyes of all those present "the Two Lands were inundated with the [elec]trum of [his] ra[ys], he having arisen like the sun-disk" (*BL* 42; *H* 24; # 109 + 72,7–8), a statement which finds its parallel in the *Texte de la jeunesse stw.t=f m ỉr.wy pʿ.t* "while his rays were in the eyes of the *paet*."[438] We are then informed that "he (Amun) then appointed her Person at the *Station of the Lord* of the king, multiplying *bỉɜy.t*-signs for her" (*BL* 42; *H* 24; # 72,8–9). As mentioned above, Gitton, Carlotti, and Gabolde believe that the *Station* was located between what is today the area between the 4th and 5th Pylons.[439] Since (1) it is clear that this feature was located in a public area of the temple, and given that (2) the main frontal pylon of the temple at the time of the events of the *Historical Inscription* was the 5th, and that the temple's *wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr* was most likely located in front of it, then it appears likely that the *Station* was located somewhere in this forecourt.[440] This conclusion is supported by its being the venue of the presentation of offerings which took place next, for among the roles of temple forecourts were to accommodate a large number of people (including members of the population at large) when they acted as the venues for necessarily public events such as animal sacrifices, the presentation of tribute, or the rewarding of officials.[441]

---

[437] Redford, *History*, 4–5.

[438] *Urk.* IV, 157,17 (col. 4).

[439] Gitton, "Palais", 63–73; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 292.

[440] *Contra* Breasted, who argued that it was located in the temple sanctuary (*Chapter*, 16–17 no. 23).

[441] Morenz, *Religion*, 92–5; Gabolde, "Cour", 55–61.

In this manner, we have a situation identical to one at Luxor Temple where, before the construction of the colonnade and the later additions of Ramses II, the forecourt of Amenhotep III[442] would have been the *wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr* of this temple, identical to the *mɜrw*: *wḥm mnw ỉr.n ḥm=f n ỉt=f ʾImn ỉr.t n=f mɜrw m ḥtp-nṯr ḫft-ḥr-nʾIp.t-rs.yt* "Repeating (or "erecting") of monuments which his Person made for his father Amun, the making for him of a *maru* as a divine offering at the front of the Southern Sanctuary (Luxor Temple)."[443] It is described as *s.t šsp bɜk.wt ḫɜs.wt nb.wt ms ỉn.w ʿšɜ.w m-bɜḥ ỉt=ỉ m ḫrp.wt tɜ.w nb.w* "the place for receiving the products of all foreign lands, (and for) presenting numerous tributes in the presence of my father, consisting of the taxes/dues of all lands."[444] Furthermore, Bell argues, "[t]he occurrence of this *rekhyet* formula here tends to confirm the admission of the populace to this place."[445]

b. <u>*Appointment at the Station*</u>

Hatshepsut, therefore, was made to stand at the *Station of the Lord* which, as the name suggests, was the designated location for the king. Amun's *s.t n.t ḏʿm* seems to have been his own sacred post, presumably a podium on which the god's barque could rest while the offerings were presented to him (and is not a reference to his sanctuary). That Hatshepsut had by now become Pharaoh is clear since, for the first time, so far as the preservation of the text permits this statement, she is referred to as a *nsw.t* for the first time: "he (Amun) placed the *king* in front of him" (*BL* 42; *H* 23; # 109,2–3). The position of being placed in front of Amun was in itself also a purely royal prerogative. We are then told that Amun placed her at the *Station* and "multiplied *bỉɜy.t*-signs for her" (*BL* 42; *H* 24, # 72,9). The mention of Amun performing *bỉɜy.t*-signs at this juncture, when the procession has returned to the temple's *Station* area, is of a high significance which has thus far been overlooked. It will be remembered that, at the start of the text, when only Thutmose III was king, that Amun skipped his performance of a *bỉɜy.t* at the *Station*, presumably where he, or a representative due to his young age, was perhaps posted, thus signaling his disapproval with matters as they were. Now,

[442] *PM* II, 316 (90) f.

[443] *Urk.* IV, 1651,7–8; Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 600–7; Bell, "Luxor", 275 no. 121.

[444] *Urk.* IV, 1651,17—1652,1.

[445] Bell, "Luxor", 275 no. 128.

with Hatshepsut on the throne, his divine will actualised, Amun was pleased to perform his *bi3y.t* at the *Station*, having there posted his beloved daughter.

This could be taken one step further. Given that Amun demonstrated his displeasure by not performing a *bi3y.t* at the *Station* when only Thutmose III was king, and that he did so only after and as soon as Hatshepsut had become the ruler, then it could be argued that all which took place in the meantime—such as enthronement and reception of the crowns—were steps aimed at transforming Hatshepsut into Pharaoh. They consisted of an "interruption" in the expected sequence of events of whichever religious occasion was the backdrop of Hatshepsut's seizure of power as related in the *Historical Inscription*. This being the case, then one might expect that, had Amun been pleased with things as they were at the start of the text, he would have actually performed his *bi3y.t* at the *Station* where presumably a representative of Thutmose III would have stood, after which offerings would have been presented to him as planned.

If the *Station* is expected to be the location where the king would have performed various rituals such as censing and presentation of offerings to Amun, then it is surprising that it is not stated that Hatshepsut performed these actions; rather, this is expressed in the passive voice *wn.in=tw ḥr ir.t snṯr ḥr sms ʿ3b.t n ʾImn* (*BL* 42; *H* 25; # 72,12–13). In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, there exists the almost identical sentence: *wn.in ḥm=f ḥr ir.t n=f snṯr ḥr ḫ.t ḥr sms ʿ n=f ʿ3b.t ʿ3.t m iw3 wnḏw ʿ.wt n.wt ḫ3s.wt* "Then his Person was performing a censing(-ritual) on the fire, presenting him with great food-offerings consisting of *iw3*- and *wnḏw*-cattle, and desert wild animals."[446] It is argued in the following chapter that this anonymous *ḥm=f* could have been none other than the then-reigning king, Thutmose II.[447] Why, then, was Hatshepsut, also king, not the one who is said to have done the censing and presentation of offerings? Due to lack of evidence this remains unknown, but one could posit the suggestion that it may have simply been the fact that there already was another king on the throne, Thutmose III, whose job it was to present them.[448] That a representative of his performed these rituals seems the likelier explanation due to Thutmose III's presumed young age at the time: if the aim of the passive voice had been a reluctance to name another king in a coronation

[446] *Urk.* IV, 158,4–6 (col. 5).

[447] Chapter 4, 136–7. In this chapter, the ritual of the presentation of the *ʿ3b.t*-offering is discussed at greater length (pp. 135–43).

[448] Stephan correctly observes that Thutmose III is not mentioned in the text, but does not seem to have envisaged this possibility (*Dekoration*, 42).

text of a ruler bent on proving her legitimacy, then there should have been no reason not to employ a construction like that in the *Texte de la jeunesse* by simply referring to him as *ḥm=f*.

Soon after the presentation of the offerings, the equivalent of six lines from the Deir el-Bahari version are missing, but the last sentence before the text breaks off bears discussion: "Praises were invoked in the Great Name of the lord of his temple" (*BL* 42; *H* 25; # 72,14). This sentence is reminiscent of a passage from Horemheb's texts where the Ennead, in reaction to the crowning of Horemheb, [verb] *ḥknw r ḳꜣ n p.t*. The verb would have either been used in an active voice or, as here, with the passive *sḏm(.w)=f*.[449] One is also reminded of Hatshepsut's Middle Colonnade inscription where, after Hatshepsut had been announced the new king by Thutmose I, the assembled officials went out *mꜣṯ=sn mꜣṯ=sn rn n ḥm.t=s m nsw.t* "(they) announcing and announcing the name of her Person as king."[450] It is most likely not a precise ritual in question here, but one of great celebration for the new king, which would have entailed onlookers to chant her names. Certainly the proximity of the reciting of titularies in both of Hatshepsut's texts to a crucial event which had just preceded it is a factor they have in common. This passage might also indicate that it was followed by more descriptions of celebration akin to those described in Horemheb's texts and the *Contendings*.

It will be remembered that after Horemheb appeared from the *pr-nsw.t* wearing the Blue Crown, Amun placed him in front of him, and "embraced his beauty," publicly demonstrating his approval and confirming his kingship.[451] This seems to have coincided with a ritual pertaining to the titulary. It has already been mentioned that in Horemheb's accounts, there is an inconsistency in the order of (1) the exit from the temple and (2) the making of the titulary. It has also been discussed that there seem to have been more than one ritual or event regarding the titulary of the new king. Horemheb, in the simple mention of the *irỉ rn-wr* "the making of his Great Name" at the crucial juncture of his crowning, exit from the temple, and public confirmation of

[449] Sethe gave the restoration of [*rdỉ=s*]*n ḥknw r ḳꜣ n p.t* given the small lacuna at the start of the line (Turin l. 17: *Urk.* IV, 2117,18; the equivalent passage in the Ptah Stela is missing: l. 5, *Urk.* IV, 2122,6).

[450] *Urk.* IV, 260,2 (col. 25).

[451] Turin (ll. 19–20): *Urk.* IV, 2118,16–18. Of the equivalent passages from the Ptah Stela, only *ḫʿ.w m ḫprš* has survived, but it is sufficient to indicate that they were indeed once a part of the text (*Urk.* IV, 2123,1–3).

his kingship, would have therefore neatly summed up (in one line in the case of the Turin version) what may have been multiple ongoing events. That the position of the *ỉrỉ rn-wr* is different in his two texts serves to underline the notion that it abstractly stood for both the initial composition of the titulary, as well as the chanting of her names which, though not a ritual *per se*, had certainly attained a religious meaning, emulating the celebration and glorification of the sun god by all of creation at his daily glorious "appearance" at dawn.

Just as the sun arose every morning in glory, received by jubilation, so the new king, Hatshepsut and Horemheb "appeared" in public at the celebration of "the entire land," which chanted their names. Meanwhile, Horemheb, having "appeared," was embraced by Amun, publicly acknowledging his kingship. Hatshepsut, on the other hand, was publicly posted at the *Station*, and numerous *bỉꜣy.t*-signs were performed for her. Given the identical events surrounding the public confirmation in the texts of both rulers, could these two actions therefore be seen as equivalents? The two acts of the posting of the king at the *Station*, combined with the performance of *bỉꜣy.t*-signs on the one hand, and the embrace on the other, though they may have differed in form, were certainly the same in function.

In the *Historical Inscription*, one finds the sequence of (1) her *ḫʿw-nsw.t* "accession" (consisting of Amun touching her head, enthronement, and reception of crowns), after which (2) her titulary was *wd* "composed, or *rédigé*" and announced inside the *ʿḥ-nsw.t I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, followed by (3) a speech by the Ennead, after which (4) she exited from the palace structure, at which point (5) Amun placed her in front of him, and (6) appointed her at the *Station*, (7) offerings were presented to him, and (8) celebrating crowds cheered her names. In Horemheb's texts is the sequence of (1) his being crowned, (2) a speech by the Ennead, after which took place (3) the composition of the titulary and its announcement inside the *pr-nsw.t*, which (4) he then exited, at which point (5) Amun placed him in front of him, and (6) embraced him, which was (7) witnessed by cheering crowds, eventually after which (8) the festival ended. The two sequences do not quite match regarding the composition of the titulary, but as discussed above, Horemheb's texts are much more concise than the *Historical Inscription* and, through purposeful use of ambiguous language and positioning, the *ỉr.t rn-wr* would have stood for both the formulation as well as announcement of the titulary, and therefore more than one event. It will also be noticed

that no express mention is made at this juncture in Horemheb's texts of the presentation of offerings, but this does not mean that it did not take place. Firstly, it is expressly mentioned that the festival ended not with Amun's embrace of Horemheb, but later, thus suggesting that more rituals would have taken place afterwards, perhaps including offerings. Secondly and more conclusively, the Turin version states, before the mention of Horemheb entering the *pr-nsw.t*, that this was *hrw rdì.t ḥtp.w=f* "the day of giving his (Amun's) offerings" (l. 15).[452] There can therefore be no doubt that a presentation of offerings was involved in Horemheb's account, but whether this is an equivalent to the one mentioned in the *Historical Inscription* is uncertain, and neither is it relevant, for it will be remembered that the religious occasion of each text is different, for which reason it should not be surprising that differences arise.

The overall similarity with the episodes from the *Historical Inscription* pertaining to the transformation of Hatshepsut into a king, however, is undeniable. These episodes, as suggested above, did not form a part of the regular program of rituals of the original religious occasion, which was "hijacked" for Hatshepsut's ends, but consisted of an "interruption." These are clearly "royal" rituals, aimed at the king, rather than "divine" ones which would have formed a part of the normal rituals of a god's festival. That royal festivals, such as the "coronation ceremony" and the *Sed*-festival, despite differences, share many similar aspects has been noted by Egyptologists since Moret's discussion on royal rituals.[453] Similarly, these could be used on other occasions as well, such as the Opet festival, which was aimed at joining the royal *ka* with the king, as evidenced by the coronation sequence on the south wall of the Great Hypostyle Hall referred to above (figs. 2–4).[454] It appears, therefore, that during the "interruption," before the normal rituals of the religious occasion could be resumed, Hatshepsut underwent what may have been the standard rituals which transformed one into Pharaoh at their accession. Given the uniqueness of her situation in that she did not accede to the throne at the death of her predecessor, Thutmose II, but during the very lifetime of the reigning king Thutmose III through divine intervention,

[452] *Urk.* IV, 2117,8.

[453] Moret mentioned, for example, the ritual of shooting four arrows in the four cardinal directions (Moret, *Caractère*, 104–8). Cf. Leclant, "Suckling", 138; Gardiner, "Coronation", 23; Blackman, "Purification", 8–9.

[454] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 148–50 (schematic on pl. 262). This contains the typical scenes of purification, imposition of the crowns, *bs-nsw.t*, and "culmination" scene consisting of Amun touching Sety I's head while Thoth writes down his names on a *rnp.t*-hieroglyph.

her accession and pertaining rituals were "inserted" in the middle of the standard progression of the festival occasion.

The similarities between the main events of the *Historical Inscription* and Horemheb's accounts, despite their overall differences, is therefore understandable. Given that it is unknown in Hatshepsut's case of what Amun's many *bi3y.t*-signs for her consisted, and that its rough equivalent in Horemheb's texts is that the god "embraced his beauty," an identical event could very well be imagined having taken place for Hatshepsut as well. It would have most likely in actuality consisted of a movement by the carriers of the Amun's barque, or perhaps even an actual touching of her head by his high priest for all to see, but in figurative terms, this would have been interpreted precisely as Horemheb's text phrased it: the god himself reaching out to touch the crowns on his head, publicly giving his blessing and confirming his kingship. This, however, is pure speculation, and for reasons already discussed a perfect coordination between the texts of both rulers should not be expected.

Events highly similar to those of the *Historical Inscription* are also to be found in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, but these are discussed in the following chapter.[455] After the first two blocks of the north side of the Chapelle Rouge (109 + 72), there has been disagreement as to the ordering of the remainder. All of these also consist of speeches by Hatshepsut all of which share the same theme of legitimacy. Apart from block 287, most of these do not add information to the unfolding events, and consequently only pertinent passages are henceforth covered. The most recent study was undertaken by Burgos and Larché, and it is their ordering which is followed here.

10. *Hatshepsut's speech: oath and claims to veracity (excerpt) (BL 41; H 26–9; # 161 + 19[456] + 63; LC 136–40, § 180–1; G 21–2)*

(# 161,4) *wṯs=i ḥḏ.t*

ḫnm=i n.t/dšr.t

ḫnm rf it=i nfr.w(=i)

rwḏ (5) *mn.w=i m 'Ip.t-S.wt*

ḏd ꜥnḫ=i ḥr wṯs.t Ḥr

(6) *in it=i nb nṯr.w smn sꜣ.t=f m-ḥr.t tp=i*

[455] Chapter 4, 151–5.

[456] This block number is incorrectly numbered 119 on the relevant page in the plate volume (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 188).

bs(7).*n=f w*(*i*) *r ḥḳɜ ỉdb.wy tỉ ḥm=f ḥr bỉɜy.t*

dhn.n=f w(*i*) *nb* (8) *rḫy.t ḫft-ḥr-n tɜ r-ḏr=f*

sḫnt.n=f w(*i*) *r ỉmy-ˁḥ m*(# 19,9)*-bɜḥ-ˁ psḏ.t tm.t*

sḫˁ.n=f w(*i*) *m ˁ.wy=fy ḏs=f* (10)[457] *rnn.kwỉ m Ḥr ṯmɜ-ˁ*

rdỉ.n=f ḥms(*=ỉ*) *ḥr* (11) *wṯs.t Ḥr m-bɜḥ-ˁ šps.w-nsw.t mỉ-ḳd*(*=w*)

"(# 161,4) I wear the White Crown,
I am united with the Red Crown,
my father is indeed joined with (my) beauty,
enduring (5) are my monuments in Karnak,
my life is stable on the Support of Horus.
(6) It is my father, the lord of the gods, who established his daughter (the Uraeus-goddess) as she who is on my head,

having introduced (7) me to rulership over the Two Banks while his Person was performing *bỉɜy.t*-signs,

having appointed me as the lord of the (8) the *rekhyt* in the presence of the entire land,

having advanced me to one who is inside the palace in (# 19,9) the presence of the entire Ennead,

having caused me to appear with his own two hands, (10) I having been brought up as Horus the strong-of-arm,

having caused that (I) sit on (11) the Support of Horus in the presence of the entirety of the royal nobles."[458]

Hatshepsut, now king, was wearing the Double Crown during the delivery of this speech. This is evidenced through the *sḏm=f* forms used in the passages preceding the participial statement *ỉn ỉt=ỉ … smn*.[459] Hatshepsut then proceeded to explain how it came to pass that she now bore the Uraeus on her forehead. What follows seems to consist of a summation of what had just taken place, [460] as not only textual context, but also the shift to *sḏm.n=f* forms, suggest.

[457] Not marked by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 26).

[458] For full translation of this section, see: Appendix A, 298–301.

[459] For the participial statement, see: Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 227,3.

[460] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 139 (§ 181,k).

The overall sequence of the surviving rituals Hatshepsut underwent is the following: after their first meeting, (1) Amun advanced (*sḫnt*) her to the *Palais de Maât*, where he performed *bỉɜy.t*-signs for her (*BL* 31; *H* 9; # 184,18–19); (2) they then exited, and entered within (*r-ḫnt*) *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* (*BL* 33; *H* 14; # 142,21), where Amun laid his hands on her in protection and advanced (*sḫnt*) her to the throne platform where he caused that she occupy the dais (*dỉ.n=f ḥms=s ṯnṯɜ.t*) (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,22–4); (3) Hatshepsut then removed her priestly headdress and donned the Double Crown (*BL* 34; *H* 17; # 143,16–17). (4) We are then informed that these events, to which the assembled *smḥr.w* were reacting, consisted of Hatshepsut's *ḫʿw-nsw.t*, and it is added that it was the god himself who had "made" (*ỉr*) it (*BL* 35; *H* 19; # 164,9–10). It is clear that these events are summed up here in the speech by Hatshepsut, using similar wording: "he (Amun) having advanced me to one who is inside the palace in the presence of the entire Ennead, having caused me to appear with his own two hands, I having been brought up as Horus the strong-of-arm" (*BL* 41; *H* 26; # 161 + 19,8–10). If correct, this would further support the argument presented above that these actions, the installation on the throne and crowning (*sḫʿ*), consisted of her *ḫʿw-nsw.t* "accession (lit. royal appearance)." The *ỉr.t ḫʿw-nsw.t*, it was argued above, is equivalent to Amun causing Hatshepsut to appear (*sḫʿ*), and this finds confirmation here in the speech where the same verb is used "he caused me to appear (*sḫʿ*) with his own two arms." Both, in turn, would be equivalent to the god touching the king's head, as demonstrated through the "culmination scene" of Sety I on the south wall of the Great Hypostyle Hall, and are identical to the action related earlier in the text, at Hatshepsut's enthronement: "he extended his arms (in protection) over his egg ... and he advanced her to the *rwdw*-platform of the unique lord" (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,22–3).

Aside from context, this speech also confirms the view presented above that Hatshepsut's *ḫʿw-nsw.t* took place inside her palace: "he (Amun) having advanced me to one who is inside the palace in the presence of the entire Ennead" (*BL* 41; *H* 26; # 161 + 19,8–9). The Ennead's presence at the moment that Hatshepsut was crowned is confirmed through a passage from the speech of the unknown deity (most likely the Uraeus-goddess given the context of imposition of the crowns): "appear (for yourself) as the form of his disk, you having been united with the crowns (or "appearances") of his Ennead!" (*BL* 35; *H* 18; # 48,2–4).

What follows after the oath and summary is a series of assertions made by Hatshepsut which, as the title by Lacau and Chevrier suggests, consist of "protestations de véracité."[461] Gillen elaborates this title "oath – claims to veracity and uniqueness."[462] Indeed, Hatshepsut declared: "… without a boasting with falsehood being therein. (It) has not been heard since the (primeval) time of this land and the [ti]me of the rising/emergence from Nun" (*BL* 41; *H* 27; # 19,13–15). The reason why Hatshepsut's speech appears at this juncture in her text is clear: even with Amun's public blessing, having confirmed her kingship, Hatshepsut's situation was so unusual that she would have still felt she had to further support her claim to the throne. So far as can be told from what survives of the text, its remainder consisted of speeches, all delivered by Hatshepsut, the aim of all of which was to lend further support to her claim to the throne.

11. *Hatshepsut's speech: recollection of different oracular processions (BL 40; H 25; # 287; LC 133–5, § 179 a–b; G 22)*

[… *ḥr bỉɜy.t*] (# 287,1) *ꜥɜ.t wr.t m-bɜḥ-ꜥ nṯr pn nfr*

ḥr sr n=ỉ nsw.yt tɜ.wy

(2) *šmꜥ mḥw ḫr snḏ=ỉ*

ḥr rdỉ.t n=ỉ ḫɜs.wt nb.wt

ḥr sḫḏ.t (3) *nḫt.w ḥm.t=ỉ*

ḥɜt-sp 2 *ɜbd* 2 *pr.t sw* 29 3-*nw n ḥb ỉmn ḫft* (4) *nn wdn.wt Sḫm.t hrw* 2-*nw*

m sr n(=ỉ) tɜ.wy m wsḫ.t n.t ʾIp.t (5) *rsy*[*.t*]

ỉst ḥm=f ḥr bỉɜ.t m-bɜḥ-ꜥ nṯr pn nfr

ḫꜥ.t ỉt=(ỉ) (6) *m ḥb=f nfr ʾImn ḥry-tp nṯr.w*

wn.ỉn=f ḥr ỉṯ.t ḥm.t=ỉ (7) [*r ꜥḥꜥw*] *n nsw.t mnḫ*

sꜥšɜ.n=f bỉɜy.t ḥr=ỉ ḫft-ḥr-n tɜ r-[*ḏr*]*=f*

"[…] (# 287,1) very great [*bỉɜy.t*-signs] in the presence of this good god,

predicting for me the kingship of the Two Lands,

(2) Upper and Lower Egypt being under the fear of me,

giving to me all the foreign lands,

illuminating (3) the victories of My Person.

[461] Lacau and Chevrier, 136–40 (§ 180–1).

[462] Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 21.

> Regnal year 2, month 2 of *Peret*, day 29, third day of the festival of Amun, corresponding to (4) these offerings of Sekhmet on the second day
>
> was the predicting to (me) of the Two Lands in the (fore)court of South[ern] (5) Ope[t].
>
> His Person (Amun) performed *bi3y.t*-signs in the presence of this good god
>
> (at) the appearance of (my) father (6) in his beautiful festival, Amun, chief of the gods.
>
> He conducted My Person (7) [to the sta]tion of the beneficent king, and he multiplied *bi3y.t*-signs on my account in the presence of the en[tire] land."

In the previous section, Hatshepsut had related to the masses what had transpired for her inside the palace. After claims to her legitimacy and uniqueness, she went on here to remind everyone of events which had taken place even before those of the text.

To note is the shift to the first person, indicating that the speaker here was Hatshepsut.[463] These passages relate more than one oracular session, where the text resumes in the middle of one session, followed by a second, perhaps completely, preserved one.[464] There is unfortunately no evidence to ascertain whether these were preceded or followed by more accounts of such events, perhaps even in more than one regnal year.

There has been much disagreement regarding the interpretation of block 287, a synopsis of which is presented in Appendix B. In light of Warburton's research, the accepted translation of the verb *sr* in this thesis is "to foretell."[465] Block 287 therefore not providing evidence for Hatshepsut's accession or "coronation" (i.e. appearance ceremony), then it follows that Amun placing someone in front of him, appointing him/her to the *Station of the Lord*, and performing *bi3y.t*-signs for them do not alone entail that individual's transformation into Pharaoh, and therein lies the main and crucial difference between what happens in the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription* and in block 287. As evidenced by the main narrative itself, more rituals

[463] This was first noted by Yoyotte ("Date supposée", 85–7).

[464] On the following block which is missing, there might have been, in parallel with the first oracular session, mention of the "dominion" of the king which, as argued, constitutes the concluding part of a regular formulation of events which involve a royal "appearance."

[465] Warburton, "Darkness", 287 ff.

would have been required for this to take place. I prefer the term adopted by authors of the CFEETK to denote the type of event related in this block: *séance oraculaire*, for it is descriptive, but neutral as to the occasion on which it took place.[466] The religious occasion is, in fact, named.[467] The performance of *bi3y.t*-signs was therefore not an occasion in and of itself, but a part of one.

In the following chapter, it is argued that the 7th Pylon text briefly relates the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, or at least an event of the same type, i.e. *séances oraculaires* on which occasion(s) kingship was predicted for Thutmose III before his accession: noteworthy for now is that in the former, the presence of Thutmose II is clearly stated, while in the second, this can be gleaned through the indirect reference to him mentioned above of *ḥm=f* at the performance of the censing and presentation of offerings.[468] In block 287, similarly, the prediction of kingship to Hatshepsut was done in the presence of an unnamed reigning king, and therefore before her accession. What these *séances oraculaires* share with the events of the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription* is that the performance of *bi3y.t*-signs by Amun were expected, but this is where the similarities end. What sets the *Historical Inscription* apart from the rest is (1) as argued, that Hatshepsut actually became a king on the occasion, and (2) that even though the performance of *bi3y.t*-signs was expected, they were anticipated for Thutmose III or a representative—not Hatshepsut. This signaled a clear departure from what was expected to happen on the religious occasion of the *Historical Inscription*, at which point the "inserted" entailing rituals transforming her into a Pharaoh consisted of, as argued above, an "interruption" in the middle of the standard procedure of the festival occasion.

As for the king in whose second regnal year the events of block 287 took place, it appears likeliest that it would have been Thutmose III (for history of discussion on the subject, see Appendix B). To say that the reign in question was that of Thutmose I or Thutmose II presupposes the notion that the events of block 287 were pre-planned with the full knowledge of the reigning king (hypothetical *coup d'états* notwithstanding). That is not to say that it was impossible for either king to have

[466] E.g. Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 288.

[467] It unfortunately remains unknown precisely what this festival is, however, but Lacau mentioned its corresponding festivals in a stela by Thutmose III and in Ramses III's festival calendar (*Chapelle*, 135 (§ 179,f)).

[468] Chapter 4, 154 and Appendix B.

planned to make Hatshepsut their successor,[469] and hence perhaps Thutmose III's references to his own oracular selections by Amun mentioning Thutmose II. The fact of the matter, however, is that, the way events did transpire in ancient Egyptian history, the reign of Hatshepsut was eventually erased from memory, and there is simply no evidence which has survived to support this notion—apart from her own claims. The only exception is the Middle Colonnade inscription, but this describe Hatshepsut's elevation to kingship, rather than its mere prediction in the presence of Thutmose I; block 287 can therefore not be seen as a historical telling of the same event. As pointed out by Meyer and Dorman, Hatshepsut did not hide the fact that Thutmose III was king as well. Furthermore, it was argued above that since it was not Hatshepsut who presented the offerings to Amun in the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription* (*BL* 42; *H* 25; # 72,12–13), then it would have been another king: Thutmose III or a representative. Given that Thutmose III himself similarly referred to his own predecessor, Thutmose II, as being present at the oracular selection of the 7th Pylon inscription, and probably also at that of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, it appears likely that Hatshepsut is referring to her respective "predecessor," Thutmose III. As Dorman argued, "it can scarcely be any other reign, in view of Hatshepsut's status during Thutmose II's floruit."[470] According to Tefnin, "[r]ien n'indique d'ailleurs, sinon peut-être l'absence même de cette precision, que l'an 2 ainsi mentionné appartienne bien au règne de Touthmosis III."[471] This interpretation, furthermore, removes the need to argue that the plan to transform Hatshepsut into Pharaoh was set in motion as early as Thutmose II's, or even Thutmose I's reign.[472] Rather, this would suggest that, in the absence of the predecessor, and with her steady rise in power, Hatshepsut was able to pave her own way to the throne by obtaining divine legitimation for her actions through such events as those related on block 287.

Hatshepsut's reminding all those present of past events which had taken place, one as early as the second regnal year of Thutmose III, relating how Amun had actually

[469] Cf. Ockinga, "Appointment", 261.

[470] Redford, *History*, 54 no. 20. He did not see this as mutually exclusive with the possible presentation of Hatshepsut as heiress by Thutmose I which is carved in the Middle Colonnade at Deir el-Bahari.

[471] Tefnin, *L'an 7*, 241–2; cf. Cannuyer, "Brelan", 114; Dorman, "Early Reign", 54. As with the possibility raised by Yoyotte, however, it is not impossible that this king was originally named in the *Historical Inscription*, the relevant block not having survived (Yoyotte, "Date supposée", 89, 91).

[472] Redford, *History*, 55.

already foretold that this day of her *ḫˁ-nsw.t* would one day come, fits well within the textual context of the *Historical Inscription*. The blocks preceding and following # 287 being missing, there may well have initially been references to more than the two which have survived.[473] The remainder of the text consists of speeches by Hatshepsut, the goal of all of which were to support her legitimacy.

There is uncertainty regarding the ordering of most of the blocks of the north wall of the Chapelle Rouge. Lacau situated # 146 before the block which would have formed the north-east corner of the second row of blocks of the Chapelle Rouge, and therefore the end of the *Historical Inscription*.[474] Regarding block 287, which he placed between 109 + 72 and 161 + 19 + 63, Lacau pointed out that there is no indication for its original position, and that it could have originally been located further to the east (and therefore later in the text).[475] There are no parallels for # 54, 194, 21, 147, and 37 in the Deir el-Bahri version, therefore making their ordering uncertain.[476] Helck saw # 21 as attached to and the last in the sequence 161 + 19 + 63.[477] He stated that no parallels with the Deir el-Bahri version survived past # 54, but did not provide an explanation for his arrangement of the blocks (# 54, # 37 + 194 + 147).[478] Burgos and Larché, however, demonstrated at least that blocks 147 and 194 were connected (from left to right, in the opposite direction of the reading of the text), while Grimm did so for 37 and 147.[479] The order of # 37 + 147 + 194 is therefore confirmed, but its position relative to the blocks of the remainder of the text remains uncertain.[480] Burgos and

[473] Karkowski points out traces of an as of yet unpublished inscription of 19 columns, apparently of the same type, containing mentions of *bỉzy.t*-signs being performed for Hatshepsut, but which fascinatingly and tantalisingly not only explicitly mentions both her and Thutmose III, but a date of regnal year four ("Notes", 163).

[474] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 149 (§ 188 a). This was taken up by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 32–3), Burgos and Larché (see plan in *Chapelle* I, 316), and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 24).

[475] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 133 (§ 179 a).

[476] # 54: *ibid.*, 141 (§ 183 a); # 194: *ibid.*, 143 (§ 184 a); # 21: *ibid.*, 145 (§ 185 a); # 147: *ibid.*, 147 (§ 186 a); # 37: *ibid.*, 148 (§ 187 a).

[477] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 29. The reason was that the end of the text on # 63, combined with the start of # 21, would have formed a coherent sentence.

[478] *Ibid.*, 30–2. The sequence 37 + 194 + 147 was chosen because it does not yield grammatically incorrect sentences. The same is the case with Gillen's 147 + 194 + 37 ("Historical Inscription", 23–4). Müller ("Krönungsinschrift", 206–11) followed the Lacau and Chevrier's ordering.

[479] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 153–4; Grimm, "Feindbilder", 207–14.

[480] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 153–4 (for overall order, see: *ibid.*, 61, with the blocks for the north side presented in reverse order, from east to west).

Larché reuse the section titles as initially phrased in the publication by Lacau and Chevrier; Gillen largely bases his thereon as well.

Here follows a list, from right to left (the direction in which the text is read), of the blocks of the north side of the Chapelle Rouge in the order suggested by Burgos and Larché, using Lacau and Chevrier's adopted section titles. As stated above, all of these consist, Hatshepsut's *ḥꜥw-nsw.t* on 109 + 72 onward, of speeches by Hatshepsut ("discours d'Hatshepsout"). Linked blocks are listed under one bullet point:

1. 109 + 72: dernières processions oraculaires et cérémonies d'action de grâce à Karnak (*H* 23–5; *LC* 129–33, § 177–8; *G* 21; Appendix A Part 2, 297–8)
2. 161 + 19 + 63: serment et protestations de véracité (*H* 26–8; *LC* 136–40, § 180–1; *G* 21–2; Appendix A Part 2, 298–301)
3. 287: rappel de différentes processions oraculaires (*H* 25; *LC* 133–5, § 179; *G* 22; Appendix A Part 2, 301–2)
4. 21: ses (Hatshepsut's) relations avec les dieux (*H* 26–8; *LC* 145–6, § 185; *G* 22–3; Appendix A Part 2, 302–3)
5. 54: récit des processions oraculaires d'une déesse (*H* 30; *LC* 141–3, § 183; *G* 23; Appendix A Part 2, 303–4)
6. 194: les bienfaits de son règne (*H* 31–2; *LC* 143–5, § 184; *G* 23)
   + 147: son triomphe surnaturel (*H* 32; *LC* 147–8, § 186; *G* 23)
   + 37: sa puissance incontestée (*H* 31; *LC* 148–9, § 187; *G* 23–4; Appendix A Part 2, 304–6)
7. 146: apologie poétique (*H* 32–3; *LC* 149–53, § 188; *G* 24; Appendix A, 306)

These speeches by Hatshepsut, as argued above, served to further legitimise the events which transpired which led to her seizing the throne, and the place of block 287 in this context is fitting. Of these, one more section, from block 54, bears discussion.

12. Hatshepsut's speech: an account of the oracular processions of a goddess (excerpt) (BL 40; H 30; # 54; LC 141–3, § 183 a–b; G 23)

(# 54,1) *wn.ỉn=s ḥr ỉṯ.t ḥm.t=ỉ*

dỉ.w ḥms=ỉ (2) *ḥr wṯs.t Sḫm.ty Ḥr*

wn.ḫr rs nb.t tɜ.wy ḥr bỉɜy.t ꜥɜ.t wr.t (3) *ꜥšɜ sp-sn wr sp-sn ḥr ḥm.t=ỉ*

tỉwỉ ḥr s.t-wr.t

ḥr smn.t rnp.wt=ỉ (4) *m wɜḏ.t-rnp.wt*

ḥr ḫtt gn.wt=ỉ m ḥb Sd

(5) *wḏȝ.ỉn nṯr.t tn r ȝḫ.t=s n.t ḏʿm*

swḏ.n=s n(=ỉ) ỉṯ.t ḫʿ.w

(6) *ỉdb.wy Ḥr ḫr s.t-ḥr=ỉ*

rdỉ.n=s n(=ỉ) ʿrf.t Km-Wr

šnn.wt(7)*=f ḫr ḥry.t=ỉ*

ỉṯ.n=ỉ st mỉ pḥ.ty nḫn=f

ỉw (8) *nbỉ.w=s r ḫft.yw=ỉ*

"(# 54,1) She (the Uraeus-goddess) then seized my Person,
and it was caused that I sit (2) upon the Support of the Double Crown of Horus.
The Mistress of the Two Lands (the Uraeus-goddess) then performed very great *bỉȝy.t*-signs, (3) doubly numerous and doubly great concerning my Person
while I was on the Great Seat,
establishing my years (4) as the Flourishing-of-Years,
and carving my annals of (lit. "in") the *Sed*-festival.
(5) This goddess then proceeded to her horizon of electrum,
having transferred to me the seizing of the crowns,
(6) the Two Banks of Horus under my supervision,
having given to (me) that which the Great Black encloses/surrounds,
all those in its encompassment (7) being under the terror of me,
I having seized it like the strength of his youth,
(8) her flames being against my enemies."

It is unclear what the events to which these passages refer are. Lacau stated that these passages are reminiscent of the events of block 287 (*LC* 142, § 183,b, note a) despite the fact that he had stated that Schott's argument that they consist of an account of her seizure of the royal office is debatable (*LC* 134, § 179,b, note d). Yet, Hatshepsut seating the Great Seat (*ṯnṯȝ.t*, or Support of Horus, or the like), it will be remembered, is referenced multiple times throughout the *Historical Inscription* (*BL* 33; *H* 15; # 142,24 and *BL* 35; *H* 18; # 48,5 and *BL* 41; *H* 27; # 19,10–11), which suggests that the events recounted on block 54 refer to the time during the main narrative in which she sat the throne, and not during one of the *séances oraculaires* mentioned on block 287.

There can be no doubt, given textual context, that the goddess in question is once more the Uraeus-goddess: as pointed out by Lacau, the terms describing

Hatshepsut's victory and dominion are reminiscent of the earlier speech of the Uraeus-goddess, in which she stated: "I will fell for her the tribesmen of Nubia, curling up in the middle of her brow, I will trample for her the Bedouin of Asia, swaying about, having appeared on her forehead" (*BL* 34; *H* 16; # 44,5–6).[481]

The theme of domination is one of crucial importance to note. It appears several times, at noteworthy points during the text. (1) The speech by the Uraeus-goddess just mentioned (*BL* 34; *H* 16–17; # 44 + 143,5–10) uses very similar phraseology: "I will place the respect of her in all lands, the terror (*ḥry.t*) of her throughout all foreign lands, I will place her *bꜣ.w*-power, I establish her strength (*pḥ.ty*), I will subdue for her the encompassment (*šnn.t*) of the sun-disk." This, it will be remembered, was while she was seated on the Great Seat, and was immediately followed by her wearing the crowns (*BL* 34; *H* 17; # 143,15). (2) The reaction of the *smḥr.w* of throwing themselves to the ground at the moment of Hatshepsut's *ḫꜥw-nsw.t* qualifies as a domination theme, since it would have symbolically consisted of her subjugation of the people of Egypt (*BL* 35; *H* 19; # 164,9–10). Two columns later, it is stated that Hatshepsut was "she who seized the flat lands, the one who establishes their tribute" (*BL* 35; *H* 19; # 164,13). (3) The theme of domination appears briefly for a third time at Hatshepsut's appointment at the *Station of the Lord* and the performance of numerous *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for her, when it is stated that Amun "placed the fear of her in the front" (*BL* 42; *H* 24–5; # 72,8–10). The first two points at which the theme of domination appears are at Hatshepsut's accession to the throne (her *ḫꜥw-nsw.t*), while the third one, it could be argued, consisted of *a* royal appearance by Hatshepsut, since it did not consist of any seizure of office (she was already king by this point), but of her "appearance" in public as king. Regardless of which *ḫꜥỉ* "appearance" of a king it was, this was always symbolically understood as the rising of the sun. This was understood to have been accompanied not only by the theme of domination, that is, the victory of Ra over his enemies at dawn, but also that of jubilation. It was already mentioned above how intimately related the theme of celebration was to the sun's appearance in the morning. In Horemheb's texts, too, both themes of celebration and domination appear at the exit from the *pr-nsw.t*: "he (Amun) embraced his beauty, he having appeared with the *khepresh*-crown in order to transfer (*swḏ*) to him that which the sun disk encompasses (*šnn.t*), the Nine Bows being under

[481] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 142 (§ 183 a).

his feet, the sky in festival, the land joyful, the Enneads of the Beloved Land, their heart pleased, while the land, the bank, and all the people were joyful, they cheered to the heavens, while great and small, they seized shouting, while the entire land was rejoicing."[482] A speech referred to above from Speos Artemidos has a diadem-goddess, Weret-Hekau-Pakhet, say: "You (Amun) have caused m(e) to appear on the forehead of your daugh[ter], the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *Maatkara*, … I have placed the terror of [you] (Hatshepsut) in all lands, swaying about between [your] eyebrows, I breathe scorching fire unto [your] enemies."[483] This ties in perfectly with Leclant's arguments regarding the connection between a king's reception of his office and his dominion.[484]

Leclant also argued for a connection of these two with the nursing of the king and his birth into his new life as Pharaoh, that is, his rejuvenation. In the *Historical Inscription*, too, the theme of rearing the king appears several times, confirming his views: (1) inside the *Palais de Maât*, it was said that Amun performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for Hatshepsut beside Hathor (a Uraeus-goddess), who "nursed her with [her] body" (*BL* 31; *H* 9–10; # 184 + 295,20–2); (2) inside *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, Hatshepsut was said to have sat on the throne while she was nursed in the presence of the entire land (*rnn.tỉ m Ḥr nb-tꜣ.wy ḥft-ḥr tꜣ r-ḏr=f*) (*BL* 33; *H* 15, # 142,25); (3) this same instance is referred to again in Hatshepsut's speech after her appointment at the *Station*: "He (Amun) caused me to appear with his own two arms, *rnn.kwỉ* ("I having been brought up" or "while I was nursed") as Horus the Strong-of-Arm" (*BL* 41; *H* 26; # 19,10).

The entirety of the associations between these various concepts, which mirror the rising of the sun at dawn (underlined below), finds itself neatly summed up in the caption of a scene next to the Window of Appearances in the First Court of Ramses III's temple in Medinet Habu: "Appearance of the king (*ḫꜥỉ-nsw.t*) as a divine child (*sfy*) like Ra in the [mor]ning ([*dwꜣ*].*yt*), in his noble palace (*ꜥḥ.t*) which is like the horizon of Ra, his Ennead in the sky, Amun-Ra joyful (*ḥꜥ.w*) […] in their shrines, *Sed*-

[482] Turin ll. 20–1: *Urk.* IV, 2119,2–7.

[483] *Urk.* IV, 286,12–16.

[484] Leclant, "Suckling", 140 f.

festivals and millions of years were predicted (*sr*) eternally with strength and victory (*knỉ nḫ.t*) to their son *Usermaatra-mery-Amun*."[485]

III. Summary of conclusions reached

In short, the main events of the *Historical Inscription* may be divided into the following clear steps:

1. Amun arose for his festival and, reaching the *Station* in the temple forecourt, he did not perform a *bỉꜣy.t* for Thutmose III or a representative which he was expected to have done.
2. He sought Hatshepsut out in *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, and led her to the *Palais de Maât* in Karnak temple, where she put on her regalia as God's Wife, and Amun performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for her while she was nursed by Hathor.
3. The procession made an exit from wherever they were, perhaps still the *Palais de Maât*, went to and entered *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, where Amun laid his hands on Hatshepsut in protection, and advanced her to the *rwḏw*-platform of the *s.t-wr.t*, on which she was enthroned. This was done after a declaration by Amun that this was his will.
4. Still inside the palace structure, perhaps still on the throne, Hatshepsut removed her priestly regalia and donned the Double Crown. This was done in accordance with a preceding speech by the Uraeus-goddess.
5. If Hatshepsut had left the throne to get her crowns (which would have nevertheless still taken place inside the palace), she was seated on it again (or perhaps the crowns were brought to her), and the Ennead delivered a speech confirming her kingship and rejoicing in the fact.
6. Still inside the palace, the Uraeus-goddess delivered a speech to Hatshepsut, in conformance with which, at arguably the high-point of the text, Amun then granted her a *ḫʿw-nsw.t* "royal appearance," effectively making her a king.
7. Despite the reference to the titulary earlier in the text, it appears that it was at this point that it was composed or *rédigé* (*wḏ*) and presumably announced.

[485] *PM* II, 493 (68) c; *MH* IV, 238 A.

8. The procession exited the palace, and reached the temple forecourt. Hatshepsut, now king, and Amun's wishes fulfilled, the standard procedure of the festival could resume, and he performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for her at the *Station*.
9. This was followed by the presentation of a great offering to Amun. Even though it does not appear that it was Hatshepsut who performed it, people rejoiced at this, and recited her titulary. The reason is uncertain, but since Hatshepsut was now king, the offerings were being offered on her behalf by default.
10. What follows is a long series of speeches by Hatshepsut in which she asserts her legitimacy and right to rule through various means, including reminding all those present of past times when the events of that day of her *ḫʿw-nsw.t* were predicted.

The crucial points worth noting are the following: the events of the *Historical Inscription* are quite unique, in that they consist of more than Hatshepsut's actual accession to the throne, including accompanying ritual which resulted in the crowns being placed on her head for the first time—her crowning. We are informed that something else took place as well: her "coronation ceremony" or, to use the term adopted in this thesis, appearance ceremony, that is, her first public appearance as king since her accession during a festival, after which, but still on the same occasion, she was posted at the *Station* for the duration of the performance of the offerings to Amun. That Hatshepsut was not already a king at the outset is clear given that she started with putting on her priestly garb. Also worthy of mention is that the placing by a god of an individual in front of him, and performance of *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for them, were not necessarily done for a king, or even during an accession or "coronation" (*bỉꜣy.t*-signs could mean different things in different contexts). This is relevant for the discussion of the *Texte de la jeunesse* in the next chapter. Yet another noteworthy feature is that her accession took place not inside the temple, but inside the clearly royal structure that was the *Nn-wꜣ=ỉ-r=f*, a detail which has a part to play in the analysis of Horemheb's texts in the fifth chapter.

CHAPTER IV

The *Texte de la jeunesse* of Thutmose III

Part of an inscription that has long been known, the account of the oracular selection of Thutmose III is carved on the south face of the southern wall of the Hatshepsut central suite of rooms in Karnak.[486] It was first published in 1875 by Mariette,[487] but the first reliable translation of the text was provided by Breasted.[488] This text has also been published in the *Urkunden* by Sethe (see Appendix C, Part 1), the main source used for the transliteration and translation presented in this thesis.[489]

The date of the *Texte de la jeunesse* has been the subject of debate: Borchardt (whom Sethe followed) and Nims argued for Thutmose III's 42nd regnal year, the highest mentioned in his Annals.[490] This was refuted by Seipel, who conclusively demonstrated that the inscription would have been carved before then, and additionally presented arguments supporting the carving having occurred soon after the beginning of Thutmose's sole reign.[491] Dorman agreed that the *Jeunesse* was carved earlier than regnal year 42, but rejected Seipel's arguments that the carving took place very early in the king's sole reign, tentatively suggesting 30 instead.[492] It is, however, generally believed that the inscription was carved before regnal year 23 of Thutmose III.[493]

This text continues to be of high importance to Egyptologists due to its two main topics, reflected in its two main sections: the first is a flashback, in which Thutmose III relates an event which took place during his youth while Amun was out on procession in Karnak (cols. 1–16), and the second, taking place in the "present,"

---

[486] *PM* II, 106 (328), plans XI–XII (1).

[487] Mariette, *Karnak*, 51–2 (pls. 14–16).

[488] Breasted, *Chapter*, 5 ff. For a history of early publications of this inscription, see: *ibid.*, 5–6 and *Records* II, § 132.

[489] *Urk.* IV, 155–76.

[490] Borchardt, *Baugeschichte*, 30, no. 2; Sethe: *Urk.* IV, 155,15–17, no. a, 156,13; Nims, "Dishonoring", 97–100.

[491] Seipel, *LÄ* II, s.v. "Hatschepsut I.", 1051, no. 42; "Verfehmung", 581–2.

[492] *Monuments*, 46–55 and 64–5.

[493] Laboury, *Statuaire*, 32–4, 546–51; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 289, no. 92; cf. Laboury, "Portrait", 270, nos. 90 and 92 in 286.

consists of a listing by Thutmose III of the monuments which he built in Karnak (cols. 16 f., esp. 25–49).

It is this first section which concerns us. The events it relates have been labeled slightly differently, but in most cases have been seen as Thutmose III's coming to the throne, i.e. his accession: a belief shared by Breasted and Sethe, as well as modern scholars.[494] On the other hand, others have described this text as an account of Thutmose's coronation ceremony.[495] In contrast, the authors from the CFEETK I quote below carefully do not label these events, but simply refer to them from what is clear in the text: as a "séance oraculaire."[496] It is concluded that this is precisely what the text relates: it is not an account of the king's accession to the throne, but, like the passage from block 287 from Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription* discussed in the previous chapter, first and foremost an oracular session—a prediction—that the prince Thutmose would one day become king.

This text has often been often referred to with Thutmose III's young age in mind: his "youth" by Breasted, *Jugendzeit* by Sethe, and as the *Texte de la jeunesse* by various authors.[497] Confusingly, *Texte*, or *Légende de la jeunesse* has been used, by some authors, to refer to Hatshepsut's Middle Terrace reliefs and texts.[498] Because it does not make any assumptions as to the nature of the events which took place (that is, accession or coronation), I have chosen to adopt the widely-used term *Texte de la jeunesse*.

---

[494] Breasted did not use any specific word to refer this event, but its identification with the accession to the throne of Thutmose III is clear (cf. esp. *Records* II, § 134; *Chapter*, 14–15 no. 15); his reference to a part of the events of this inscription as Thutmose III's "coronation" seems to be a reference not to the ceremony, but to the act of crowning (*Chapter*, 6). Sethe called it a *Thronerhebung* (*Urk.* IV, 155). More recently, Dorman and Troy have expressed this view (Cline and O'Connor, *Biography*, 41 ff. and 125 f. (esp. 131), respectively).

[495] Redford *History*, 75; Barta "Rituale", 6; Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 249 (they call it the king's *sacre*, that is, coronation ceremony), and Stadler, "Krönung", 81–2.

[496] E.g. Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt," 288. This is due to the *bi3y.t* that the god manifests while he is in procession. For instances where *bi3y.t* and "oracle" intersect, see: Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 7–14.

[497] Breasted, *Chapter*, 6; Sethe, *Urk.* IV, 155. For use of "*Texte de la jeunesse*," see, e.g. Barguet, *Temple*, e.g. 321; Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 249; Laboury, *Statuaire*, e.g. 17; Carlotti et Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 255 ff.; both editors of *Thutmose III: a New Biography*, Cline and O'Connor; Larché, "Observations", 407 ff.; Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, e.g. 112–13). For evidence for the actual young age of Thutmose III at his accession, see: Dorman, "Early Reign", 40 (esp. no. 14, p. 60).

[498] *Ibid.*, 39 f.

The inscription is in retrograde, moving left to right. Thutmose III is depicted to the left (west) of the first column of text, while his speech, the inscription itself, is moving toward the right (east), toward the recipients of his speech—the assembled court officials. This is also the case in Hatshepsut's so-called coronation inscription on the Middle Terrace at Deir el-Bahari which ran in the direction of the assembled courtiers[499] and, as seen in the previous chapter, as well as in her *Historical Inscription*, in which the inscription ran toward Amun and his sanctuary. The Thutmose III inscription starts with relating a *ḥms.t-nsw.t* "audience" held by the king in his 42nd regnal year, on the occasion of which he relates an event from his younger years during which Amun, out on festival procession, selects him as future king (cols. 1–16). This account is followed by a listing, in general terms, of what Thutmose III has done for Amun in return (cols. 16–22). There follow praises by the assembled officials (cols. 22–4), and a listing by Thutmose III of specific monuments that he built for Amun in Karnak (cols. 25–49). Long categorised as a *Königsnovelle*, this inscription figures in Hofmann's study of the *Kerngruppe* thereof.[500]

It is ultimately concluded that this inscription describes neither Thutmose III's accession, nor his coronation ceremony; rather, it tells of a *séance oraculaire* over the course of which kingship was predicted to him by Amun, like the events carved on block 287 of the *Historical Inscription*. It is also concluded that the far less likely possibility, that the *Texte de la jeunesse* presents an account of Thutmose III's promotion to coregent with his father, should not to be omitted altogether.

I. The lay of the land

As with Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*, this text contains several references to real locations in Karnak temple. Before proceeding with the text, an attempt will here be made to describe Karnak, as it might have been during the childhood of Thutmose III. Based on the analysis of the text presented below, it is concluded that Thutmose II was present in the events of this text, and that this was therefore taking place before his son's accession to the throne on I *šmw* 4 (coregency notwithstanding). Based on the

[499] *Deir el Bahari* II, pls. 56–8 and 60–2.

[500] Hermann, *Königsnovelle*, 9; Shirun-Grumach, *Offenbarung*, 128–31; Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 209–27. For the origin of the term, see: *ibid.*, 11 no. 11. For Hofmann's *Kerngruppe*, see: *Königsnovelle*, 42–9.

short reign of only a few years of Thutmose II[501] and on the fact that Hatshepsut officially became king in Thutmose III's seventh regnal year, then one can assume that the events of the *Historical Inscription* took place around a mere ten years after those of the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

The Karnak complex would therefore have looked much the same as it did later during Thutmose III's seventh regnal year (fig. 8). If the construction of the 4th Pylon had already begun, it would have merely been at an even earlier stage of completion than during the time of the *Texte de la jeunesse*. There would have also been a pylon marking the main entrance to the inner parts of the temple, located where the current 5th Pylon stands today, fronted by an old feature of Karnak temple: a *wadjyt*.[502]

The inscription contains two references to a *wꜣḏy.t*—the "northern *wadjyt*" (col. 3) and the "*wadjyt* on both its sides" (col. 6)[503]—both of which, at least as early as Breasted's analysis of this text, have been interpreted as the colonnade located between the 4th and 5th Pylons in Karnak, the "two sides" referring to the spaces to the north and south of the east-west axis.[504] As with the previous chapter, due to the ambiguity of the archaeological and textual evidence, and since it lies outside the scope of this paper, this thesis devotes little attention to identifying which and whose *wadjyt* this was.

II. Analysis of the *Texte de la jeunesse*

1. Beginning of the text; statements of legitimacy (Cols. 1–3; Urk. IV*, 156,13–157,12)*

The beginning of the *Texte de la jeunesse* describes Thutmose III who, having summoned his courtiers, gives a speech which begins with him stressing his filial relationship with the god Amun and announcing that *wḏ.n=f n(=ỉ) wnn(=ỉ) ḥr ns.t=f ỉsk wỉ m ỉmy sš=f* "He (Amun) commanded to (me) that (I) shall be on his throne while I (still) was one-who-is-in his nest."[505] This statement is an immediate revelation of the will of Amun, which Thutmose III then proceeded to elaborate. In Hatshepsut's great

[501] Dorman, "Early Reign", 40, no. 12 in p. 60; Hornung, "New Kingdom", 200–1.

[502] Chapter 2, 34–5.

[503] *Urk.* IV, 157,13 and 158,8. The phrase *wꜣḏy.t mḥt.yt* is paralleled with *wꜣḏy.t rs.yt* in dedication texts by Amenhotep II on the columns of the southern wing of the colonnade (*Urk.* IV, 1328,1–3).

[504] Breasted, *Chapter*, 12–14 no. 11; *Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 1–4)*, 158 (p. 76); Spencer, *Temple*, 68–9.

[505] *Urk.* IV, 157,2–3.

Punt Inscription (cols. 2–10),[506] she too begins with statements which stress her own filial relationship with Amun, and asserts that she is acting on his orders, urging the attending officials to comply. As is also the case with Thutmose III, she then reveals Amun's will: in her case, to send an expedition to Punt in order to accomplish various goals to please the god (cols. 11–13).[507] Comparing texts by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, it is interesting to note the great disparity in how much time is devoted to underlining one's direct descent from Amun by each ruler.[508]

The text continues:

(2) […] [*nn gr*]*g*[509]

nn ỉwms

ḏr-wn ḥm=ỉ m ỉnpw

tỉ w(ỉ) m wḏḥ m r-pr=f

n ḫp[*r*] *bs=ỉ r ḥm-nṯr*

(3) […] [*mɜ*]ᶜ *ḥm=ỉ*

ỉw=ỉ m ḳmɜ tỉ.t ʾIwn-mw.t=f

mỉ nḫn Ḥr m ɜḫ-bỉt

[There is no false]hood,

There is no misstatement therein.

Since my Person was a royal child,[510]

when I was a young child[511] in his temple,

my induction into (the rank of) *ḥm-nṯr*-priest had not (yet) happ[ened].

---

[506] *Urk.* IV, 349,16–352,1.

[507] *Urk.* IV, 352,2–7.

[508] For the analysis, in tabular form, of the following inscriptions: Hatshepsut's "Thutmose I Returns Thanks to Amun" (*Urk.* IV, 265–74; Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 141–50, table on 148; Gardiner, "Thanks", 6 ff.); her Punt oracle (Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 165–6), Great Punt (*ibid.*, 174), Deir el-Bahari Middle Terrace coronation (*ibid.*, 182–4), and base of northern standing obelisk inscriptions (*ibid.*, 194–5); Thutmose III's 7th Pylon (*ibid.*, 201), Semna (*ibid.*, 207), Karnak outer face of southern wall (*ibid.*, 222–4), Annals (*ibid.*, 241–6), and Akhmenu outer face of southern wall inscriptions (*ibid.*, 251–7).

[509] The pick excavating a pool determinative (Gardiner U 17–18), together with the presence of *ỉwms* "misstatement," indicate that the last word in this lacuna was *grg* "flasehood" (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 290–1), as proposed by Sethe, who also suggested *nn* before it.

[510] *ʾInpw*: "royal child" or "prince(ss)" (*Wb.*I, 96; Faulkner, 23). Bonhême and Forgeau note that it may have additionally referred to princes with no right to the throne (*Secrets*, 264).

[511] *wḏḥ*: "a child which has just been weaned," from *wḏḥ* "to wean" (*Wb.* I, 409–10; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 76).

(3) […the tem]ple[512] of my Person.
I was a *Pillar-of-his-Mother* in form and shape,
like the Child[513] Horus in *Akhbit*[514].

We are then informed that, on the occasion of this event, Amun is on a processional outing, which was, so far as one can tell from the text, limited to the temple enclosure. It is possible that the inscription either never mentioned the specific occasion or festival by name, or that the relevant passage is lost (see the beginning of col. 4).

n ḫpr bs=i r ḥm-nṯr has been conventionally translated with the sense of "when my induction into (the rank of) *ḥm-nṯr*-priest had not yet happened."[515] It has been proposed that Thutmose III (as king's son) was here boasting having the privilege of being able to be inside the temple: "before my initiation as a prophet."[516] This seems unlikely because, as discussed below, Thutmose was at this point standing in an unroofed, public area of the temple, where the *rekhyt* were present. Especially as king's son, it would be surprising that he was here boasting having access to this part of the temple, when many others, including representatives of the public at large, did too.

It is possible that the occasion for which Amun was brought out in procession was not a festival of his, but perhaps a part of an induction ceremony of lower-ranking priests into the position of *ḥm-nṯr*. Certainly, in the Third Intermediate Period, Amun had a big role to play in the *bs.t* "induction" of priests, on their *hrw n bs*.[517] A few oracular consultations are attested from before the New Kingdom,[518] but this phenomenon seems to have at first been a royal prerogative which later spread to the rest of Egyptian society.[519] Regardless, it appears that at least one of the anticipated goals of this event was to induct Thutmose into the priesthood, when Amun

[512] The "temple" of one's head: *Wb.* II, 24; Faulkner, 102.

[513] *nḫn*: simply "child," but can also refer, as here, to the sun god/Horus in his youth, when he was hiding in the marshes of the Delta (*Wb.* II, 311; Faulkner, 138).

[514] Where the young Horus grew up, graecised and more commonly rendered as *Khemmis* (Quirke, *Religion*, 61).

[515] Breasted, *Records* II, 60 (§ 138); Sethe, *Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 1–4)*, 76 (*Urk.* IV, 157–59); Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 215.

[516] Gee, "Prophets", 100; Kruchten, *Annales*, 178.

[517] Kruchten, *Annales*, 1 ff.

[518] Baines, "Practical", 88–90.

[519] McDowell, *Jurisdiction*, 107; Hornung, *Conceptions*, 193.

unexpectedly demonstrated his will that Thutmose be king. It remains unclear whether he was made a *ḥm-nṯr* on this occasion, but he would have eventually become a "servant of the god" regardless at his accession as king, and thus the primary acting priest for all temples. As with the *Historical Inscription*, there can be little doubt that this supposed *deus ex-machina* was in actuality planned in advance. The power and credibility attributed to the god, combined with the public nature of the event, would have lent legitimising power to the young Thutmose.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the evidence from Deir el-Medina suggests a level of "coordination" between judicial courts and divine processions.[520] Similarly, in the case of Thutmose, we may here have a situation where Amun was going to be out on ceremonial procession, whether for a festival of his or a set day for priestly inductions (or both), and, as pre-planned, but known only to a few, the god would have deviated from this, and gone on to reveal Thutmose as the royal successor.[521]

It is interesting to note that the theme of a deviation from an anticipated outcome is also present in Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*, triggered by an unexpected action by Amun. There follows a period of confusion by those present regarding what the god's intentions are, resolved by divine revelation that they were to become king. It is, however, telling that, in the case of Hatshepsut, this period of confusion is quite elaborate, its length spanning from the first column of the first surviving continuous section of the text (# 222), to the nineteenth (# 142).[522]

While the occasion of Amun's outing remains a mystery, what is clear is that the specific festival occasion itself is secondary; Thutmose understandably wished to place the emphasis on his divine selection, indicated by the *bỉɜy.t*-signs of the god, on this deviation from what was supposed to occur.

2. *The god emerges from the inner areas of his temple (Cols. 3–5; Urk.* IV*, 157,13–158,2)*

   ʿḥʿ.kwỉ m wɜḏy.t mḥty.t

   (4) […] *ḏsr.w n.w ɜḫ.t=f*

[520] McDowell, *Jurisdiction*, 112–14; chapter 3, 63.

[521] For discussion on awareness of the use of oracular consultations for personal ends in Deir el-Medina, cf. McDowell, *Jurisdiction*, 110–11.

[522] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 7–14.

sḫb.n=f p.t tɜ m nfr.w=f
šsp.n=f biȝy.t ꜥɜ.t
st.wt=f m ỉr.wy pꜥ.t
mỉ pr.t Ḥr-ɜḫ.ty
rḫy.t dỉ=sn n=f (5) [*ỉɜw*]

I was standing in the northern *wadjyt*-colonnade,
(4) […] the splendours of his horizon.
He made festive the sky and the earth with his beauty,
he accepted the great sign/wonder,
while his rays were in the eyes of humankind
like the rise of Horus-of-the-Horizon,
and the *rekhyt*, they gave him (5) [praise].

The mention of the *wɜḏy.t mḥty.t* has been seen as an anachronism by Carlotti and Gabolde: in their view, Thutmose I never built a *wadjyt*-colonnade on this location, but an *iunyt*-portico, which was later eventually transformed into a *wadjyt*-colonnade by Thutmose III.[523] The reason behind the choice of the term *wɜḏy.t* would have been that it was the contemporary one used to describe this space, as it would have been at the time of the carving of the inscription, scholarly consensus now dating it to the early sole reign of Thutmose III, before regnal year 23.[524] It would have already been a *wɜḏy.t* by then.[525] In short, the two options for the choice of the term *wɜḏy.t* in this inscription are: (1) that it is an anachronism (as proposed by Carlotti and Gabolde), or (2) a reference to the physical space as it was at the time of the supposed occurrence of the events (therefore *contra* Carlotti and Gabolde) rather than at the time of the carving of the text. As pointed out above, however, a *wadjyt* was already an old feature of Karnak temple, and may have already been mythologically tied to the royal cult. A third possibility is therefore also to be envisaged: (3) it might be the case that the reference is not to the eventual *wadjyt*, strictly speaking the area between the 4th and 5th Pylons, built and rebuilt by the Thutmoses I–III and Hatshepsut, but to an older, pre-

[523] Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 283–300, figs. 9 a–12 b; cf. Gabolde, "Cour", 61–2 no. 226; Laboury, *Statuaire*, 25. See: Chapter 2, 29–30.

[524] Laboury, *Statuaire*, 32–4, 546–51; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 289, no. 92; cf. Laboury, "Portrait", 270, nos. 90 and 92 in 286. For discussion on the date of the inscription, see: *supra*, 124.

[525] Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 288–9.

existing, *wadjyt*-colonnade, perhaps one of several which had existed over the course of the history of Karnak by that point (regardless of its precise location relative to that of the eventual *wadjyt*).[526] Regardless of which of these three possibilities is the correct one, the fact of consequence is the mere setting of these events in a *wadjyt*—whichever one it was—as well as the clear mythological allusions to the Horus and Seth cycle of stories with regard to the young age of Thutmose who, after a childhood of hiding in the papyrus (*wꜣḏ*) marshes of Khemmis, was destined to become king.[527]

In this way, the *wꜣḏy.t* is a mythico-historical space, the reality of which is unimportant. It is the very setting of the events in a *wꜣḏy.t* which matters.

As everyone was posted at their proper stations, the image of the god was carried out of the private parts of the temple. Based on similar passages, the lacuna in […] *ḏsr.w n.w ꜣḫ.t=f*, can be restored with a verb denoting the public appearance of a god, such as *wbn*, *prỉ*, or *ḫꜥỉ*.[528] As for its grammatical form, the stative was probably used with these intransitive verbs of motion;[529] therefore approximately: [*Ỉmn nsw.t-nṯr.w ḫꜥ(.w)/pr(.w) m(-ḫnw?)*] *ḏsr.w n.w ꜣḫ.t=f*.

The question that arises is what the space which he entered was. According to the archaeological evidence presented above, at this point in the history of Karnak temple, until the end of the reign of either Hatshepsut or Thutmose III, the current 5th Pylon marked the entrance proper into the main part of the temple, the god's private apartments.[530] The wording of *sḥb.n=f p.t tꜣ m nfr.w=f* supports the archaeological evidence: Gabolde points out how, in this period, a similar phrase, *sḥb tꜣ.wy m nfrw=s*, occurs three times, all with reference to open-air, peristyle, temple courts.[531] A similar

---

[526] Cf. Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 178–9.

[527] Cf. the Osiris-Isis-Horus myth on the stela of Amenmes (18th Dynasty), where it is said that Horus was breast-fed by Isis *m wꜥꜥw* "in solitude," *n rḫ bw=f ỉm* "none knowing his location therein" (Moret, "Légende d'Osiris", 743 no. 16).

[528] For example, *Urk.* IV, 2038,4,13. Cf. the lacuna in the coronation inscription of Horemheb (*Urk.* IV, 2117,2). The interchangeability between the words *ḫꜥ* and *wbn* is especially clear on a scene in the Great Hypostyle Hall (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 36 ll. 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 39 and 42).

[529] Hoch, *Grammar*, § 31, § 88.

[530] *Contra* Barguet, *Temple*, 87, 306, where it is argued that it was the 4th Pylon that was considered the entrance into the main area of the temple (he did, however, argue that the "apartement privé" of Amun began from the 5th Pylon: *ibid.*, 315). The 4th Pylon, however, was not completed by the end of the reign of Thutmose I (Larché, "Observations", 451, 489, 492; Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 333–6).

[531] Gabolde, "Cour", 32–3.

phrase was also used as part of the name of a monumental door which led into the *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* of Karnak—a decidedly "open" or "public" space.[532] The evidence, both archaeological and literary, supports the notion that this open space, during the childhood of Thutmose III, was much like a *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* or *wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr* forecourt.[533]

Furthermore, textual context, via mentions of the *wadjyt*, indicates that this colonnade was located just outside (to the west of) the 5th Pylon: just before Amun's "appearance" (col. 4), we are informed that Thutmose is standing in the northern *wadjyt* (col. 3). The space Amun stepped into was an open court: his appearance into this space, we are told, was greeted with the adoration of the *rekhyt*, who could have access only to semi-profane areas of state temples, and only on special occasions (discussed just below). After the *great offering* (col. 5), the text states that Amun proceeded around the *wadjyt*, before halting in front of Thutmose (col. 6).

While it cannot be determined, on textual grounds alone, whether the columns of the *wadjyt* would have been standing at the far end of a large court, or perhaps surrounding a relatively smaller court,[534] the picture of consequence to the thesis which emerges is that the *wadjyt* would have begun outside the 5th Pylon: Amun, by exiting through it, would have immediately found himself in the *wadjyt*-colonnade of the temple forecourt.

Both before, as well as after, the later construction of the 4th Pylon, the space which would eventually become the *wꜣḏy.t* as we know it today was perceived as "la salle de l'apparition du dieu, c'est-à-dire celle dans laquelle Amon-Rê, se levant des profondeurs obscures de son temple, se montre, dans tout l'éclat de sa gloire, au petit nombre de prêtres et de fonctionnaires admis jusque dans cette partie du temple."[535]

---

[532] *sbꜣ ꜥꜣ ỉmn-sḫb-tꜣ.wy* "The great door 'Amun makes festive the Two Lands.'" Gabolde, "Cour", 32 d; Letellier, *Péristyle*, 69; Barguet, *Temple*, 85 no. 7, 307 no. 4.

[533] Thutmose IV built a peristyle colonnade with *ỉwn*-columns in front of the 4th Pylon (in the *wsḫ.t ḥby.t*), which he described as a *wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr* (Spencer, *Temple*, 75; Barguet, *Temple*, 95; Chevrier, "Rapport 1951–52", 250 pl. 8; Chevrier, "Rapport 1950–51", 572 fig. 8; cf. Letellier, "Péristyle", 56). The Great Hypostyle Hall (also a *wadjyt*, due to its columns), too, overtaking the role of the original festival court between the 3rd and 4th Pylons (cf. Barguet, *Temple*, 24–5, 314, 326, 329–330 for "dédoublement" or "transposition"), was referred to as (*m*) *ḫft-ḥr* (*KRI* II, 560), in/from which the god would emerge *m nfr.w=f*.

[534] The picture of a forecourt (*wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr*) with *wadj*-columns surrounding (*pḫr*) is interestingly mirrored in a dedication-inscription of Ramses II's in Luxor temple: *wsḫ.t=s m ḫft-ḥr ỉp.t=f pḫr.tỉ m wꜣḏ.w* "its (the temple's) court in front of his (Amun's) sanctuary, surrounded with *wadj*-columns" (*KRI* II, 607,11).

[535] Barguet, *Temple*, 314. Note that the Great Hypostyle Hall itself, like the *wꜣḏy.t* it was (largely) replacing, was also described as the place of appearance of the god. For the "transposition" of the

This is precisely what is being described in our inscription, emphasised by the sentence *sḥb.n=f p.t tɜ m nfr.w=f*.[536]

That this was an open-air area, at least partially open to the public, the one into which the god used to emerge from the inner parts of his temple, is further supported by what follows: *st.wt=f m ỉr.wy pˁ.t mỉ pr.t Ḥr-ɜḫ.ty* "while his rays were in the eyes of the *paet* like the rise of Horus-of-the-Horizon." Further supporting the public nature of this event is the presence of the *rekhyt*, who are here probably being contrasted with the *paet*: "(while) the *rekhyt*, they gave him praise."[537] From the *Historical Inscription*, there exists (1) a linguistically closer parallel "The *rekhyt*, they give you praise" in a speech by Amun to Hatshepsut (*BL* 33; *H* 12, # 22,11), and (2) another one in a narrative section wherein Hatshepsut greets Amun: "she (Hatshepsut) gave praise at the approach of the Lord of the Gods" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9, # 35,13). The setting of this second is similar to the sentence here with Amun's procession in movement in an open space while adoration (*ỉɜw*) being given to him. The open space in this instance, the *wsḫ.t n.t Nn-wɜ=ỉ-r=f* "court of the (palace) *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 8, # 35,11) which might very well have been the same physical space as the open court in front of Karnak temple where the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* took place.[538] This *wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr* court, apart from being the space where the public was admitted on special occasions, it will be remembered, was where offerings and sacrifices could be presented, and tributes given and placed, witnessed by the *rekhyt* present.[539]

It is therefore clear that the location where the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* are taking place, into which Amun "appeared," was the forecourt of Karnak temple at

---

wɜḏy.t, see: *ibid.*, 24–5, 314, 326, 329–30. While the *wɜḏy.t* does not seem to have strictly been referred to as a *s.t n.t ḥˁ*, it is clear that it not only functioned, but was also perceived, as such: see the texts from Dynasty XXII referred to in: *ibid.*, 311. For references to the Great Hypostyle Hall as a *s.t n.t ḥˁ* "place of appearance": e.g. *KRI* II, 558,1–5, cf. Refai, "Function", 393 ff.; Barguet, *Temple*, 315. It seems that, after its construction, the 3rd Pylon, too, was perceived as a place of the appearance of the god, from which he would appear *m nfr.w=f* (*KRI* II, 580–1, Barguet, *Temple*, 81).

[536] Cf. the dedication inscription of Thutmose II for his festival court (Gabolde, "Cour", 30–4).

[537] For *rekhyt*, see: Arnold, *Wandrelief*, 95; Bell, "Luxor", 271 no. 96, 275–6 no. 128; "Divine", 163–8.

[538] Later in the *Historical Inscription*, there is another narrative passage which describes a similar situation: the procession exiting the temple, the god inundating the world with sunlight, all those of the population present celebrating (Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 23–4, # 109 + 72,1–8).

[539] Gabolde, "Cour", 55–61; cf. Morenz, *Religion*, 92–5. Regarding the *maru*, which would have presumably functioned in a similar role due to its having been Luxor Temple's forecourt before the construction of the Great Colonnade, see: chapter 3, 104–5; *Urk.* IV, 1651,7–8 and 1651,17–1652,1; Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 600–7; Bell, "Luxor", 275 no. 121.

the time, and as such would have permitted access to representatives of the population at large on special occasions, who could thus have witnessed the magnificent and luxurious offerings and sacrifices presented by the king to the god and his temple. The public nature of these events would have served as a highly influential legitimising factor for the king presiding over these events.

As for the sentence *šsp.n=f bi3y.t ꜥ3.t* "He accepted the great sign/wonder," its relevance is less obvious, but it appears to lend further support to the outdoor setting, as discussed in the following section.

3. *The great food-offering (Col. 5; Urk.* IV*, 158,3–6)*

(5) […].*t r-pr=f*
wn.in ḥm=f ḥr ir.t n=f snṯr ḥr ḫ.t
ḥr sm3ꜥ n=f ꜥ3b.t ꜥ3.t m iw3.w wnḏ.w ꜥw.t n.wt ḫ3s.wt

(5) […] his temple.
Then his Person was performing a censing(-ritual) on the fire,
presenting him with great food-offerings consisting of long- and short-horned cattle, and foreign wild animals.

This is one of the most interesting passages in the text, one which raises the question of who it was that performed the censing-ritual and presented the offerings. Of the two main agents encountered in the text, Thutmose III and Amun, only the latter is ever referred to as *ḥm=f*. Thutmose III, the narrator of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, refers to himself in the first person throughout the entirety of the inscription, with or without *ḥm*. This suggests that the *ḥm=f* refers to neither him nor Thutmose III, but to somebody else.[540]

Based on scenes from Thutmose IV's reliefs in the *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* which depict him presenting Amun with animal sacrifices in said court, it could be argued that the situation in the *Jeunesse* is an analogous one: on one wall, Thutmose IV is depicted performing various rituals, including offering bouquets, and censing.[541] The sacrificing of cattle on a large scale is not likely to have occurred in a roofed space and, in addition to its cultic role of raising the essence of offerings skyward, incense would have also

[540] According to Laboury, this was already noted by Gabolde, but no reference is given (*Statuaire*, 570 no. 1691).

[541] Letellier, "Péristyle", 56 (Paroi A, fig. 1).

conveniently acted to alleviate the smells of slaughter. Furthermore, the burning of offerings would have also required an unroofed space.[542] Gabolde refers to an inscription on the inner face of block 147 of the Chapelle Rouge which describes the preparing of the altar for burnt offerings in a *wsḫ.t*, undoubtedly the *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* of Karnak.[543] In agreement with his views, I repeat here that it was one of the primary roles of the *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* to act as a public space, where the gods and humankind could both witness the king performing rituals, and see his benefactions for the temple and its god(s).[544] That the king, Thutmose IV, is represented performing this ritual (followed, furthermore, by his royal *ka*) suggests that this was a series of rituals that were the king's role to perform when he was present, at least, and this is supported by the reference to the performer of the ritual as *ḥm=f* in the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

Supporting this notion is a passage from Hatshepsut's coronation text in the Middle Colonnade at Deir el-Bahari, where she recounts a voyage she made to Lower Egypt with her father Thutmose I. The group of gods accompanying them are said to have declared to Hatshepsut, in a long list, the royal duties that she would perform as king, among which was: *i̯ṯ=ṯ ꜥɜb.t mꜣ.t-sw.t r rwdw n nsw.t*[*-nṯr.wꜣmn nb nsw.t-tɜ.wy*] "May you seize the offerings in Karnak at the platform of the king [of the gods, Amun the Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands]."[545]

There is little reason to doubt Ineni's account in his biography that Thutmose III would have acceded to the throne on the death of his father.[546] In line with general Egyptological opinion, we are therefore left with Thutmose II performing the censing-ritual and presenting the offerings.[547]

The discussion at the end of the chapter weighs the evidence for whether Thutmose III actually became king as a result of the events of the text (after his

[542] Gabolde, "Cour", 57.

[543] *Ibid.*, 57; for image of block 147: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 213. Admittedly, however, unless otherwise specified, the term *wsḫ.t* could refer to a large, roofed, space as well (Spencer, *Temple*, 79).

[544] Gabolde, "Cour", 56–61 ("Rôle et fonctionnement de l'édifice à travers ses mentions"), esp. p. 57 no. 3: "L'ouverture vers le ciel, qui est une particularité constitutive de ces monuments permet, en effet, de délimiter un périmètre cultuel directement en relation avec le monde céleste."

[545] *Urk.* IV, 248,10–11.

[546] *Urk.* IV, 59,13–17.

[547] Cf. Redford, *History*, 53–4; Murnane, *Coregencies*, 117; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 288. *Contra* Breasted, who concluded, on false grounds (due to the then-prevalent debate regarding Thutmoside succession), that the reign in question would instead have been Thutmose I's (*Chapter*, 14–15 no. 15).

introduction into the inner areas of the temple), but what is relevant for now is that the *grande offrande* took place before even Amun had singled out the young Thutmose, and that the main rituals of the ceremony were therefore officiated by the reigning king—Thutmose II.

The discussion regarding the *grande offrande* has thus far clarified (1) who it was that was that was the performer of the ritual: the king, namely, in the case of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, Thutmose II, and (2) has further supported the notion that the *wadjyt*, whether a portico or a colonnade, was situated within a larger area, one which would have been an open court which could accommodate participants in rituals, food offerings, as well as spectators. Based on the archaeological evidence presented above, this open court and *wadjyt* would have been the *wsḫ.t ḫft-ḥr* (to use the later, more "standardised" reference to temple forecourts) fronting Karnak temple's—then—main entrance, the 5th Pylon. This forecourt would have simultaneously functioned as a *wsḫ.t ḥby.t* "festival court,"[548] and would have as such been the venue for the presentation of offerings,[549] including most likely the one related here in the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

The interpretation of the evidence for offerings from the *Texte de la jeunesse* and Thutmose IV's scenes in the festival court can be taken further. The components of the animal offerings from the reliefs of Thutmose IV support the notion of a king officiating in these rituals and, by extension, in the ones in the *Texte de la jeunesse* as well: it consists of *wnḏw* and *ỉwɜ*-cattle, along with *mɜ-ḥḏ*(*.w*) "oryx(es)" and *gḥs*(*.w*) "gazelle(s)."[550] The latter two, as animals not native to the Nile Valley, constitute *ꜥw.t n.wt ḫɜsw.t* "foreign wild animals." These are precisely the constituents of the offering in the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

In the *Historical Inscription*, as with the *Jeunesse*, mention is made of censing (*ỉr.t snṯr*) and presenting (*smɜꜥ*) the offering (*ꜥɜb.t*) almost *verbatim*: *wn.ỉn=tw ḥr ỉr.t snṯr ḥr smɜꜥ ꜥɜb.t n ỉmn m ỉp.t-sw.t* "One then did the censing and presenting of offerings to Amun-in-Karnak" (*BL* 42; *H* 25, # 72,12–13). In the representations of the Valley Festival on the third register of the north side of the Chapelle Rouge, block 273 couples the *ỉr.t snṯr* with the sacrificing of cattle in the ritual of *ḥw.t sp 4* which is

[548] Wallet-Lebrun, *Livre*, 62: "Sans doute les qualificatifs de "cérémonielle" et d'"axiale" ou de "grande" n'ont-ils rien de contradictoire" (cf. *ibid.*, 179).

[549] Chapter 2, 34.

[550] Letellier, "Péristyle", 56 (fig. 1, paroi A, "extrémité droite").

described as a *ꜥȝb.t ꜥȝ.t*.[551] In contrast with the *Texte de la jeunesse*, however, there is unfortunately no mention of the animals being sacrificed in the *Historical Inscription*.

While not a part of the *Historical Inscription*, but from the same monument, there are several scenes depicting the presenting of sacrificed cattle in the Chapelle Rouge. On the 5th register of blocks of the southern wall of the vestibule (block 150), as with Thutmose IV's reliefs, the king, in this case Hatshepsut, is depicted offering four sacrificed animals, each captioned *rnn* "young, i.e. calf," and followed by a designation of the specific animal: (1) *gḥs* ("gazelle") (2) *mȝ-ḥḏ* ("oryx") (3) *ng*[*ȝw*]-cattle, and (4) *ỉwȝ*-cattle.[552] Aside from *ngȝw*-cattle, three of the four sacrificed animals match those in the reliefs of Thutmose IV and the *Texte de la jeunesse* (the *wnḏw* being the only one not mentioned). Similarly, the animal sacrifice on the inner faces of blocks 143 + 44 (south wall of sanctuary, second register of blocks) is also depicted being performed by Hatshepsut and here, too, the constituents of the offerings are relevant.[553] Rather than the more usual three or four, six slaughtered animals are depicted, each captioned *rnn* "young," and again followed by a designation of the specific animal: (1) [*ỉwȝ*]-cattle, (2) *ng*[*ȝw*]-cattle, (3) *wn*<*ḏw*>-cattle, (4) *mȝ-ḥḏ* ("oryx"), (5) <*b*>*ȝw*(*y*) ("buck," or "ibex"), and (6) *gḥs* ("gazelle").[554] The caption for the first sacrifice, unfortunately illegible due to a break in the block, has been restored as "*ỉwȝ*-cattle" by Lacau who does not, however, provide an explanation.[555] In comparison with the three examples mentioned thus far, as well as other offering scenes in the Chapelle Rouge, however, Lacau's restoration seems unlikely to be false, for the *ỉwȝ*-cattle is the one that appears most often, and the only one to do so in other Chapelle Rouge offering scenes where only one sacrificed animal is depicted.[556]

---

[551] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 99; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 133 (§ 178,k), 171 (§ 231). This is the case too in blocks 216 + 306 and 32 + 173 on the fourth register of the west face of the Chapelle Rouge (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 134–5); of the two sets of equivalent parallel scenes on the east face, only the two censing scenes on blocks 214 and 125 survive (*ibid.*, 152).

[552] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 180–1; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 276 (§ 444).

[553] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 238; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 309 (§ 522).

[554] *Loc. cit.*

[555] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 309 (§522).

[556] The surviving *ḥw.t r stp.wt* scenes in the Chapelle Rouge: blocks 216 and 173 (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 134–5, 152: parements des façades ouest et est, assise 4), block 150 (*ibid.*, 180–1: vestibule, long côté sud, assise 5, scène 2), blocks 44 + 143 (*ibid.*, 238: sanctuaire, côté sud, assise 2, scène 6). There are also scenes depicting offerings being made by the king which are more varied in content, including plants and fowl. Aside from one exception, wherever there are animal sacrifices in these

The differences between the listing of these offerings in various sources[557] is not necessarily a result of actually differing sacrifices, but of how detailed the primary source is. Even Hatshepsut's depiction of the sacrifices, listing six kinds, is still a very condensed version of what it would have been like in actuality: "[o]n devait en offrir un assez grand nombre, mais, dans les représentations courantes, on réduisait la scène à l'essentiel."[558]

To conclude, there are four primary sources which have been examined: (1) The offerings depicted on the walls of the Chapelle Rouge and (2) in Thutmose IV's reliefs in the festival court, and the ones mentioned textually in (3) the *Historical Inscription* and (4) *Texte de la jeunesse*. (a) On the one hand, it was demonstrated that many of the constituents of the *grande offrande* in the *Texte de la jeunesse* are shared with those in Thutmose IV's reliefs and some of Hatshepsut's (e.g. # 143 + 44) from the Chapelle Rouge. (b) On the other hand, the phrasing of the passage expressing the censing and presenting of the offerings in the *Texte de la jeunesse* is almost identical to the one in the *Historical Inscription*. It follows, therefore, that (c) even though no specifics are mentioned in the *Historical Inscription* as to the constituents of the offerings, that they, too, like the *Texte de la jeunesse*, and the reliefs of Hatshepsut and Thutmose IV's, would most likely also have included at least *wnḏw* and *ỉwꜣ*-cattle, along with *mꜣ-ḥḏ*(.*w*) "oryx(es)" and *gḥs*(.*w*) "gazelle(s)."

---

scenes, it is always and only the *ỉwꜣ* which appears: block 284 (*ibid.*, 164: vestibule, parement nord, assise 4, scène 4), block 100 (*ibid.*, 168: vestibule, parement nord, assise 7, scène 5), block 304 (*ibid.*, 243: sanctuaire, côté sud, assise 3, scène 1), block 105 (*ibid.*, 228: sanctuaire, côté sud, assise 7, scène x+2). The one (surviving) scene which is the exception depicts two kinds of animal sacrifices: as expected, the *ỉwꜣ*, as well as the *ngꜣ* (block 278, *ibid.*, 68: l'extérieur, long côté sud, assise 6, scène 2). Regardless of whether this means that in these specific offering-rituals the only cattle offered was the *ỉwꜣ*, or that it could "stand in" and represent all other forms of cattle-offerings, the fact of consequence is that the *ỉwꜣ*-cattle appears most often (cf. Helck, *LÄ* IV, s.v. "Opfertier", 594), thus supporting Lacau's restoration.

[557] E.g. Blocks 150 and 44 + 143 respectively depict four and six animal sacrifices. The sacrificing of animals, especially when captioned with the name of the ritual *ḫw.t r stp.wt sp 4* "to strike the choice (cuts of meat) four times," like the ritual of striking the four chests, has connotations with the dominion of the king in all four cardinal directions (Leclant, "Mascarade", 141). On the ancient Egyptian notion of identifying the sacrificing of animals with the killing of the enemies of Egypt, including Seth, see, for example: Altenmüller, *LÄ* IV, s.v. "Opfer", 583; Leclant, "Mascarade", 141–45; Blackman, "Grace", 72, nos. b and c. For more examples of "défilés de boeufs gras," akin to those of Thutmose IV in the festival court at Karnak, amassed by Gabolde, see: "Cour", 56–7 no. 2, footnote 190).

[558] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 309 (§ 522). These discrepancies in the represented varieties of the animal sacrifice offering ritual have also led Larché to state that this ritual "ne comportait pas un nombre déterminé d'animaux" (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 60 no. 116).

A connection between the offerings mentioned in all four primary sources has been demonstrated. What this means must be now be considered: it is unclear whether this is an offering that was specific to one festival, or common to more than one. The offering mentioned in the *Historical Inscription*, while probably the same as that depicted on blocks 143 + 44, does not entail that they would have even occurred on the same festival occasion. These simple mentions of the animals in the offerings cannot be taken as accurate reflections of the actual numbers and types of animals needed for a given festival, and must be understood as generalising statements. Nevertheless, it is probably safe to say that the sacrificing of such a rich variety of animals would have been reserved for greater occasions. The festival occasions in both the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription* would have certainly been among the greater of calendar festivals, thus guaranteeing greater legitimacy for the future king through the importance of the religious occasion, and thus ultimately through the attendance from both the elite and the population (represented by the *pʿ.t* and the *rḫy.t*) which it would have drawn. This does not, however, mean, that they were both one and the same annual festival: the representations and mentions of the animals listed above might simply be a summary and standardised way of expressing the opulence of the offerings being made. Regardless of this, however, the overall similarity in these varying descriptions of this *grande offrande* could be telling, and a detailed study could prove fruitful.[559]

The evidence and discussion thereof so far support the suggestion made earlier, that the setting here is a public and unroofed space, and also that it was the king who would have officiated the *grande offrande*. This great offering, it has been argued, indicates that the festival occasion in each of the four primary sources cited would have been one of great importance and extravagance. This need not signify, however, that they had all taken place during the same festival occasion. The main thing in common in all four primary sources is the great importance of the religious occasion itself, as well as the presenting of these offerings. It was the prerogative of the king to perform this ritual, and this would have lent tremendous legitimising power not only through the

[559] There are more mentions of some of the constituents of animal sacrifice offerings (such as *iwꜣ*, *wnḏ*, and *ngꜣ*) in other contexts as well, such as spells from the temple of Edfu and the Pyramid Texts (Leclant, "Mascarade", 141–5).

importance of the occasion, but through being witnessed by all those present in the public *wsḫ.t*-area.[560]

What this means, therefore, is that Thutmose II, as reigning king, was the one who officiated at the *grande offrande* in the *Texte de la jeunesse* on a religious occasion of great importance, while Thutmose III, as prince, would have been standing at a non-royal "station," somewhere else in the *wadjyt* (*m wꜣḏy.t mḥty.t*: col. 3), watching this take place.

Furthermore, it can be argued (discussed further below) that Thutmose II would have himself been standing at the *Station of the Lord* during this time, which may have been a, or the, designated location of the king in this area of the temple from which to conduct various rituals, including the making of the *grande offrande*.

Whether the *Station* was the specific location where the king stood to perform the *grande offrande* or not, what is certain is that the *ḥ ḥw n nb* was indeed located somewhere in the *wadjyt* area of Karnak temple[561] which, at this point in time (and as demonstrated above), was part of the open and unroofed court at the front of the temple. The public nature of the location of the *ḥ ḥw nb nsw.t*, being inside the *wadjyt*, is clear from the *Texte de la jeunesse*: all the events leading up to Amun's selection of Thutmose and taking him inside the temple took place in the open air area of the court and *wadjyt* at the front of the temple, before the 5th Pylon, in the presence of the *rekhyt*.

As pointed out in the previous chapter, it is clear—based on context—from the main narrative section of the *Historical Inscription* as well that the *Station* in that text—probably the same one as in the *Jeunesse*—was located in a public area, and somewhere at the front of the temple proper.[562] In addition, block 287 of the same text, in which Hatshepsut retrospectively relates an oracular session which had occurred for her earlier, in Year 2, by Amun in Luxor temple, states that she was as a result posted "[at the station] of the efficient king" of the court (*wsḫ.t*) of that temple—in the presence of *nṯr pn nfr* "this perfect god:" Thutmose III (*BL* 40; *H* 25–6, # 287,3–7; Appendix B). These two references from the *Historical Inscription* support the notion that royal "stations" were usually located in public areas of temples, where various

[560] Cf. Bell, "Luxor", 275 no. 128; Gabolde, "Cour", 30–4, 56–61.

[561] Cf. Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 292.

[562] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 7, # 222,2; *ibid.*, 24, # 72,9. Chapter 3, 40, 51–2, 104.

rituals, including the *grande offrande*, would have taken place.[563] It seems logical therefore to assume that the *Station*, as the designated place for the king while the festival procession was in a temple forecourt, was also where he would have stood while making the *ꜥɜb.t ꜥɜ.t* for the god.

In conclusion, I therefore believe that Thutmose II was present, and the officiating king, during the main ritual occasion of Amun's outing in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, and that he would have actually been standing at the *Station* himself during all, or a part of the duration of the text.

Before carrying on with the analysis of the inscription, I would first like to return to a sentence the discussion of which was postponed.

On Amun "receiving" a bỉɜy.t

I would like to draw attention again to a sentence from the previous subsection (*the god emerges*): *šsp.n=f bỉɜy.t ꜥɜ.t* "He (Amun) accepted (lit. "received") the great sign/wonder."[564] In light of the discussion on the *grande offrande*, I think that what is being described here (col. 4), in the description of Amun "accepting" a *bỉɜy.t*, is in direct relation with the *ꜥɜb.t ꜥɜ.t* which follows (col. 5).

From context, it is clear that Amun is the subject of the verb, but where one would expect Amun to be the one doing the *bỉɜy.t*, he is the one receiving it. I have not encountered over the course of my research another instance of a god receiving a *bỉɜy.t*, but interpreting it as one would any other instance thereof, the sense becomes clearer: in accordance with Gillen's views on the *bỉɜy.t*,[565] the one we encounter in our text may have been a "sign" used to ask for the god's approval, which he accepted (*šsp*, lit. "received").[566]

Here are the pertinent facts: (1) Amun's positive reply to the *bỉɜy.t* directed at him is immediately preceded by his exit from the roofed parts of the temple, and (2) the reaction to his own positive reply is the performance of the censing-ritual, and the

[563] *Contra* Breasted, *Records* II, § 140,b and *Chapter*, 16–17 no. 23: while he too saw the *Station* as the place where "the king stood in the performance of the prescribed state ritual," he located it in the sanctuary rather than in a public area.

[564] *Urk.* IV, 157,16 (col. 4).

[565] Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 7 ff.

[566] Cf. *ibid.*, 10–11.

presentation of the *grande offrande*. This could be evidence, in general terms,[567] of a standard set of rituals which took place on great occasions of Amun's public outing: after exiting the closed parts of the temple, a *bỉɜy.t*-sign/wonder may have been directed to Amun, which he would have accepted, signaling that he approved of the situation, and was ready to further the festival to its next step, that is, the presenting of great and numerous offerings to him in an open court area, witnessed by all those attending. Given the miraculous nature of a *bỉɜy.t,* it must be wondered if the one Amun accepted was also performed by another deity, rather than a human agent.

Alternatively, and more simply, *bỉɜy.t* here could be synonymous with *bỉɜw* "wonders, marvels," with reference to the exceptional nature of the offerings which were about to be presented to Amun, which he accepted (*šsp*) publicly (*st.wt=f m ỉr.wy pˁ.t*).

However, after the completion of one of the main rituals of the ceremonial occasion (the *grande offrande*) Amun "deviated" by behaving unexpectedly—to use the term adopted in the previous chapter—and sought out Thutmose III. The god was not yet finished doing what he had always meant to do.

4. *Amun mysteriously seeks out Thutmose, and finds him (Col. 6; Urk.* IV*, 158,7–12)*

(6) […]

[…].*w* (*?*) *ḥr pḫr wɜḏy.t ḥr gs.wy=s*(*y*)

nn ɜm ỉb ḫnty.w ỉrr.(*w*)*t=f*

ḥr ḏˁr ḥm=ỉ m s.t nb.t

rḫ.n(*=ỉ*) *wỉ ỉs*

ỉw=f ḫn(*.w*)

(6) […]

[…] moving about in both wings (lit. "its two sides") of the *wadjyt*,

the heart was without grasping what-was-forthcoming (from) his actions (lit. "those (things) which he was doing")

while seeking my Person everywhere.

(I), however, knew myself

[567] A fuller description would certainly have mentioned not only many more ritual actions, but also numerous incantations.

when he made a (ritual-)stop.

The gap at the start of the sixth column of text is extremely unfortunate, for if this text ever did contain a passage explicitly describing Amun's "departure" or "deviation" (encountered in the *Historical Inscription*) from what he was expected to do, it is my belief that it would have been expressed in this lacuna. The distinction of importance between the two inscriptions, however, as I attempt to argue henceforward in this chapter, is that the theme of "deviation" in the *Texte de la jeunesse* would not have been indicated by an instance of Amun *not* performing a *bỉꜣy.t* he was meant to. This would have, in contrast with the *Historical Inscription*, indicated that the god was pleased with the way things were at the time of the occurrence of the festival, the epitome of which would have been a great offering being made to Amun. Rather, it seems likelier that some sort of action of his—no matter how unexpected—would have been related at the start of the sixth column, rather than an instance of non-activity by not doing his *bỉꜣy.t*. The following discussion will attempt to explain and support this view.

In the *Historical Inscription*, the block following that numbered 72, where this text's own *grande offrande* is narrated, is unfortunately missing. As discussed in the previous chapter, however, there does thankfully remain one sentence following the offering (but before the text breaks off), and it describes praises (*ḫknw*) being invoked (*nỉs*) for Hatshepsut in her royal name which had been established (*wd.t*) earlier in the text (*BL* 42; *H* 25, # 72,13). Setting the tone with *nỉs*(*.w*) *ḫknw* "praises were invoked," this passage may have been followed by a few more describing more celebration, with stock phrases incorporating various elements such as *ḥꜥỉ/ḥꜥꜥw* "to rejoice; rejoicing," *m ỉhhy* "in acclamation," or *rš/ršw.t* "(to be) joyful; joy" which usually appear as a reaction to a significant action by Amun for the king, or at the end of an account of a future king's *ḫꜥỉ* "arising, appearance" into his new life as Pharaoh.[568]

Returning to the *Texte de la jeunesse*, it seems doubtful that the start of column six would have contained such references to celebrations, for all reactions of others from here until the eighth column describe a lack of understanding of what is happening: *nn ꜣm ỉb ḫnt.yw ỉry.tyw=f* "the heart was without grasping what-was-

[568] E.g.: *Historical Inscription*: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 17, # 143,11–12; *ibid.*, 24, # 109,3–5; Horemheb's Turin inscription: *Urk.* IV, 2119,4–7 (l. 21); *Contendings of Horus and Seth*: Gardiner, *Stories*, 60, 4–10 (16,5–16,8); stèle Louvre C 286 ll. 16–21 (Moret, *Légende d'Osiris*, 744–6).

forthcoming (from) his actions" (col. 6).[569] It is worth noting that in "the heart was without grasping what-was-forthcoming (from) his actions," appears once again a contrast being made between the hidden will of the gods, and what they decide to reveal.[570] It is also important to note that this does not necessarily mean that no celebrating took place as a result of Thutmose II presenting offerings to Amun: from within the specific context of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, which presents events which were relevant to, and from the perspective of, Thutmose III, it may have simply been a question of wishing to omit a mention of another king being celebrated. This would have furthermore hardly fit well within the context of the inscription by having one or more of the standard phrases used to express the celebrating which would have accompanied the *ḫʿi* of a king, only to have the jubilant masses switch to a mood of confusion.

It is therefore clear in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, that Amun's actions at this point were unexpected, constituting this particular text's "deviation" section. But could this passage of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, as with the "deviation" in the *Historical Inscription*, in this gap have related an instance of Amun not performing a *bỉɜy.t* which he was expected to? As discussed in the previous chapter, this would have been an event of extreme significance: Amun not giving his blessing, manifested by an expected *bỉɜy.t*, in public in the court of the temple, witnessed by "the entire land," would have been a tremendously significant event. It would have indicated a lack of satisfaction with the way things were, a situation which required rectifying.[571]

Despite numerous similarities, the events taking place in each text are different, and it therefore does not follow that their themes of "deviation" were the same either. Amun did indeed "deviate" in the *Texte de la jeunesse* as well, but it is my belief that this would not have been expressed by a lack of a *bỉɜy.t* by the god. He would have instead, as expected, performed his *bỉɜy.t* for Thutmose II after and as a result of the *grande offrande* which this king would have conducted in person. The reason why this

[569] For the interesting precise correlation in meaning between Egyptian on the one hand, and English—among others—on the other in their figurative use of "grasp" meaning "to understand" or "to comprehend," see: Breasted, *Chapter*, 15 no. 17. Note also Sethe's use of the verb "begreifen" (*Urk*. IV (*Übersetzung 1–4)*, p. 76, no. 6).

[570] The previous instance (col. 4) discussed above only arguably exhibits this contrast, but a more concrete one appears later in the text (col. 8).

[571] Chapter 2, 51–2.

would not have been mentioned, like the possible omission of celebration as argued above, would be simply because the text itself is a concise account of what transpired, furthermore purely from Thutmose III's own perspective. Amun's *bi3y.t* for Thutmose II as a response to the *grande offrande*, simply inconsequential to Thutmose III and, while important to Thutmose II, was an expected and regular event which thus did not necessitate mentioning; neither would it have served the purposes, nor matched the context of, the overall inscription from a literary standpoint.

The difference between the "episodes" which follow that of *the grande offrande* in each text gives more support to the notion that the ceremonial procedures, as they took place, in the *Historical Inscription* on the one hand, and the *Texte de la jeunesse* on the other, while similar, are in fact different. In the case of the former, we encounter the following "episodes:" Amun's deviation from the expected ritual procedure took place early in the festival (*H* 7), after which he "revealed" his intentions (*H* 14), that is, to make Hatshepsut appear as king (*H* 19), and then only after which did the *grande offrande* take place (*H* 25). On the other hand, the reverse is true in the *Texte de la jeunesse*: the *grande offrande* had already taken place (col. 5), only after which did Amun "deviate" by proceeding in and around the *wadjyt* and then finally stopping in front of Thutmose, thus "revealing" his intentions (col. 6). The period between "deviation" and "revelation" in the *Jeunesse*, as mentioned briefly earlier in the chapter, is resolved almost immediately, a mere three columns of text later (col. 9).[572] It is worth noting, however, that, unless it is missing, no sentence in the text explicitly states that the god revealed his actions: the text simply moves on to the next section which describes Thutmose III's experiences of being bestowed with royal power.[573]

Needless to say, however, textual proximity need not entail closer chronological gaps between various events. In support of a closer succession of events in the *Texte de la jeunesse* is, as argued above, that they are all taking place, up until the "revelation"-phase, in the same space: the large, open, public court featuring *wadj*-columns. Near the start of the *Historical Inscription* however, Amun was already at the *Station of the Lord of the King* (which was probably located in the *wadjyt*) but did not perform his *bi3y.t* there (*H* 7). He then proceeded to various places outside (e.g. the *tp-iṯrw*, the *ʿḥ-nsw.t I-*

[572] *Urk.* IV, 159, *ca.* 10.

[573] The very start of the eighth column is missing, where there may very well have been a "revelation" sentence (see *infra*, 160).

Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him)[574] as well as inside (e.g. the *ḥw.t-ꜥ3.t-M3ꜥ.t*)[575] the temple itself, eventually reaching the *s.t šms.wt-nsw.t r ḥw.t-nṯr* [*Im*]*n* "the place of the royal following to the temple of [Amu]n," only at which point do things become clear to those attending (*BL* 33; *H* 14, # 142,18–19). Indeed, after a speech by a deity, when the narrative resumes, it is the *ḫꜥw-nsw.t* "royal appearance" of Hatshepsut which is related (*BL* 35; *H* 19, # 48 + 164,7–10).

Despite even admitting that the *Texte de la jeunesse* goes into far less detail regarding the ceremonies taking place than the *Historical Inscription* does, it is clear that these two texts differ in the sequence of the events that they have in common.

The sentence describing Amun finding Thutmose is grammatically difficult to interpret, there being no subject: *rḫ.n wi̯ i̯s*. Breasted stated that it is "syntactically not unparalleled" (without providing instances, however) and that it is clear, from context, that it is Amun who is performing this action.[576] Hofmann restores a suffix pronoun *=f* as a subject: *rḫ.n <=f?> wi̯ i̯s* "<Er> erkannte mich aber."[577] An alternative interpretation lends itself, however: following the passage relating Amun's (ritual-)stop (*ḫnw*), there is a gap long enough for one sentence.[578] The three following ones are *sḏm.n=f* forms, where the subject is the pronominal first person *=i̯* in all three cases,[579] and two of which have the pronominal reflexive first person dependent pronoun *wi̯* as their objects.[580] Furthermore, in the case of these two, the suffix pronoun *=i̯* is not written, probably for vocalic reasons: *sḏm.n(=i̯) wi̯*. Based on context, therefore, and thereby avoiding any restorations, we are left with Amun "deviating," at everyone's surprise, and then proceeding around the *wadjyt* for reasons known to none other than him—and Thutmose. Indeed, the latter states, during this confusion: *rḫ.n(=i̯) wi̯ i̯s* "(I), however, knew myself." The intended reaction of the reader would have been one of awe and amazement at Thutmose's fore-knowledge of what was to come.

---

[574] *tp-i̯trw*: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 7, # 222,2. *Nn-w3=i̯-r=f*: *ibid.*, 8, # 35,11; *ibid.*, 14, # 142,21.

[575] Whatever its precise location, it was somewhere close to the front of the temple: Hatshepsut, while in the *ḥw.t-ꜥ3.t-M3ꜥ.t*, is said to have been *m ḫnty ḥw.t-nṯr=f* "in the front of his (Amun's) temple" (Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 9, # 184,20).

[576] Breasted, *Chapter*, 15 no. 18.

[577] Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 210 (transliteration), 216 (translation).

[578] *Urk.* IV, 158,13 (start of col. 7).

[579] *Urk.* IV, 158,14–16 (col. 7).

[580] *Urk.* IV, 158,14,16.

Paradoxically, however, to the modern reader, this seems to lend further support to the notion that the recognition of Thutmose by the god was pre-planned, and that his ceremonial outing was, in fact, "rigged" or "hijacked" from the start. If this interpretation is far too cynical, one could alternatively, but along the same lines, rather than ascribe such prescience to Thutmose (whichever way you look at it), argue that he did not know all along that he was going to be selected by Amun, but simply "felt"—or somehow "knew" (*rḫ*)—that he was his intended goal when Amun "deviated" and began proceeding around the *wadjyt* or, more specifically, at the moment Amun stopped in front of him (assuming that *ỉw=f ḫn*(*.w*) is an circumstantial subordinate clause).

The verb *ḫnỉ* "to alight, stop, or halt"[581] is the standard word used for the processional stops made by a god during religious occasions.[582] The following line, the start of the seventh column, is sadly missing, but guesses can be made as to the original contents of this gap: (1) Amun's search for Thutmose now over, and the sentences following it recounting the prince's reaction to Amun's stopping for him, some sort of "sign" from the god could be expected. It is therefore possible for this sentence to have contained a description of the approval of the god, perhaps—but not necessarily—manifested by a *bỉɜy.t* for Thutmose. A comparison with the *Historical Inscription*, however, indicates that this restoration is not necessarily correct: near the start of the text, when Amun and Hatshepsut first meet, Hatshepsut's reaction is narrated first, which is only then followed by a *bỉɜy.t* from the god. In fact, the passages describing the first meeting between god and king in both texts share many of the same elements: the reaction of the king, his/her being placed in front of the god, his *bỉɜy.t*, and the king being led to a location by Amun. It is in the order in which these episodes, or stages, take place that the two differ (discussed in this coming section).[583] (2) Despite these differences, however, the numerous shared elements allow an alternative suggestion for

[581] *Wb.* III, 287–8; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 192.

[582] Cf. Kruchten, *Djéhoutymose*, 256–61.

[583] For now, the "episodes" of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, in textual order of succession, are: (1) the reaction of the king (*Urk.* IV, 158,13 (?),14–16), (2) his being placed in front of the god (*Urk.* IV, 158,17), (3) and being led to the *ʿḥʿw nb nsw.t* (*Urk.* IV, 159,1), and (4) the god performing a *bỉɜy.t* for him (*Urk.* IV, 159,2). The *Historical Inscription*: (1) "reaction" (Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 9, # 35 + 184,13–17), (2) *bỉɜy.t* (*ibid.*, 9, # 184,17–18), (3) "placing-in-front" (*ibid.*, 9, # 184,18), and (4) Hatshepsut being led to the *ḥw.t-ʿɜ.t-Mɜʿ.t* (*ibid.*, 9, # 184,18–19).

the lacuna in the seventh column: in the *Historical Inscription*, the sentence preceding the description of her reaction to meeting Amun, who had been on his way to reach her since his "deviation" by not performing his *bỉɜy.t* at the *ʿḥʿw nb nsw.t*, states that she *ḥr rdỉ.t ỉɜw m ḫsf.w nb nṯr.w* "gave praise at the approach of the lord of the gods" (*BL* 35; *H* 9, # 35,13). Similarly, in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, Amun had started moving around, searching for Thutmose, whose first reaction, at the god's "approach" (*ḫsfw*) (and eventual *ḫnw* "halt") may have been one of "giving praise."

5. *Thutmose's reaction to Amun stopping for him, and the god's own reaction thereto (Col. 7; Urk.* IV*, 158,13–159,2)*

(7) […]
[*dỉ.n*(*=ỉ*) *wỉ ḥr ḫ.t m-bɜḥ=f*]
[*dwn.n=ỉ ḥr*] *sɜtw*
ḫɜm.n(*=ỉ*) *wỉ m-bɜḥ=f*
dỉ.n=f wỉ ḫr-ḥɜ.t ḥm=f
sʿḥʿ.kwỉ r ʿḥʿw [*n*] *nb*
wn.ỉn=f ḥr bỉɜy.t ḥr=ỉ

(7) […]
[I placed myself on the belly in front of him,]
[I prostrated on] the floor,
I bowed (lit. "bent myself") in his presence,
He placed me in front of his Person,
(And) I was stationed at the *Station [of] the Lord*.
He then performed a *bỉɜy.t*-sign for me.

This fascinating passage is one of the most important in the inscription, and furthermore demonstrates—despite their differences—the greatest similarity between the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription*: the protagonist's being made to stand at the *Station* as an event of extreme significance for, being the designated spot where only the holder of the office of Pharaoh could be posted, it meant that s/he had

thus obtained Amun's approval—manifested by a *bỉꜣy.t*—to stand where only a king could.[584]

When Amun stopped, Thutmose threw himself to the ground before him. In terms of the "episodes" put forward in the previous section, this consists of his "reaction" to Amun finding him. In the *Historical Inscription* as well, at her first meeting with Amun, it is said that *rdỉ.t=s s*(*y*) *ḥr ḫ.t=s m-bꜣḥ-ᶜ ḥm=f* "she (Hatshepsut) threw herself on her belly in the presence of His Person (Amun)" (*BL* 31; *H* 9, # 184,14). However, this is followed by a speech by Hatshepsut directed to Amun, for which there is no equivalent in the *Texte de la jeunesse* (which, on the other hand, describes Thutmose's reaction in three short sentences, transliterated and translated in this section). We can be certain, however, that, in actuality, one speech would have at least been made. Admitting that the *Historical Inscription* itself is not a faithful step-by-step account of what transpired, it is clear that the *Texte de la jeunesse* is even more concise. This should not be surprising, as the subject matter of the *Historical Inscription* is entirely devoted to Hatshepsut's becoming king, while the section of the *Texte de la jeunesse* under discussion in this chapter is merely the introduction to the overall text, the remainder of which consists of Thutmose III enumerating his many deeds for Amun and his temple in return.

The outcome of the meeting in both cases, however, is the same, in that the future king submitted him/herself to Amun's divine will, epitomised by the end of Hatshepsut's speech: "What is it that you wish to happen? I shall truly act in accordance with that which you have commanded" (*BL* 31; *H* 9, # 184,16–17). This, approved by the god's *bỉꜣy.t*, paves the way for the remaining "episodes" to take place, enabling the protagonist of each text to be led towards the inner areas of the temple.[585]

The *Texte de la jeunesse*, in contrast, does not mention Amun immediately signaling his approval at Thutmose's submitting himself to him. Rather, it relates that Amun placed Thutmose in front of him, and that the future king was then posted at the *Station*, only at which point did the *bỉꜣy.t* take place. The sentence describing this, *sᶜḥᶜ.kwỉ r ᶜḥᶜw n nb* "I was stationed at the *Station of the Lord*," is grammatically tied

[584] Cf. Breasted, who argued that the *Station* was the place from where the king conducted rituals, and that, by extension, Amun, by posting Thutmose there, was "thus practically installing him as king" (*Chapter*, 17 no. 23).

[585] For the *bỉꜣy.t* as the indicator of the god's approval: Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 8–11 (esp. 10).

to the ones preceding it, in that they are past tense circumstantial forms relating actions which took place in relatively quick succession. The verb *sʿḥʿ* "cause to stand," being a verb of motion, is conjugated with the stative, and being a transitive verb (with the causative *s*-), it gains a passive meaning: "I was made to stand," or "I was stationed."[586] It was only at this point that the text describes Amun expressing his approval by performing a *bỉɜy.t* for Thutmose III.

In the *Historical Inscription*, Hatshepsut did eventually stand at the *Station of the Lord*, but this occurred later, toward the end of the narrative of the text (*H* 42, # 72,8–9). Therein lies the most crucial difference between the two texts: on the one hand, before being posted at the *Station*, Hatshepsut goes through a very long process of shedding her office as Wife of the God and gradually—and officially—becoming Pharaoh, and on the other, Thutmose is taken and placed at the *Station* soon after Amun's "deviation," receives his *bỉɜy.t*-signs, only after which does the possibly fictional (see below) crowning of Thutmose III take place.

As concluded in the previous chapter, Amun's not performing his *bỉɜy.t* at the *Station*, when the *grande offrande* was about to be made, thus signaling his lack of approval, is the basis of, and "trigger" to, the resulting events which took place in the *Historical Inscription*. In other words, they were all merely to allow Hatshepsut to become king, so that she could be posted at the same spot as at the start of the text, namely the *Station of the Lord*, as Pharaoh, so that the *grande offrande* could finally take place, now that it had Amun's approval. The *Palais de Mâat* of the *Historical Inscription*, to which Hatshepsut is led by Amun immediately after their first meeting (*H* 9), was therefore not the goal in and of itself, but one of several intermediary steps leading up to her *ḫʿỉ-nsw.t* "appearance as king" (*H* 19), which then finally gave her access to stand at the *Station* (*H* 23) while the *grande offrande* was performed (*H* 24).

The events which directly follow the first meeting in each text, therefore, despite even the "episodes" they share (listed below), can therefore not be used as equivalent points of comparison. A proper comparison necessitates skipping over the majority of the *Historical Inscription* starting from Hatshepsut's first meeting with Amun (*H* 9), right up until Hatshepsut, now king, could finally be made to stand at the *Station of the Lord* (*H* 24) so that the festival, interrupted by Amun's "deviation," could

[586] Hoch, *Grammar*, § 31, § 88. Cf. columns 3 and 4 earlier in the text (*Urk.* IV, 157,13–158,2).

finally pick up where it had left off, but thenceforward with Hatshepsut as a central figure (*H* 26 f.).

To facilitate the comparison with the *Texte de la jeunesse*, the relevant "episodes" are listed in bullet points. To start with, here follows a comparison of the immediate contexts in both inscriptions following the first meeting of the protagonist with the god.

After Amun did not perform the *bỉꜣy.t* as he was expected to at the *Station* (his "departure, or deviation"), Hatshepsut's first meeting with Amun was followed by the following episodes:

(1) Her "reaction" to submit herself to him (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9, # 35 + 184,13–17).
(2) Following her speech, Amun demonstrated his approval: *ḥr bỉꜣy.t ꜥꜣ.t wr.t ꜥšꜣ sp-sn wr sp-sn* "he performed very many and very great signals/wonders" (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9, # 184,17–18).
(3) Afterwards, Amun placed her in front of him (*rdỉ.t=f s*(*y*) *ḫr-ḥꜣ.t=f*) (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9, # 184,18),
(4) and led her to a different location, indicated by a causative verb: he *sḫnt* "advanced" her to the *ḥw.t-ꜥꜣ.t-Mꜣꜥ.t* "the Great House of Maat," commonly known as the *Palais de Maât* (*BL* 31–2; *H* 9, # 184,18–19), one of several intermediary steps.
(5) Eventually, at the end of the text, she was made to stand at the *Station* (to which Amun performed many wonders for Hatshepsut), after which the *grande offrande* was made (*BL* 42; *H* 24–5, # 72,8–14).

In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, the order is slightly different: the ritual of the *grande offrande* had already been completed successfully, and it was only afterwards that the "deviation" took place:

(1) After Thutmose's "reaction" of submitting himself to Amun,
(2) the god placed him in front of him (*dỉ.n=f wỉ ḫr-ḥꜣ.t ḥm=f*),
(3) then made him stand at the *Station of the Lord* (also indicated by a causative verb, *sꜥḥꜥ*),
(4) only after which did he perform his *bỉꜣy.t*, thus "signaling" his approval.
(5) As discussed in the following section, Thutmose is then taken past the 5th Pylon.

In both texts, we encounter many of the same episodes: deviation, reaction, god placing the protagonist in front of him, advancing to a different location, and *bỉꜣy.t*. One key difference lies in where Hatshepsut and Thutmose are led right after the first meeting. The latter is directly made to stand at the *Station*, while Hatshepsut was first led through multiple locations, underwent multiple rituals, became king and made her *ḫʿi-nsw.t* "appearance of the king" before eventually being posted at the *Station*. The first difference that will be noted, however, is the order in which these episodes take place. They simply do not match. The identical sequence of (1) the god placing the king in front of him and (2) leading them to another location is not significant, however, for this is simply a standard procedure of royal festivals involving the public appearance of a god: in reality, as representations of the divine procession clearly show, the king's position was to march in front of the divine barque. In mythological terms, however, it would have been the god who was guiding the procession. The fact of consequence here is that, like the *Station of the Lord*, this was a royal position. The god, already simply by placing Hatshepsut or Thutmose in front of him, was exhibiting exceptional favour towards them by positioning them only where a king could be. The description of a divine procession with the king in front, whether stationary or in motion, appears often: four times in the *Historical Inscription* (*BL* 31–2, *H* 9, # 184,18; *BL* 33, *H* 13, # 22,15; *BL* 33, *H* 15, # 142,22; *BL* 31–2; *BL* 42, *H* 23, # 109,2–3), and another four times in the *Turin Inscription* of Horemheb (ll. 13, 15, 17, 20).

However, as suggested above, if the two texts are to be compared correctly, it is the events surrounding the episode of being made to stand at the *Station* that must be taken into consideration. Here, again, are the relevant episodes in the *Texte de la jeunesse*:

(1) After Thutmose's "reaction" of submitting himself to Amun,
(2) the god placed him in front of him,
(3) then made him stand at the *Station of the Lord*,
(4) and then performed his *bỉꜣy.t*, thus "signaling" his approval.

And now the (adjusted) equivalent episodes in the *Historical Inscription*:

(1) Hatshepsut's "reaction" to submit herself to Amun (*BL* 31; *H* 9; # 35 + 184,13–17),

(2) (Here, over the course of the text, Hatshepsut becomes king, making her *ḫꜥi-nsw.t* in *Nn-wꜣ=i̯-r=f* (*BL* 41; *H* 19; # 164,9–10), and then, following several speeches by gods (*BL* 42; *H* 19–23), the narrative part of the text resumes, stating that the procession entered the temple of Amun: *m-ḫt-nn wḏꜣ r ḥw.t-nṯr=f* (*BL* 42; *H* 23; # 109,2)

(3) *rdi̯.n=f nsw.t pw ḫr-ḥꜣ.t=f* "then the god placed her in front of him" (*BL* 42; *H* 23; 109,2–3)

(4) *wn.i̯n=f ḥr dhn ḥm.t=s r ꜥḥꜥw nb n nsw.t* "And then he appointed her Person to the *Station of the Lord* of the King" (*BL* 42; *H* 24; # 72,8–9),

(5) *ḥr sꜥšꜣ bi̯ꜣw.t ḥr=s* "multiplying wonders for her" (*BL* 42; *H* 24; # 72,9).

Focusing exclusively on the episodes surrounding the appointment at the *Station*, we find that the sequence of events here is identical in both texts. Being made to stand at the *Station of the Lord* is a central theme in both inscriptions. It has already been demonstrated that its significance lies in its legitimising power to the king not only in it being a royal privilege to stand there, but also to be seen standing there, in that public location, by all those present, while the *grande offrande* took place.

Here we encounter another one of the most interesting similarities between both texts: even after their designation by Amun, neither Hatshepsut nor Thutmose III is the performer of the ritual of the *grande offrande*, as might have been expected. In the *Historical Inscription*, the performance of the ritual is related in the passive voice: *wn.i̯n=tw ḥr i̯r.t snṯr ḥr smꜣꜥ ꜥꜣb.t n ỉmn m ỉp.t-Sw.t* "One then did the censing and presenting of offerings to Amun-in-Karnak" (*BL* 42; *H* 25; # 72,12–13). As demonstrated above, it was the king's role to perform this ritual. In the previous chapter, it was also demonstrated that this must nominally have been Thutmose III. In actuality, however, the ritual itself may have been performed by the high priest of Amun at the time due to Thutmose's young age, therefore possibly accounting for the passive voice being used.[587] In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, as discussed above, it is Thutmose II, the performer of the ritual, who is—inexplicitly—referred to as "*ḥm=f*."

[587] It is interesting to note that, in the second year of Thutmose III's reign, when the king would have been quite young, a royal order to the viceroy of Kush for the temple of Semna be refurbished was issued in the passive voice: *ḏd.wt m ḥm n stp-sꜣ ꜥ. w. s.* "That which was said in the *ḥm* of the palace (living, prosperous, and healthy): …" (*Urk.* IV, 194,1), the reason for which might also have been Thutmose III's young age at this point (cf. Dorman, "Early Reign", 42–3).

In both cases, there is the current reigning king, to whose status is elevated another personality—the protagonist in each text. The picture that emerges gives the impression that there is a senior king, and a younger one, the heir apparent. The idea of a coregency springs to mind. This idea and its ramifications are explored at the end of the chapter, but for now what matters is the phenomenon of the appointment of the king-to-be at the *Station*.

In the *Historical Inscription*, Hatshepsut, by becoming king, could finally stand at the *Station* while the *grande offrande* took place, performed—nominally—by Thutmose III, the reigning ("senior") king, after which she acted as Pharaoh during the remainder of the festival occasion.[588] Similarly, Thutmose III in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, thanks to Amun's intervention, could stand at the *Station* (but after the *grande offrande* had taken place, performed in this case by Thutmose II, the then-reigning (senior) king), and follow through the remainder of this religious occasion as Pharaoh (or at least as heir apparent) by accompanying the god back into his private apartments—which he would have otherwise been unable to do. This would have meant going past the 5th Pylon, the significance of which is explained below. Turning our attention again to the *Station*, the *ʿḥʿw,* as demonstrated above, was most likely the designated spot for the king for the presentation of the *grande offrande*, so it logically follows that both Thutmose III and Hatshepsut, each in their own inscription, by being posted at the *Station*, were being made to stand next to their corresponding senior ruler (Thutmose II and Thutmose III, respectively).

With this in mind, another inscription of Thutmose III's, one which has not been mentioned thus far in the chapter, ties in very well with our discussion, and will briefly be considered here before moving forward with our analysis of the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

Thutmose III's 7th Pylon Inscription

Carved on the western door jamb of the 7th Pylon in his 42nd regnal year at the earliest,[589] Thutmose III gives, akin to the *Texte de la jeunesse*, another, but very brief, account of his rise to kingship thanks to Amun, after which he lists various construction

[588] The terms "junior" and "senior" partner in a coregency were coined by Simpson ("Dated", 215). The reason why "senior" is written in-text with quotation marks is because the description of Thutmose III as such is accurate only precisely in this context: after Hatshepsut became Pharaoh, she "acted publicly as the senior partner in a coregency with her nephew" (Murnane, *Coregencies*, 34).

[589] Dorman, "Early Reign", 41 no. 19 in p. 61.

projects and offerings which he has instituted for him in return.[590] This text is discussed in more detail at the end of the chapter, but for now, I would like draw attention to the following passage:

(1) […]
[*rdỉ.n n=ỉ ỉt*]*=ỉ ỉmn-Rᶜ-Ḥr-ɜḫ.ty ḫᶜ* [*ḥr s.t-Ḥr n.t ᶜnḫ.w*]
[…]
[*bs.kwỉ*] *ḫr-ḥɜ.t=f r-ḫnw* [*r-pr*]
sr(*.w*) *n=ỉ ḥkɜ.t tɜ.wy ns.w*[*t*] *Gb ỉɜ.t Ḫprỉ*
r-gs ỉt=ỉ nṯr-nfr nsw.t-bỉty ᶜɜ-ḫpr-n-Rᶜ dỉ.w ᶜnḫ ḏ.t
ỉsṯ rmṯ nb […]

(1) "[…]
My [father] Amun-Ra-Horakhty [granted me] an appearance [on the Throne of Horus of the living],
[…]
[I was introduced/inducted] before him inside [the temple],
The rulership of the Two Lands, the thrones of Geb, and the office of Khepri were predicted for me
at the side of my father, the perfect god, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *'Akheperenra* (Thutmose II), given life eternally,
while all the people […]"[591]

The significance of this passage has been interpreted differently by various authors (*infra*, "Final Analysis"). I argue at the end of the chapter why it is that I conclude that (1) the specific passage from the 7th Pylon text presented here is possibly synonymous with what happens in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, and that they are not describing Thutmose's accession, coronation, or even appearance ceremony, but simply his oracular selection by the god.[592] In the meantime, I have demonstrated above, without recourse to the 7th Pylon text, but using only the *Historical Inscription* as a point of comparison, that (2) Thutmose II would have indeed been present at the events of the

[590] *PM* II, 169–70 (498); *Urk.* IV, 180–84; Hermann, *Königsnovelle*, 9; Shirun-Grumach, *Offenbarung*, 128–31; Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 198–203.

[591] *Urk.* IV, 180,7–13 (l. 1).

[592] In agreement with Carlotti and Gabolde ("Ouadjyt", 288–9); *contra* Bonhême and Forgeau (*Secrets*, 249).

Texte de la jeunesse. Bearing these two things in mind, it becomes clear that we have here, thanks to the inscription on the 7th Pylon, an unambiguous reference to Thutmose II's presence at his son's oracular session, recounted in the *Jeunesse* as well.

6. *Thutmose's reaction to Amun stopping for him, and the god's own reaction thereto (cont.)*

To summarise the conclusions reached so far: accepting for now that the specific passage from the 7th Pylon inscription is a brief reference to what is described in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, the mention of the presence of Thutmose II supports the conclusion that I had reached via comparison with the *Historical Inscription* that he would have indeed been present to witness the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

It is important to note again, however, that this comparison with the *Historical Inscription*, along with the conclusion reached above that the *Texte de la jeunesse* provides only a very summary account of what happened, need not signify that the ceremonial occasion (e.g. Opet or Valley Festivals, etc.) and pertaining sequence of rituals described in both texts by Thutmose III on the one hand, and in the *Historical Inscription* on the other, were one and the same. Neither text, as it survives, unfortunately provides any dates or clues which could enable us to identify what the festival occasion in each case was. It is however clear that the events in both texts played out differently, even if they had taken place on the same festival occasions.

The discussion so far in the chapter (*Amun seeks out Thutmose* and *Thutmose's reaction*) already pointed out crucial differences between the events which took place in the *Texte de la jeunesse* (and now, by extension, those of the 7th Pylon text) and in the *Historical Inscription*. The inclusion of the presence of Thutmose II at his son's oracular selection has a very meaningful consequence: it highlights the most critical difference between these two groups of texts. This difference is that in the case of the *Historical Inscription*, Amun shows disapproval with the state of affairs by not performing an expected *bi3y.t*, and therefore selects Hatshepsut, and makes her king. Amun now satisfied with the new situation, the religious ceremonies could resume: firstly by the performance of the *grande offrande* with Hatshepsut in the royal position, at the *Station*, and then going on to see through the festival to the end, as various gods would have successively retreated to their respective "horizons."[593] In the texts by

[593] The critical sections which would have contained (the now sparser) narrative sections after the *grande offrande* are unfortunately missing, but one instance survives towards the end where the diadem-goddess who, since her appearance early in the text, was a prominent figure over the course of

Thutmose III, on the other hand, it is clear that Amun is satisfied with Thutmose II being king, and proceeds to place Thutmose III at the side of his father, then "inducts" him (this particular event, as recounted in the *Jeunesse* and the 7th Pylon inscription of Thutmose III, is discussed in the following section).

In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, the reaction of the spectators is one of confusion, which is soon resolved. In the *Historical Inscription*, on the other hand, the reaction, aside from confusion, is one of shock and awe. The contrast between the two texts in their dealing with the reaction of the audience is telling as to the significance of the unfolding events. Amun's not performing his *bỉʒy.t* at the *Station*, where the king himself would have presumably been standing, was indeed a significant event.

By contrast, the action sparking the "deviation" in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, based on how little of the reaction of the audience the reader feels, seems rather banal in comparison. While the text makes it clear that Amun's proceeding around the *wadjyt* after the *grande offrande* was unexpected, the small amount of attention devoted to it and the quick resolution of tension point out that, when the text was being carved, what was being remembered was not the earth-shattering event that it was the young Thutmose III who was unexpectedly selected. Rather, what Thutmose wished to emphasise was the fact of his oracular selection which would have lent him great legitimacy (cols. 1–16), and then, more importantly, his own grateful response to Amun which he then proceeded to list (cols. 16–49).[594] The significance of Thutmose's oracular selection is not the focus of the text; it is the very fact—one which comes off as a *fait accompli*. In hindsight, as memorialised through the text, Amun's intercession does not seem all that surprising.

Supporting this notion is that there is no interruption *per se*, but merely an alternative outcome to what was expected: after the successful performance of the *grande offrande*, which has been demonstrated to have been an important event due to its public nature, Amun selects Thutmose and "inducts" him. It was already known from the start of the text that an induction was going to take place (col. 2), but instead

---

the festivities, and whose retreat to her *ȝḫ.t* "horizon" is narrated (*H* 30, # 54; chapter 3, 118–19). It could similarly be argued that the retreat of other deities which had been mentioned throughout the text, most prominently Amun, but also the Ennead, was also related at other points in the text. Cf. the gradual return of the barques of Amun, Mut, Khonsu, and the royal *ka* in Luxor Temple during the Opet Festival to their respective chapels (Bell, "Luxor", 262–3).

[594] On the focus of the text being Thutmose III's deeds in return for Amun having originally "nominated" him, see: Spalinger, "Drama", 285.

of being initiated into the role of *ḥm-nṯr*, as seems to have been the expectation, Thutmose was designated as future king, indicated by the exceptional favours Amun exhibited for Thutmose, such as his many *bỉɜy.t*-signs, placing him in front of him, and most importantly posting him at the *Station of the Lord*.

In contrast, it has been demonstrated that, in the *Historical Inscription*, the expected rituals of the religious festival were put to a halt until Amun had completed what he had set out to do, that is, to make Hatshepsut king. It was after this long interruption that the ceremony could resume. Furthermore, and more importantly, the trigger to all of these events was the critical moment when Amun did not perform his *bỉɜy.t* at the *Station of the Lord*, most likely signifying Amun's dissatisfaction with the way things were with the throne—with understandably severe implications. Hatshepsut's selection by Amun eventually resolved the situation, but this would have been an action of extreme significance. Furthermore, it is clear that as a result of the events of the *Historical Inscription*, Hatshepsut had officially become a fully-fledged king.

The same may not be said of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, but this is discussed in the next chapter. For now, the last relevant passages of the text will be presented.

7. Claims to veracity and the hidden will of the gods (Col. 8; Urk. IV, *159,3–9)*

(8) […]

[*nn m*] *ỉwms*

ỉw=sn ỉdr.w m ḥr.w rmṯ.w

sštɜ.w m ỉb.w nṯr.w

rḫ nn […]*=f*

nn rḫ st

n wn.t[595] *wp st*

(8) […]

[There is no] lying,

They were withheld from the faces of humanity,

the secrets being in the hearts of the gods,

These knowing his/its (?) […]

[595] For *n wn.t* being identical to *nn wn* in meaning: Hoch, *Grammar*, § 103; Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 108,2.

There is none who knows it,

There is none who opens it.

The narration here is interrupted with Thutmose asserting the truthfulness of his story, and contrasting the secret and mysterious nature of events involving divine intercession, in this case his oracular selection, with after they become apparent, once actualised. Unless it is missing (for example, at the start of col. 8), this passage comes closest to the "revelation" episode in the *Historical Inscription* where, once the procession is said to have reached the *pr-ḥḏ šps rw.ty wr.ty n nb tꜣ.wy* "the noble 'white house' (treasury?) of the great gates of the Lord of the Two Lands," it suddenly became clear to onlookers, whose great shock and confusion is described at length, what Amun's goal was, that is, to make Hatshepsut king: *m-ḫt-nn ỉp.n ỉb=sn ḏr sḥḏ.t nṯr ỉmn.t n=f* "afterwards, their heart recovered since the god illuminated (i.e. revealed) that which he had hidden" (*BL* 33; *H* 14; # 22 + 142,18–19).

8. *The doors of the 5th Pylon are opened for Thutmose, who passes through (Cols. 9–10; Urk.* IV, *159,10–17)*

(9) […]

[*sn=f n*]*=ỉ ꜥꜣ*[*.w*] *ḥr.t*

wn=f n=ỉ sbꜣ.w ꜣḫ.t[*=s*]

ꜥ[*ḫ*]*.n=ỉ*[596] *r p.t m bỉk nṯry*

mꜣ(*=ỉ*) [*bs*]*=f ỉmy p.t*

dwꜣ=ỉ ḥm=f

(10) […] *ḥ*[…] *nb*

mꜣ.n=ỉ ḫpr.w ꜣḫ.ty ḥr wꜣw.t=f sštꜣ.w m p.t

(9) […]

[He opened for] me the doo[rs] of the sky,

He opened for me the doorways of [it]s horizon,

I f[le]w up to the sky as a divine falcon,

so that (I) may see his [intro]duction[597] which is in the sky,

[596] ꜥ*ḫỉ*: (auf-/fort-)fliegen (*Wb.* I, 225). According to Sethe, only the arm uniliteral ꜥ (D 36) and the wing-determinative (H 5) have survived intact, with the second phonetic element restored with the uniliteral *ḫ* (Aa 1).

[597] The restoration *bs* is Sethe's: *Urk.* IV, 159,14.

so that I may adore his Person.

(10) […] every […]

I saw the forms of He-of-the-Horizon on his mysterious paths in the sky.

This was already interpreted by Breasted as figuratively representing Thutmose III entering the sanctuary of the god "to behold the splendors of his father."[598] While it is true that *ꜣḫ.t* "horizon" can denote the sanctuary or the temple altogether,[599] what is being referred to here is the pylon itself, which was also understood as a horizon.[600] The horizon, that is the temple from the pylon onward, the "apartements privés" of the god, as the point of contact between the sky, the earth, and the world of the dead,[601] was where only select individuals equipped to be able to pass (*bsi*) into these liminal areas could do so. This process was called *bsi* "to introduce," and meant both physically to be introduced somewhere, as well as figuratively, in the sense of "passage" or "transition" between worlds or states of being.[602] These contrasting worlds between which an individual is allowed access are listed as the following by Kruchten: "celui du chaos et celui de la creation; celui des morts et celui des vivants; celui des humains et celui des dieux; celui du profane et celui du sacré."[603] Aside from *ꜣḫ.w*, the transfigured dead,[604] only the king "et ses substituts" (i.e. the vizier, and "initiated" priests, *ḥm.w-* and *it.w-nṯr*) among the living could pass from the profane into the sacred world of the gods, who could do so only after having been "introduced," "initiated," or "inducted" (*bs*) into their respective offices.[605] It was by being "initiated" that the individual becoming king could gain access to the interior parts of the temple, an extension of the divine world into that of the living.[606] Viziers and *ḥm.w-nṯr* could thus also step in for the king

[598] Breasted, *Chapter*, 17–18 no. 29; cf. Daumas, "Chants liturgiques", 41 no. 5.

[599] Shafer, "Temples", 7–8.

[600] *Ibid.*, 5; Bell, "Divine", 132. The shape of a pylon mimics that of the hieroglyphic sign used to write *ꜣḫ.t*.

[601] Shafer, "Temples", 8 no. 57 in p. 245; Kruchten, *Annales*, 163, 245.

[602] *Ibid.*, 147–49. He applied the first interpretation to the *bs-nsw.t* in the Turin inscription (*ibid.*, 174; Turin ll. 13–14: *Urk.* IV, 2116,15–2117,6).

[603] Kruchten, *Annales*, 149.

[604] Assmann, "Initiation", 135 ff.; Kruchten, *Annales*, 159–62.

[605] *Ibid.*, 165–93, esp. 166.

[606] *Ibid.*, 166.

to conduct rituals and festivals in his absence, since being "initiated," they were "dotés d'une possibilité d'action dans les deux univers."[607]

Goebs refers to a Pyramid Text spell (*PT* 470 § 913) which describes the deceased flying to the sky (his mother) as falcons (*bỉk.w*) after he is rejuvenated by being suckled by diadem goddesses (the White and Red Crowns). She describes this in accordance with the theme of passage, with the aim of the deceased being "to join Re, in whose daily journeys he wishes to partake."[608]

Similarly, the *Texte de la jeunesse* describes Thutmose III's first "introduction" into the private sector of the temple, where he would meet the god again, but this time see him in his true form(s), and be crowned by him in the core of the temple. His induction, however, was not into the office of *ḥm-nṯr* as originally expected (col. 2), but possibly that of kingship, as discussed in the next section. Unfortunately, however, nowhere in the *Texte de la jeunesse* are the unfolding events explicitly designated as Thutmose III's *bs-nsw.t*. Striking similarities with other inductions do exist however, suggesting that even though not labeled as such, the events being described at this point in the *Texte de la jeunesse* are telling of a *bs.t*. The use of *bs* in the 7th Pylon inscription referred to above is one of several restored elements however, and is therefore not immediately helpful in ascertaining the nature of the events related in the *Text de la jeunesse*; the validity of these restorations is discussed separately.

Supporting the notion that this was indeed a *bs.t* "induction" are the similarities with texts describing priestly inductions compiled by Kruchten in his *Annales des prêtres*. The first prophet, Bakenkhonsu, for example, declares: *tw=ỉ bs.kwỉ r ỉt-nṯr mɜ=ỉ ḫpr.w=f nb.w* "I was inducted into (the office of) father-of-the-god so that I may see all his forms."[609] This interestingly matches our text in that Thutmose "saw the forms of He-of-the-Horizon." Similarly, Thutmose's entrance into the inner areas of the temple would match Bakenkhonsu being initiated. The accuracy of this analogy is confirmed through comparison with the text of another prophet, Neb-netjeru, who asserts: *bs.n=f (w)ỉ r ʿḥ m ḏsr.w=s mɜ=ỉ Ḥr m ms.wt=f* "He [i.e. Amun] introduced (m)e into the

[607] *Ibid.*, 175, see 162 and 176 for priests as "replacing" the king in the conduction of daily temple rituals.

[608] Goebs, *Crowns*, 183–5. Cf. Assmann, "Initiation", 139–42.

[609] Kruchten, *Annales*, 179.

temple [lit. 'palace'] in its most sacred area, so that I may see Horus at his birth."[610] The *ꜥḥ* "palace" in this case is clearly a temple, in the sense of the dwelling of a god, but it is to note that it was not the general designation for "temple" that was used, but the central part where the god resided.[611] This is confirmed through another similar text where the priest Hor states: *ꜥḳ=i m-bɜḥ r b*(*w*) *ḏsr* "I entered in the presence (of the god) in the sacred place."[612] Returning to Neb-netjeru: after his being inducted into the inner areas of Karnak temple, he could then behold the mysteries of the cult. In this case, it is not the *ḫpr.w* of the god that are explicitly mentioned to have been witnessed, but the (re-)birth of the sun god (simply called Horus in this case) in his daily cycle. In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, we are informed that Thutmose witnessed Amun's *bs.t* "passage, entrance, or induction" into the sky. This passage should be interpreted in the same light: Thutmose saw the *bs.t* "passage," that is, *msw.t* "birth," of the god in(to) the horizon (i.e. the temple) during his daily circuit.

O'Connor describes Thutmose III's ascent to heaven in real terms as "his instruction in the arcane secrets of the rituals intended to ensure the orderly progression of the solar cycle,"[613] but this is not explained. To understand this, one must turn to the result of the *bs.t*. As Kruchten argues based on these texts, being "initiated" entailed two things: "illumination" and "transmutation."[614] The first is in the sense of "revelation," that is, "[p]ropulsé dans un univers nouveau, celui-ci se voit révéler, d'un coup, un monde supérieur, comme le prisonnier de la caverne de Platon, tiré de son obscurité, découvre soudain un monde lumineux, plus proche de la réalité."[615] This would have meant seeing the ultimate event, the daily solar cycle, and especially the son god's birth, as it truly happened. Interestingly, in the Late Egyptian story of Setne Khaemwas and Naneferkaptah, we are informed that once the former recovered the

[610] *Ibid.*, 182.

[611] I am here in agreement with Balanda, who argues that the *ꜥḥ*, in relation to the royal palace, was its core area which would have included the throne room and the bedroom (*Society*, 128–37). The term *ꜥḥ*, which is known to also denote temples as well as palaces (*Wb.* I, 214) could therefore be denoting the temple equivalent of the *ꜥḥ* of the royal palace. Kruchten, in his analysis of the priestly annals, also saw the place of induction (of priests in this case) as ultimately being into the sanctuary of the temple (*Annales*, 18–20).

[612] *Ibid.*, 183.

[613] O'Connor, "Enigmatic", 24.

[614] Kruchten, *Annales*, 193–204.

[615] *Ibid.*, 194.

book written by Thoth he long sought, that he recited a spell from it with which "he saw [Pre appearing in the sky with his Ennead], and the moon rising, and the stars in their forms."[616]

The *bs.t* "initiation" therefore signified three things: (1) in worldly terms being inducted into one's office, (2) gaining access into the inner areas of Karnak temple as a result, and (3) in otherworldly terms being reborn into a new life and state of being ("transmutation"), having been enlightened with the mysteries of the cult and cosmos ("illumination"). Indeed, Leclant has argued, without reference to *bs.t*, but through the suckling of the king, in reliefs ("la suite des épisodes du couronnement") as well as on statues, that the "passage" of the king into the afterlife through his death and rebirth stands in parallel with two other "passages" which he experienced: his actual birth leading to his life in the world of the living, which was followed by yet another passage: "une autre naissance à une forme de vie spéciale et caractéristique du seul souverain: celle du couronnement en tant que roi. Le prince qui deviant roi naît à une vie nouvelle, celle de souverain."[617] Similarly, Bell states that the king, when he entered the sanctuary of Luxor Temple (that is, the divine world) during the Opet festival into the presence of the god, that he "became a renascent god, with a renewed persona and additional names."[618]

Barguet pointed out two texts from the 22nd Dynasty which not only describe initiated priests passing through to the inner areas of the temple, but which even allow the identification of the location where the opening of the doors of the horizon took place. On the statue of Neb-netjeru, son of Neser-amun, an initiated priest, his son Hori addresses him, saying: *mɜ=k ỉmn m wɜḏy.t wn=k ꜥɜ.wy m rw.t ɜḫ.t ỉn=k sšp m bɜḫ* "You saw Amun in the *wadjyt*, you opened the door leaves in the gate of the horizon, and you brought the sunlight from the East."[619] In the second text, Nes-pa-qa-shuty states: *mɜ=ỉ ỉmn m ɜḫ.t=f m wɜḏ.yt tw.t m pr(.t)=f m bɜḫ sỉɜ.n=ỉ ms.w=f pw nṯr.w* "I saw Amun in his horizon, in the *wadjyt*-colonnade with statues at his coming forth from the east, I knew that the gods are his forms/manifestations."[620] This *wadjyt*-colonnade featuring

[616] Translation: Lichtheim, *Literature* III, 130.

[617] Leclant, "Suckling", 136–7.

[618] Bell, "Divine", 174.

[619] Barguet, *Temple*, 311.

[620] *Ibid.*, 311–12.

statues is none other than the *wadjyt* as we know it today, between the 4th and 5th Pylons, with the statues of Thutmose I lining its walls on the inside.[621] In partial disagreement with Barguet, however, I do not necessarily believe that the *rw.t ꜣḫ.t* in question in the text of Neb-netjeru son of Neser-Amun denotes the doors of the 4th Pylon, for we are informed that Neb-netjeru opened the *rw.t ꜣḫ.t* while he was already in the *wadjyt*: the doors in question must therefore be those of the 5th. Which door or pylon this was however, is unimportant, for two main reasons (1) the concept of where the temple proper began was a loose one, and differed from one text to another,[622] and (2) during the times during which the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription* took place, the 5th Pylon would still have been the only main entrance to the temple proper on the temple east-west axis.

Returning our attention to the *Texte de la jeunesse*, it is now clear that here Thutmose is indeed undergoing a *bs.t*, for he is "introduced" by the god beyond the entrance proper of the temple, that is, the "horizon," and is "illuminated" by seeing cosmic events take place as they actually did; it could at the very least be said that he underwent a practically identical experience. What remains resolving is whether he actually became a king as a result.

9. *The crowning of Thutmose and the establishment of his titulary (Cols. 10–12; Urk.* IV*, 160,1–12)*

smn.n wỉ Rᶜ ḏs=f

sᶜḥ.kwỉ m ḫᶜ[*.w=f ḥ*]*ry.w tp=f*

wᶜt.t=f mn.tỉ m (11) [*ḥꜣ.t=ỉ*]

[…]

[*ᶜpr.k*]*wỉ m ꜣḫ.w=f nb*(*.w*)

ssꜣ.kwỉ m sꜣr.t nṯr.w

mỉ Ḥr ỉp.n=f ḏ.t=f r pr ỉt=ỉ ʾImn-Rᶜ

[*ḳ*]*n.kwỉ m sᶜḥ.w nṯr m* (12) […]

[…]

[*smn.n=f*] *ḫᶜ.w=ỉ*

wd.n=ỉ nḫb.t ḏs=f

---

[621] *Ibid.*, 312.

[622] Cf. *KRI* II, 580–1; Barguet, *Temple*, 81.

smn.n=f bỉk=ỉ tp srḫ …

Ra himself established me,
I was dignified with [his] crown[s] which are [o]n his head,
his Uraeus affixed to (11) [my forehead],
[…]
[I] was [equipped] with all of his manifestations,
I was satisfied with the wisdom of the gods
like Horus when he 'counted his body' at the temple of my father Amun-Ra,
I was [pro]vided (lit. "accomplished") with the dignities of a god in (12) […]
[…]
[He established] my crowns.
I installed the titulary itself (?),
He established my falcon on the *serekh* (palace-façade) …

From this passage, as well as the one which follows, which describes the formulation of Thutmose III's titulary, it is clear that he is here being bestowed with the status and insignia of royalty, and certainly not becoming a *ḥm-nṯr*.

The verb *smn* appears often in contexts describing the bestowal of crowns. While in this case the object of the verb is the king himself, the verb is usually used for the "establishing" of crowns,[623] annals,[624] or attributes.[625] Regardless of the accuracy of Sethe's restoration in "[I was equipped] with all of his manifestations," that this passage expresses Thutmose's "transmutation" is clear. This is followed by "I was satisfied with the wisdom of the gods" which, in its turn, expresses his "illumination."

As Lacau has argued, the expression "to count/inspect one's body" means to come of age: "le moment où l'enfant prend conscience de ses actes (l'âge de raison, en

[623] E.g. the caption of a culmination scene from the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak depicting Amun crowning, or confirming the kingship of, Sety I (fig. 4), where he says: "(I) establish for you the crowns on your head, you having appeared as King of Upper and Lower Egypt" (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150 col. 8; *PM* II, 44 (152) II, 9).

[624] E.g. the caption of a "culmination" scene carved on the 8th Pylon where Thoth, writing on the *heb-sed* wands, says: *smn=ỉ gn.wt n.t sȝ.t(=ỉ?) Mȝʿ.t-kȝ-Rʿ* "I establish the annals of (my?) daughter *Maatkara*" (*Urk.* IV, 288,11; *PM* II, 174 (519) I, 3).

[625] E.g. the caption of a scene from Speos Artemidos from the reign of Hatshepsut: *smn=ỉ sʿḥ=ṯ m nb ns.wyt tȝ.wy* "I (Amun) establish your dignity as the lord of the kingship of the Two Lands" (*Urk.* IV, 285,5; *PM* IV, 164 (5)).

somme)."[626] In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, "to count one's body" in the sense of reaching adulthood, which figuratively indicates a "passage" or an "initiation" into a new life and, in Horus' case, the life of king, then it could be that Thutmose is here likening the initiation which he undergoes in the text with the initiation which the god Horus himself had undergone in past mythical times. Amenhotep II, in his great Sphinx Stela, states: *ỉs.t gr.t ḫ^{c}.n ḥm=f m nsw.t m ḥwnw nfr ỉp.n=f ḏ.t=f km.n=f rnp.t 18* "His Person appeared as king, as a beautiful young man, when he counted his body, having completed 18 years."[627] In the *Historical Inscription*, at some point after her *ḫ^{c}w-nsw.t*, Hatshepsut declares: *ỉp.n(=ỉ) ḏ.t(=ỉ) m nsw.t mnḫ* "(I) counted (my) body as efficacious king."[628] On her journey with her father Thutmose I to Lower Egypt in her coronation texts and reliefs at Deir el-Bahari, Hatshepsut is described as having become (*ḫpr*) *m ḥwn*(*w*)*.t nfr.t* "a beautiful young woman."[629] As Kruchten points out, various priests, at their initiations, described themselves as *ḥwnw* as well.[630] That this identification with Horus is taking place is further supported by not only the fact that Thutmose, earlier in the text, in his pre-initiation state of not being a king, described himself as an *ỉnp* and a *wḏḥ* (col. 2), but furthermore that he likened himself to Horus before his own "initiation," that is, when the god himself was not yet king, but also a child, a *nḫn*, *m ꜣḫ-bỉt* "in Khemmis" (col. 3). As argued above in the discussion of these passages, Thutmose's very location at this point, before his initiation, was none other than the *wadjyt* mimicking the papyrus marshlands of Khemmis, which thus further strengthened the king's identification with the god Horus. Then, just as they were once children hiding in the thickets, they reached adulthood ("counted their bodies"), which meant moving away from the papyrus marshes, and "passed" into the horizon and the sky—in real terms, beyond the *wadjyt*, past the 5th Pylon, and into the core of the temple.

The term *ỉnp*(*w*), with its jackal determinative, is particularly relevant to the emergence of the new king from the papyrus marshes of the Delta. In her coronation

---

[626] Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 144 (§ 184,c). Cf. Shirun-Grumach, *Offenbarung*, 160, 168. Gardiner referred to this expression as well, in this case, in a private letter from Papyrus Anastasi I, but cited the passage from the *Texte de la jeunesse* as well (*Hieratic*, 6* no. 9).

[627] *Urk.* IV, 1279,8–10.

[628] # 194,9: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 31.

[629] *Urk.* IV, 246,6.

[630] *Annales*, 185–6. See also: Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 264.

sequence of reliefs and texts at Deir el-Bahari, Hatshepsut is described as an *ỉnpw* as well.[631] Goebs discusses two spells which refer to Horus' assumption of the two crowns and kingship after having come from Lower Egypt: in Pyramid Text spell 555 § 1373a–1374c, the deceased, identified with Horus, comes forth from Pe in order to assume kingship, and in Coffin Text spell 42 (I, 178m–o, B3Bo, B2Bo), the Red Crown is referred to as *ỉr.t Ḥrw ꜣḫ-bỉt* "the Khemmis Eye of Horus." This is comparable to Coffin Text spell 49 (I, 217–221), where Horus is the deceased Osiris' deputy/vizier (during night-time), "until Horus comes from Heliopolis."[632] Goebs persuasively argues for the notion that moon deities, such as Thoth and Osiris in his lunar guise, were seen as the viziers of the sun god, and thus his deputies when he was away at night-time (the god of the morning star, often identified with Horus, in turn, was simultaneously seen as the ruler just before dawn), a notion which was intimately connected with the conception of viziers/deputies, and hence the moon and the morning star, as having the form of jackals (identified with deities such as Anubis, Wepwawet, and *Wpjw*).[633] According to Goebs, *sꜣb*, a word the determinative and ideogram for which is a jackal (E 17 in Gardiner's sign-list), signifying both "jackal," as well as an administrative title, "seems to typically designate the sungod's deputy, and thus the 'vizier' in terrestrial terms. Here one may compare Vandersleyen's … approximate rendering of *m jnpw* referring to the crown-prince as 'avant d'être roi.'"[634] Thutmose III and Hatshepsut, by designating themselves with the term *ỉnpw*, therefore, were identifying themselves, in cosmic terms, with the moon or the morning star which rules in its father's stead during his death at night, and thus terrestrially as the future rulers who will assume kingship at the passing of their respective predecessors (Thutmose II for Thutmose III, and Thutmose I for Hatshepsut). This constellation of ideas, of viziers/deputies, moon gods, and of initiation, or "passage" from the marshes of Lower Egypt to kingship, life to death and morning to night and vice-versa, of youth to adulthood, can be found summarised in a passage pointed out by Kruchten in which the

[631] Col. 25: *Urk.* IV, 260,3 (col. 25); *Deir el Bahari* III, 62.

[632] Pyramid Text Spell 555: Goebs, *Crowns*, 121–7, cf. 197; Coffin Text spell 42: *ibid.*, 133–4; Coffin Text spell 49: *ibid.*, 115–120.

[633] Goebs, *Crowns*, 115–34 and comment ***i*** from discussion on the Cannibal Spell along with excursus on *sbꜣ wˁ/wˁtj* (*ibid.*, 226–36).

[634] *Ibid.*, 127; Vandersleyen, "Inepou", 563–6 (quote from p. 566).

high priest of Isis at Abydos, Wenennefer, describes himself before his initiation as a *ḥwnw sbḳ* "a splendid young man" flourishing *mỉ ʾIḥy m ỉdḥ.w* "like Ihy [a lunar child-god] in the Delta marshes."[635]

The sentence *wd.n=ỉ nḫb.t ḏs=f* is problematic, for it is almost certainly grammatically incorrect. The third person pronoun *=f* suffixed to the emphatic *ḏs* does not have a matching one as (1) the subject of the verb is in the first person, so that "X himself installed" does not work, (2) and the noun preceding it, *nḫb.t*, is feminine, so that *ḏs=s* would be expected instead.[636] Assuming that *nḫb.t* was here treated as a masculine noun, "I installed the titulary itself," then no restorations would be needed. The verb *wdỉ*, "to place, put; (im)plant; lay; appoint"[637] was also used for "affixing" a name, including those of non-royalty.[638] In other cases I have encountered where a *nḫb.t* is said to be installed (*wdỉ*), however, it is a god who is performing the action, and not the king him/herself.[639] Akin to the sentence a few lines before "Ra himself established me," therefore, it is possible that Ra would have been the subject in this sentence. No such modification is possible, however, without moving the element *ḏs=f* to before *nḫb.t*.[640] As Breasted pointed out, in Horemheb's Turin inscription, it is stated that it was *mỉ ḥm n Rᶜ* "like (that of) the Person of Ra" that Horemheb's Great Name and titulary were composed.[641] It is my opinion that this sentence is indeed incorrect, and that its original intent was to say that the god had installed/affixed his very own titulary for Thutmose. A much simpler restoration lends itself in this light: *wd*(*.w*) *n=ỉ nḫb.t*<*=f*> *ḏs=f* "his (the god's) own titulary was installed for me."[642] Based on

---

[635] *Annales*, 180, 185; Statue Louvre C 219, *KRI* IV, 297,6–7.

[636] Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 36.

[637] Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 72.

[638] Breasted, *Chapter*, 19 no. 36; Bonhême, "Désignations", 353–4.

[639] For example: (1) Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*: *wn.ỉn ḥm n Nb-r-ḏr ḥr wd.t nḫb.t ḥm=s* "Then the Lord-of-All installed/affixed the titulary of her Person (Hatshepsut)" (Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 19, # 164,11–12); (2) same block: *ḏd ḥm=f wd=f nḫb.t* … "His Person (Amun) spoke, installing the titulary …" (*ibid.*, 19, # 164,13–14); (3) the caption of Amun in a relief at Speos Artemidos: *wd.n*(*=ỉ*) *nḫb.t=ṯ* "I installed your titulary" (*Urk.* IV, 285,6).

[640] E.g.: *wd.n*<*=f*> *ḏs=f nḫb.t*(*=ỉ*) "He himself installed my titulary."

[641] Breasted, *Chapter*, 20 no. 36.

[642] Alternatively, one could do away with only the element *ḏs*: *wd*(*.w*) *n=ỉ nḫb.t=f* "his titulary was installed for me." The use of the passive *šdm*(*.w*)*=f* is also encountered in the Turin inscription: *ỉr*(*.w*) *rn wr nṯr pn nfr nḫb.t=f* "This good god's (Horemheb's) Great Name and his titulary were made" (l. 19: *Urk.* IV, 2118,11).

preceding and following sentences with *sḏm.n=f* forms with the god as their subject, it would have been clear that he was the agent installing Thutmose's titulary.

The final sentence in the passage under analysis is the first one introducing the following section, that of the composition of Thutmose III's titulary. This fascinating passage describes this action through imaginative and elaborate word-play. This, however, is not relevant for the purposes of this thesis, and is not dealt with here. What is worth noting, however, is the Horus Name:

snḫt.n=f wỉ m kɜ nḫt

dỉ.n=f ḥ^{ꜥ}=ỉ m-ḫnw Wɜs.t

(13) [*m rn pwy n Ḥr Kɜ-nḫt-ḥ^{ꜥ}-m-Wɜs.t*]

He strengthened me as a strong bull,

He caused that I appear within Thebes,

(13) [in this my name of Horus the Strong-Bull-who-appeared-in-Thebes].

The formulation of the name could be seen as referring to the events in this text, wherein Thutmose is crowned, therefore becoming and "appearing" as king, in Thebes' Karnak temple. This, however, is not likely to be the case, as the discussion below explains.[643]

What is also noteworthy about the titulary is the point of the text at which it is conferred: soon after the investiture with crowns, as encountered again in the *Historical Inscription* (*BL* 35; *H* 19; # 164,11), as well as Horemheb's Turin inscription (l. 19).

Following this, two columns of text conclude the first section of the overall *Texte de la jeunesse*. Descriptions of celebrations, as encountered in the aftermaths of the "appearance" of kings in various texts,[644] would have been expected, but if this theme is present, it does not stand out. There is one word, the verb *ḥ^{ꜥ}ỉ* "to rejoice," from among those used often in descriptions of celebrations taking place, in this case used to express Amun's happiness with Thutmose becoming king (col. 16). Rather, it is the other main outcome that is emphasised in this text—the new king's dominion:

(15) *dỉ.n=f* [*ỉw.t*] *ḫɜs.wt nb.wt m ksw n bɜ.w ḥm=ỉ*

ḥry.t=ỉ m ỉb.w pḏ.t

[643] *Infra*, 188–91 (s.v. "Remainder of the 7th Pylon inscription and its ramifications").

[644] *Supra*, 144 and no. 568.

tɜ.w nb.w ḫry ṯb.ty[*=i̯*]

(15) He caused that all foreign lands [come], bowing to the *bɜw*-power of my Person,

the terror of me being in the hearts of the Nine Bows,

all lands being under [my] sandals."[645]

Like the sun god Ra's victory over his enemies at dawn, i.e. his *ḫꜥi* "appearance," that of the king, i.e. his "passage" into his new life, entailed a "promesse de victoire."[646] For this reason, the young king "allaité (during preceding rituals) est souvent figuré dans une attitude de domination."[647] In Horemheb's Turin inscription, both elements of rejoicing as well as dominion are encountered as a result of his becoming king: after his investiture, the king and the god are described to have exited the inner parts of the temple (or palace) in festival procession, and that *ḫpt.n=f nfr.w=f ḫꜥ.w m ḫprš r swɜḏ n=f šnn.t ỉtn pḏ.t ḫr rd.wy=fy p.t m ḥb tɜ ḫr ršw.t* "He (Amun) embraced his (Horemheb's) beauty, he having appeared with the Blue Crown, in order to transfer to him the circuit of the sun disk, the Nine Bows being under his feet, the sky in festival and the land bearing happiness" (col. 20). The *Texte de la jeunesse*, too, therefore exhibits the theme of domination, a feature which it shares with other so-called coronation texts.[648]

The first half of this text ends here, and so does our analysis thereof. It is the significance and very nature of what took place which may now be analysed.

III. Final analysis

This text raises many questions. Among those posed already in the analysis above is whether this may indeed be described as an account of a coronation ceremony, or at least as an account of the accession of Thutmose III. Alternatively, it could be seen as a "séance oraculaire" over the course of which it was predicted that Thutmose would one day rule Egypt, but that he did not become Pharaoh *per se* as a result of the events of

[645] Col. 15; *Urk.* IV, 161,14–16.

[646] Leclant, "Suckling", 141.

[647] *Loc. cit.*

[648] This theme was discussed for the *Historical Inscription* as well (chapter 3, 86, 120–2).

the text. Furthermore, a question that must be asked is how accurate an account this is of what took place and whether any of this even happened in the first place.

1. *The Texte de la jeunesse as a séance oraculaire*

As explained in the introduction chapter, conventionally speaking, the "accession" of the king consists of his seizure of royal power as soon as possible after the death of the previous king so as to ensure smooth transition in government. The coronation ceremony on the other hand, would have taken place later, on a selected favoured date, in a public crowning and investiture ceremony. A *séance oraculaire*, on the other hand, if the events recounted on block 287 discussed in the previous chapter are representative, would not entail immediately becoming a king, but would consist of a prediction of kingship.

As pointed out in the previous chapter, these passages are recounting more than one oracular procession which had taken place. It was also pointed out that the same sequence of (1) the protagonist being placed at the *Station*, followed by (2) a *bỉꜣy.t* being performed for him/her, is encountered in the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription* as well (*BL* 42; *H* 24; # 72,8–9).[649] There too is the theme of dominion encountered for, immediately following Amun performing the *bỉꜣy.t*, we are informed that he was also "placing the fear of her (Hatshepsut) in the front" (*BL* 42; *H* 25; # 72,9–10). The analysis of the *Texte de la jeunesse* has called attention to the presence of the same sequence of (1) appointment at a *Station* followed by (2) performance of *bỉꜣy.t*-signs. There is unfortunately a break in the text immediately afterwards, at the start of the eighth column of text. Via comparison, it may have initially also contained a short sentence describing the dominion of the king.

Breasted, on the other hand, has argued that this lacuna contained "the oracle of the god, proclaiming him (Thutmose) king,"[650] while the first half of the overall inscription "records the elevation of Thutmose III from a position of humble rank in the priesthood of the Karnak temple of Amon to the throne of Egypt. This is

[649] For a discussion of this sequence, see: Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 11.

[650] Breasted, *Records* II, 57 (§ 134). He also suggested that it is this same "oracle" in question in a passage from Thutmose III's Wadi Halfa inscription (*Urk.* IV, 807,3). This is problematic however, for the term used there, *nḏ-r*, neither the *Wörterbuch* and Faulkner translate as "oracle" (*Wb.* II, 371; Faulker, *Dictionary*, 144: "to take counsel; consult; question); this translation in both publications is listed under *nḏw.t-r* (*Wb.* II, 371; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 144).

unquestionable fact."[651] The term "oracle" usually refers to the pronouncement by a deity, and can also be understood as a prediction of a future event.[652] The *bi3y.t* was a means through which Amun demonstrated his approval, and thus a type of oracle.[653] Gillen, in his discussion on this term, therefore cites the *Oxford English Dictionary* entry for "oracle:" "the instrumentality, agency, or medium by which a god was supposed to speak or make known his will; the mouthpiece of the deity; a response, decision, or message, given usually … at the shrine or seat where the deity was supposed to be thus accessible to inquirers."[654] This conundrum is interestingly mirrored in the ancient Egyptian word *sr*, for which both translations of "to declare" and "to predict" have been proposed. Thanks to the reviews by Warburton and McDonald (Appendix B), it should be translated with the sense of the prediction of a future event, and not "to announce."[655]

Researchers from the CFEETK, as well as Anthony Spalinger,[656] consider the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* as a "séance oraculaire" or Thutmose's "nomination." Carlotti and Gabolde, as well as Murnane, furthermore completely identify these events with those of Thutmose III's other inscription on the 7th Pylon, and state, citing both texts, that the *wadjyt* was "le lieu où, en présence de Thoutmosis II, il (Thutmose III) avait été désigné par l'oracle d'Amon à une royauté future."[657] A critical analysis of this statement reveals which parts come from the *Texte de la jeunesse*, on the one hand, and the inscription on the 7th Pylon on the other. The most obvious element from the *Texte de la jeunesse* is the location, the *wadjyt*. The presence of Thutmose II, as explained above, is not by name, but it has been demonstrated that the reference is to him. The passages of the 7th Pylon text presented above do clearly show that Thutmose II was present, but more meaningfully, Thutmose III states that it was *r-gs* "at the side"

---

[651] Breasted, *Records* II, 58 (§ 135). His transformation into Pharaoh, furthermore, would have been at the price of the royal status of the previous ruler (whom he said, due to mistaken notions at the time regarding Thutmoside succession, was his father, Thutmose I; see: *ibid.*, 59 (§ 136); for succession, see: *ibid.*, 53–5 (§ 128–30).

[652] Kákosy distinguishes between the terms "oracle" and "prophecy" (*LÄ* IV, "Orakel", 604).

[653] *Ibid.*, 600.

[654] Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 9, citing the *Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. X (1989 edition), 884.

[655] Warburton, "Darkness", 287 ff.; McDonald, "Review: giraffe", 232; *contra* Cannuyer, *Girafe*; cf. Dorman, *Monuments*, 28.

[656] Spalinger, "Drama", 269 ff., esp. 274.

[657] Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 293; cf. Murnane, *Coregencies*, 117 no. 27.

of his father, Thutmose II, that the rulership of the two lands were predicted for him. It was demonstrated from the analysis of the *Texte de la jeunesse* above that the *Station of the Lord* was the location where (usually) only the king could stand, and that by posting Thutmose III to the *Station*, he was making him stand next to his father, Thutmose II. The two texts therefore seemingly match on this point, but not necessarily, as explained below (under *Restorations*). Even then, this still does not necessarily mean that the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* are the exactly same as those carved on the 7th Pylon.

According to Carlotti and Gabolde, what occurred was a "séance oraculaire au cours de laquelle la royauté va lui être prédite."[658] This matches almost *verbatim* what was encountered in the 7th Pylon inscription: "The rulership of the Two Lands, the thrones of Geb, and the office of Khepri were predicted for me."[659] Conversely, they mention this with specific reference not to the text of the 7th Pylon, but to the *Texte de la jeunesse* where no *sr* "prediction" *per se* is mentioned. What it does have, however, is Amun performing a *bỉɜy.t* for Thutmose after he appointed him at the *Station of the Lord*.[660] This seems to be the missing piece which could confirm the equating of the events of the two inscriptions.

The text of the 7th Pylon, therefore, contains no references to the performance of *bỉɜy.t*-signs, but mentions that kingship was "predicted/foretold" (*sr*) for Thutmose. In direct contrast, Amun is said to have performed a *bỉɜy.t* for him in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, but no mention is made of "prophecies/predictions." Before tackling this, another element which these two texts possibly share, that of induction (*bs.t*), which would support the notion that they relate the same event, must be discussed first. The comparisons presented above of Thutmose passing beyond the 5th Pylon with priestly initiation texts confirms that, while this "passage" is not explicitly described as such, it almost certainly does consist of an "initiation." Extremely unfortunately, the equivalent passage expressing induction in the inscription of the 7th Pylon is a restoration by Sethe, one which must be addressed in order to be able to link the two texts in question.[661]

---

[658] *Ibid.*, 288.

[659] *Urk.* IV, 180,11–12.

[660] *Urk.* IV, 159,1–2.

[661] *Urk.* IV, 180,10. Kruchten, even though he cites Sethe's *Urkunden*, when he discusses this text, the verb *bsỉ* is presented as confirmed, while only the *.kwỉ* is restored (*Annales*, 169). Troy, on the other hand, provides no restorations at all for *bs.kwỉ* (Troy, "Religion", 147).

The restorations in the Thutmose III 7th Pylon Inscription

The context is the following: [*bs.kwỉ*] *ḫr-ḥ3.t=f r-ḫnw* [*r-pr*] *sr*(*.w*) *n=ỉ ḥk3.t t3.wy* … "[I was inducted] before him inside [the temple]; the rulership of the Two Lands … was predicted for me …"[662] According to Kruchten, in the priestly annals of the 21st–23rd Dynasties, which followed a certain formula, the location into which the priest was inducted may be reconstructed as follows: (*r*) *n3 s.wt ꜥ3.w m-ḫnw*(*-n*) *pr=f* (*šps*) "(into) the great places inside his noble house," to be interpreted as the *Saint des Saints*."[663] Excluding restorations, what remains in common is Thutmose/the priest in movement toward a location. The combination of *ḫnw* with *r* gives the sense of movement "into" an area which presumably would have had a space into which to enter.[664] In any case, given the great importance of the festival occasion involving a *ḫꜥỉ* "appearance" and a *sr* "prediction" of kingship in the text of the 7th Pylon, it is clear that the location in question was a significant one.[665] The *Station of the Lord*, for example, via comparison with block 287 of the *Historical Inscription*, might have been a viable option, but can be excluded due to the fact that it is not a structure with interior space (which would have kept the king hidden from sight, whereas it is clear from context that this is a public location, where kings were visible).

In the text of the 7th Pylon, the restoration of *r-pr* could have been done slightly differently, in that simply *pr*, for example, which is a structure "into" which one could enter, would have worked just as well. Just as likely would have been other locations such as *pr-wr* as designations of the temple sanctuary. This would fit well with the importance of the religious occasion, and it would be surprising if there were no mention of the king entering the sanctuary. However the original text went, down this line of thinking, what ultimately would have been meant was the sanctuary, akin to the *ꜥḥ* used to describe it encountered in the initiation text of Bakenkhonsu above.

If we admit that the location into which Thutmose III went was indeed the sanctuary of the god then, from context, the restoration of the missing verb with *bsỉ* seems almost certain. The priestly initiation texts discussed above strongly support this

---

[662] *Urk.* IV, 180,8–11.

[663] Kruchten, *Annales*, 18–19.

[664] *Wb.* III, 372.

[665] Cf. Kruchten, *Annales*, 166: the *bs-nsw.t* "n'intervenait qu'à l'occasion des principales fêtes du calendrier égyptien."

view. Some passages from Horemheb's Turin inscription do so as well by providing close parallels to passage from the 7th Pylon: [*bs.kwi*] *ḫr-ḥ3.t=f r-ḫnw n* [sanctuary] *sr*(*.w*) *n=i ḥk3.t t3.wy ns.wt t3.wy Gb i3.t Ḫpri* "[I was introduced] in front of him into [the sanctuary], and the rulership of the Two Lands, the thrones (*ns.wt*) of Geb, and the office (*i3.t*) of Khepri were predicted for me." We are informed that Horemheb and Horus of *Ḥw.t-ns.wt* proceeded to Thebes, with the intention of the god being to "introduce" (*bs*) him into the presence (*m-b3ḥ*) of Amun, so that his office (*i3.t*) may be transferred to him (l. 13).[666] When Horemheb meets Amun, it is stated that the latter saw him in his royal induction (*bs-ns.wt*) in order to give him his office (*i3.t*) and his throne (*ns.t*) (l. 14).[667] Similarly, in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, what could be interpreted as Thutmose's induction also gave him royal privileges, such as the ability to stand at the *Station*. The possible reason for the use of the verbs "to transfer" (*swḏ*) the office and "to give" (*di.t*) the office and the throne in the Turin inscription in contrast to the 7th Pylon inscription, where "to predict" (*sr*) is used, is discussed below, but is immaterial for now: regardless of whether the protagonist of the text was to become a king as an outcome, the near-identical phraseology which the two texts share in their statement of the purpose of the royal induction, as well as what does remain of the 7th Pylon inscription (in that it hints of a movement into a location, possibly the sanctuary), support Sethe's restoration of *bs.kwi*.

This superficial similarity may not be particularly significant, however: while I have not found other passages quite so similar in the context of a *bs-nsw.t*, its goal is several times said to have been to place the king on the *s.t* or *ns.t* of a deity.[668] However, similar phraseology appears in contexts where the term *ḫ‘i* is used as well, involving the "appearance" of a king on the seat of a god,[669] as well as in contexts which include both *bsi* and *ḫ‘i*.[670]

It therefore seems at least possible that Sethe's restorations are correct. Even if it was not *bsi* or any variants thereof that was originally used in the text of the 7th

[666] *Urk.* IV, 2116,15–18.

[667] *Urk.* IV, 2117,4–6.

[668] Kruchten, *Annales*, 170–3.

[669] Redford, *History*, 8–22 (esp. no. 39 in p. 9).

[670] E.g. in Thutmose I's Tombos Stela (*Urk.* IV, 82; Kruchten, *Annales*, 168; Redford, *History*, 15 no. 74).

Pylon, the similarities with the *Texte de la jeunesse*, where Thutmose's induction is indeed present (but not explicitly named as such), could mean that in this case too, the "induction" aspect of the events being related is implied.

However, the logic of the argument in support of the restoration of **[***bs.kwi***]** is cyclical: it rests on the assumption that the space into which Thutmose was [inducted] was the sanctuary, which in turn supports the notion that the text relates his induction. The only certainty, through the preposition *r-ḫnw*, is that there was a movement into a location. Given the similarities with the oracular sessions related on bock 287 of the *Historical Inscription*, it is also possible that the space into which Thutmose entered was a *wsḏ.t*. In this case, there would be no doubt that Thutmose did not become a king as a result of what is related in his 7th Pylon inscription. If, by accepting Sethe's restoration of **[***bs.kwi***]**, this text relates a royal induction however, then it must be wondered how this ties in with the fact that it is also stated that kingship was "predicted" (*sr*) to him. Confusingly, Kruchten believes that the placing of the crowns on the head of the person being inducted was a part of the process of royal induction,[671] which seems accurate, given that the *bs-nsw.t*, or *montée royale*, is the scene which usually precedes the "culminating" one depicting the encounter with Amun in the sanctuary. Noteworthy however is the fact that the 7th Pylon inscription does not contain an explicit reference to Thutmose III being crowned;[672] this is the case with block 287 as well which certainly gives an account not of Hatshepsut's seizure of royal power, but of a *séance oraculaire*.

As argued in the fifth chapter of this thesis, Horemheb's induction alone did not transform him into a king, for even after his *bs-nsw.t* (l. 14), but before his entrance into the *pr-wr*, where he was crowned (l. 15–16), the epithets of Horemheb are non-royal ones (l. 15).[673] Furthermore, as Kruchten argues, this particular *bs-nsw.t* refers to Horemheb's literal entry into the sanctuary of Karnak rather than his being inducted into the office of kingship.[674] Even further, while it is a source of disagreement whether

[671] Kruchten, *Annales*, 166–7.

[672] While it does mention an "appearance" on a throne before the reference to the induction, it is unclear, due to the poor state of preservation of the text, how this ties in with the sentence mentioning Thutmose's induction, if at all, and even if the "appearance" in question is Thutmose's and not, for example, Amun's in a festival (*Urk.* IV, 180,8).

[673] Ll. 14–16: *Urk.* IV, 2117,4–17. See chapter 5, 213–14.

[674] Kruchten, *Annales*, 174.

Horemheb was still in Karnak or already in Luxor by the time he was crowned in the *pr-nsw.t* (ll. 15–16), what is clear is that this *bs-nsw.t* and meeting with Amun were already accomplished, meaning that the crowning of Horemheb was not a part thereof, and that it took place only afterwards. Not every instance of *bs-nsw.t,* therefore, need necessarily include a ritual of bestowal of the crowns.

Černý, in his fundamental work on oracles, made the piercing remark that "[c]onsultation with the god was reserved for the god's public appearances in festivals when the god made a tour of the temple and the town," furthermore likening this to the public audiences of kings and officials, who, like the god, could "not be approached in their private apartments and people had to wait until they appeared in public."[675]

What this therefore means is that the interpretation of the events related in the first column of the 7th Pylon inscription as a *séance oraculaire* is likelier, for the case of Thutmose being led into a forecourt or the *wadjyt*, where he heard Amun's prediction (*sr*), as in block 287, excludes the possibility of a *bs-nsw.t* in the sense of figurative entry (that is, induction) into the office of kingship. In the following chapter, furthermore, also regarding Horemheb, the notion that a *bs-nsw.t* necessarily formed a part of the transformation of an individual into king, as well as the idea that it need only have taken place inside the sanctuary of a temple, are refuted, the conclusion being that this term could also simply refer to the first meeting between a god and a king on a given festival occasion.[676] Therefore, even assuming that Sethe's **[***bs.kwỉ***]** is correct, it seems far likelier here that it refers to Thutmose III simply being ushered into the god's presence.

With Sethe's restorations for the 7th Pylon inscription and their ramifications discussed, we can turn our attention to the *Texte de la jeunesse* once more.

The Texte de la jeunesse as a "séance oraculaire" (cont.)

Assuming for now that Sethe's restorations are correct, the elements of Thutmose (1) being led into the sanctuary, (2) into the presence of Amun, (3) apparently before he was king (for the kingship was "foretold" to him), and (4) this, in the presence of Thutmose II, indicate the strong possibility that the events in the *Texte de la jeunesse* and in the passages from 7th Pylon inscription referred to above are one and the same.

[675] Černý, "Oracles", 36.

[676] Chapter 5, 209–12 (s.v. "On the meeting place of Horemheb with Amun").

In this light, if the events of block 287 represent a "standard" *séance oraculaire*, then it is clear that what Thutmose III underwent in the 7th Pylon inscription and the *Texte de la jeunesse* was different from what Hatshepsut experienced in block 287, who was not inducted nor crowned, placing the events of these two texts in a separate category from Hatshepsut's.

This interpretation however, is complicated by the fact that the block following # 287 has not survived, with the consequence that it is unknown what happened after Amun performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs for Hatshepsut. It is therefore possible that (1) Hatshepsut was inducted afterwards, in the same manner as Thutmose III in the *Texte de la jeunesse* (and, if the restoration *bs.kwỉ* is correct, in the 7th Pylon inscription as well). Arguing against this, it will be remembered that two events of an oracular nature are related on this block, the end of one and either all of or a part of another, where the end of the first does not mention an induction. (2) It would therefore follow that no induction took place after the second oracular procession mentioned on the block either. This, however, rests on the assumption that the two events of block 287 are of the same type, whereas equally hypothetically, it could be argued that the later oracular session of Hatshepsut was an even more significant one, Amun's signs indicating his wish that Hatshepsut be king becoming stronger as time went on, in step with the increase in power Hatshepsut experienced during this time.

These issues are all resolved if one sees the *Texte de la jeunesse* as recounting a real, historical, event, but only up to Amun performing *bỉꜣy.t*-signs. It is from that point that the text itself moves from being similar to the *Historical Inscription*, as a historical text including references to real locations, to having Thutmose transform into a falcon and be crowned by Ra in the sky. If this induction did not actually take place, this would make the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* almost identical to those of block 287. In this light, if one were to see the 7th Pylon inscription as giving an account of the same events as the *Texte de la jeunesse*, then Sethe's restoration of *bs.kwỉ*, likely though it is, would have to be ruled out—unless here too it is to be seen only figuratively, rather than as actually having taken place. The partial "fictitiousness" of the *Texte de la jeunesse* is discussed in detail below, but for now, it is enough to say that given the similarities between the *Texte de la jeunesse* on the one hand, and the oracular sessions related on block 287 (and possibly the 7th Pylon inscription) on the other, lend support to the notion that the former, too, relates a *séance oraculaire*.

As discussed above in the first half of this section, the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the 7th Pylon inscription differ on a point: the *bỉꜣy.t*-signs of the former, and the *sr* "foretelling" of kingship in the latter. By analogy, could both be the same thing, or at least, different elements, both a part of the same ritual? It is clear from block 287, where both a prediction as well as the performance of *bỉꜣ.t*-signs are mentioned, that they are not mutually exclusive, and that they might even be related for, according to Hatshepsut, the occasion "was the predicting to me of the Two Lands," and that this was "(when) his Person (Amun) performed *bỉꜣy.t*-signs in the presence of this good god (Thutmose III)."[677] The absence of a *bỉꜣy.t* and presence of a *sr* in the 7th Pylon text is therefore in no conflict with the absence of a *sr* and the presence of a *bỉꜣy.t* in the *Texte de la jeunesse*. Based on block 287, it seems that, according to this passage, the performance of the *bỉꜣy.t* consists of the prediction of kingship mentioned immediately before it. As pointed out over the course of the analyses of both the *Historical Inscription* and the *Texte de la jeunesse*, the very posting of the main protagonist at the *Station of the Lord* is in itself a royal prerogative. The posting of an individual who is not yet king, not having acceded to the throne yet, to such a privileged and royal location, for which the god's approval is explicitly made manifest in his reaction of performing very many *bỉꜣy.t*-signs, could certainly have been seen as a prediction (*sr*) of their becoming king.[678]

While this will ultimately remain uncertain given the unfortunately fragmentary state of the relevant texts, it does appear likely that the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the inscription on the 7th Pylon are relating the same event, or at least two different events of the same type which occurred early in Thutmose III's life, during the reign of Thutmose II, both consisting of *séances oraculaires*. Based on the evidence from block 287 of the *Historical Inscription* which mentions more than one oracular procession having taken place for Hatshepsut, both in the presence of another king (*nṯr pn nfr*), it is not unreasonable to assume that the same may have occurred for Thutmose III as well.

The events of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, and those of the 7th Pylon text by extension, finding their equivalent in the flashbacks on block 287 strongly supports the

[677] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 25–6.

[678] Cf. Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 7–11.

view of the researchers of the CFEETK, in that Thutmose III did not immediately become a king, and in that the *Jeunesse* and 7th Pylon inscription relate the prediction of kingship on the occasion of a *séance oraculaire*.[679]

Possibly supporting this argument are the two passages from Horemheb's Turin inscription cited above which refer to him with non-royal titles afterwards even after his *bs-nsw.t* (l. 15), indicating that the *bs-nsw.t* alone was not what transformed Horemheb into king. Whereas it was the purpose of the induction that was discussed above, I draw attention here to the use of verb: while in Thutmose's 7th Pylon inscription, kingship, in the form of *ns.t* "throne" and *iꜣ.t* "office" is said to have been "foretold" to him, in Horemheb's inscription, kingship, in the form of *ns.t* and *iꜣ.t*, is not "foretold" to him, but it is said that the intent is to "transfer" (*swḏ*, l. 13) and "give" (*dỉ.t*, l. 14) it to him. Horemheb is indeed king by the end of the text, possibly as a result of the related events. This suggests that there could be an underlying difference between kingship being "given" or "transferred" (Horemheb Turin inscription), both of which sound more immediate than its being "foretold" (Thutmose III 7th Pylon text). The only way to try and confirm this is by demonstrating whether Thutmose III, like Horemheb, became a king by the end of his account.

2. The Texte de la jeunesse as accession or coronation ceremony

If Thutmose did indeed become a king as an immediate result of the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, then the question which arises is whether it relates his accession or his coronation ceremony. Either way, as demonstrated, even if Thutmose did undergo an induction in actuality, a *bs-nsw.t* alone need not transform an individual into a king. Many other rituals would be expected, including the bestowal of crowns, which does indeed appear in the text.

It must first and foremost be noted that accession and coronation ceremony are mutually exclusive (except in the case of a coregency, as presented in the introductory chapter),[680] and that this not necessarily so with an oracular selection of the future king for, as seen in the *Historical Inscription*, this text relates an event which could be described as both her accession as well as her "coronation" (i.e. appearance ceremony)

[679] The similarities between the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the "nomination inscription" of Hatshepsut have been noted by Spalinger as well ("Drama", 284).

[680] Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 35, 38–9; Redford, *History*, 18; Gardiner, "Regnal Years", 24; Borchardt, *Mittel*, 69.

(given that she was promoted to kingship as a coregent), an event which featured her oracular selection by Amun on a festival occasion. Not all oracular pronouncements by a god have immediate consequences however, for a deity could predict the bestowal of the office of kingship at some point in the future, as seen with block 287 of the *Historical Inscription*. It is clear that the *Texte de la jeunesse*, too, relates an event which included an oracular selection, but the aim of this chapter is to establish whether Thutmose III, too, became a king as an immediate result of the events of his own text.

Frankfort described the *Texte de la jeunesse* as relating Thutmose's accession, while Redford referred to it as his "coronation account."[681] According to Barta, it relates his *Krönung*.[682] Dorman ambiguously calls the 7th Pylon text a "coronation inscription," adding that it mentions the king's accession date of I *šmw* 4, and tells of his "oracular selection."[683] On the other hand, Stadler considers this the date of Thutmose III's Krönung, and argues that in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, "Thutmosis wird … von Amun zum König erwählt."[684] Troy, referring to Kruchten's *Annales*, believes that the "[c]oronation was associated with an 'entry' or 'induction,'" describing the 7th Pylon inscription as providing a simplified account thereof,[685] and as "[t]he narrative of the accession of Thutmose III."[686] As demonstrated however, a *bs-nsw.t* need not always have included a crowning. Furthermore, the 7th Pylon inscription would in this light be relating Thutmose III's coronation ceremony, but no mention is made of any crowning (or none has survived, at least). Regarding the *Jeunesse* (and the Hatshepsut Middle Colonnade evidence), she states that "[t]he coronation culminated with the establishment of the royal titulary."[687] Once again, the term "coronation" is an ambiguous one: if used here synonymously with "crowning," this would be accurate insofar as the inscription mentions Thutmose III being crowned, but whether this is an account of a coronation ceremony is a different matter.

---

[681] Frankfort, *Kingship*, 106; Redford, *History*, 75.

[682] Barta, "Rituale", 6.

[683] Dorman, "Early Reign", 41.

[684] Stadler, "Krönung", 81–2.

[685] Troy, "Religion", 147 and no. 203 on p. 177. Kruchten reference: *Annales*, 147–204. According to Kruchten, the *bs-nsw.t* "se confond avec le couronnement" (*ibid.*, 167).

[686] Troy, "Religion", 131.

[687] *Ibid.*, 147.

As pointed out above, in contrast to Carlotti and Gabolde, who consider both the 7th Pylon inscription and the *Texte de la jeunesse* as relating not the accession of Thutmose III, but an oracular session during which kingship was predicted to him in the presence of his father Thutmose II, Bonhême and Forgeau interestingly believe that they describe separate events, the 7th Pylon text giving an account of a "promesse de royauté" to Thutmose III by Amun during the reign (and in the presence) of Thutmose II, and the *Texte de la jeunesse* relating his coronation ceremony.[688] In making this argument, she comes close to the conclusion presented in this chapter, but in the process makes a mistake, and overlooks a crucial detail (discussed in detail below): she describes the 7th Pylon text not merely as the designation of Thutmose III as the future Pharaoh, but also calls it an *investiture anticipée*, or coregency. In such texts (like that of the 7th Pylon), "l'oracle du dieu fait parfois pressentir la promotion du futur souverain, du vivant et en présence du roi régnant."[689] A rise to the status of coregent means becoming a Pharaoh in the full sense of the word, however, and necessarily excludes merely being promised the throne. In the case of an "oracle" or prediction of kingship by itself, in contrast to the rise to the status of coregent, the perceived successor is not invested with the office.

The rituals of (1) crowning and of (2) the instalment of the titulary must be addressed in order to ascertain whether Thutmose became a king (accession, coronation, or being made coregent), or whether the office was simply "predicted" for him, for these two episodes are usually depicted occurring side-by-side in coronation sequences (e.g. Philip Arrhidaeus' Karnak barque sanctuary: fig. 1). As stated in the introductory chapter, the term "coronation" can be misleading, for its conflation with the act of crowning seems almost inevitable. Rather, as was done with the analysis of the *Historical Inscription* in the previous chapter, it is on the word that the ancient Egyptians themselves used, *ḫʿi* "appearance," that the interpretation must be based. As Redford has argued, however, this term could be used to describe accession, coronation ceremony, or even any royal public appearance.[690]

[688] Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 249.

[689] *Loc. cit.*

[690] Redford, *History*, 3–4, 27.

The crowning of the king was a standard part of non-royal, divine festivals, such as the festival of Opet.[691] That Thutmose was crowned in the *Texte de la jeunesse* need not by necessity mean that this consisted of his coronation ceremony. Rather, that the interpretation of coronation lends itself to this case is because Thutmose was not king at the start of the narrative. The theme of crowning therefore only brings us back to the original question of whether he did actually become a king by its end and, if so, how these events can best be described: accession, coronation or appearance ceremony, or promotion to status of coregent.

Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*[692] and Horemheb's Turin text[693] describe the formulation of the titulary, and the decree of Thutmose I[694] states his titulary for administrative and ritual purposes. Bonhême, referring to the texts of Thutmose I and Horemheb, argues that their names "sont prêts à être conférés et diffusés le jour du couronnement. A moins d'admettre l'improvisation en ce domaine, il convient de supposer qu'ils furent élaborés longtemps avant la promotion sacrale."[695] There is a problem with this statement, however: the titularies would have by necessity been needed to be ready as soon as the new king acceded to the throne for, as the letter sent by Thutmose I indicates, he was making his titulary known to Turi, the overseer of southern lands, so that offerings and oaths could be made in the names of the new king.[696]

The case of Horemheb is discussed in the fifth chapter of this thesis, but suffice it to say that if the Turin text relates his coronation ceremony—meaning that he had already acceded to the throne at an earlier point—then it would have been impossible for his titulary to have been announced for the first time only at his *ḥꜥi* in the Opet festival, for matters of state would have necessitated knowledge of his full titulary in the meantime, as reflected in the Thutmose I decree.

While Hatshepsut's "coronation suite" at Deir el-Bahari is not considered due to the text's fictional nature, it does contain an interesting and useful reference, which

---

[691] Bell, "Divine", 174.

[692] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 19, # 164.

[693] Col. 19: *Urk.* IV, 2118,11.

[694] *Urk.* IV, 79–81.

[695] Bonhême, *Noms royaux*, 14–15; cf. Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 312–13.

[696] Chapter 1, 23–4. von Beckerath, *LÄ* III, s.v. "Königsnamen"; Hornung, "New Kingdom", 199–200; *contra* Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 312–14 (cf. 248); Leprohon, *Great Name*, 10–12.

Bonhême points out: when the lector-priests are summoned to announce Hatshepsut's titulary, the god made it so that they somehow knew the *ỉr.t rn.w=s mỉ-ḳd ỉr.n=f m-bɜḥ* "the making of her names as he (Amun) had made them previously."[697] While I disagree with her using Thutmose I's and Horemheb's texts to support her view, I do agree with the principle of her arguments: it would indeed be surprising if kings, at their accessions, improvised their titularies; they would have considered them, and probably deeply, beforehand, to use them to express various matters such as their policies, both internal and external, and religious views.[698]

Returning to the *Texte de la jeunesse*: after Thutmose is crowned in the sky, comes the section with the titulary. It is also at equivalent junctures, (1) at Hatshepsut's *ḫʿỉ-nsw.t* in the *Historical Inscription*, and (2) after Horemheb's crowning in the *pr-wr* of Luxor Temple, that passages pertaining to the titulary appear. The events of the *Historical Inscription*, it was demonstrated in the last chapter, consist of Hatshepsut's accession, as well as her "coronation ceremony," in the sense of her first public "appearance" as king in public on a festival occasion since having become Pharaoh. Bearing in mind that the titulary of the new king would have been prepared in advance of the king's accession, the implications of this for the *Texte de la jeunesse* are twofold. (1) If it relates an event which transformed Thutmose III into a king, then the composition of the titulary must be seen as a real and official event, one which would have marked the beginning of the reign of every king, for without a specific and publicised royal titulary, offerings and oaths could not be made in the name of the correct king. (2) If it relates an event in which the kingship is merely predicted to Thutmose III, the situation is more complicated: there would have been no need for him to have had a titulary, for offerings and oaths were not to be made in his name anyway, but that of Thutmose II. Furthermore, only kings may bear the four royal names in addition to the one given at birth, which excludes Thutmose III from having been able to obtain a titulary, if the events in the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* consist solely of a *séance oraculaire*. This does not necessarily mean that the notion of an oracular session must be discarded altogether however: the possibility that some of the events related in this text are symbolic in nature is discussed below, in which light the passages relating to the titulary could be seen as a divine revelation by the god which

[697] *Urk.* IV, 261,13 cf. also 261,2–4 and 262,1; Bonhême, *Noms Royaux*, 11–12.

[698] Leprohon, "Patterns", 1 ff.; Kitchen, "Titularies", 131 ff.

came hand-in-hand with the prediction that he would one day succeed his father. It will be remembered that in Hatshepsut's Middle Colonnade inscription in Deir el-Bahari, it is stated that her titulary was divinely-inspired, which the lector-priests proceeded to announce.[699]

Like the ritual of crowning, therefore, the formulation of the titulary is not useful in attempting to objectively identify the *Jeunesse* as an account of Thutmose III's participation in a *séance oraculaire*, his accession, or even appearance ceremony. The question must be examined from a different angle.

3. The possible coregency of Thutmose II with Thutmose III

If Thutmose III did become Pharaoh by the end of the text, and it has been established that Thutmose II was alive and the reigning king, with Amun's blessings,[700] then the conclusion that Thutmose III was raised to the status of coregent seems inescapable. In their respective discussions on the subject, Redford and Murnane refer to the passage from the 7th Pylon where Thutmose states that kingship was predicted to him *r-gs* "at the side of" his father Thutmose II. They point out that *r-gs* may be interpreted differently, as "before," as in simply "in the presence of,"[701] rather than literally, "at the side of," each having a different implication: (1) in the literal sense, the conclusion would be that, by being placed "at the side of" the reigning king, Thutmose II, Thutmose III was raised to the status of coregent; (2) in the simpler sense of "before" or "in the (physical) presence of," no such promotion is implied, indicating that this was merely an occasion on which Thutmose III was "nominated" by Amun as the next ruler during the reign of his father.[702] Redford is open to both possibilities, but Murnane persuasively argues, via comparison with Hatshepsut's Middle Colonnade coronation inscription and Ramses II's Great Dedicatory Inscription, that had the aim of the passage from the 7th Pylon been to relate Thutmose III's rise to status of coregent, it "would have done so in less equivocal language than this."[703]

---

[699] *Urk.* IV, 261,13; cf. also 262,1.

[700] *Supra*, 136–7.

[701] Gardiner, *Grammar*, 134 (§ 178).

[702] Redford, *History*, 53; Murnane, *Coregencies*, 116–17.

[703] Murnane, *Coregencies*, 117; Redford, *History*, 54. Hatshepsut presented to the assembled officials by Thutmose I: *Urk,* IV, 241–65; *Deir el Bahari* III, pls. 60–2. Sety I presenting Ramses II and having him crowned while he was *m sfy ỉmytw ḳnỉ=f* "(as) a youth within his embrace" (*KRI* II, 327,15–328,3). The veracity of the claims made by these two kings is a different matter.

The argument based on, and weight given to, the interpretation of *r-gs* is not persuasive but, while both interpretations are possible, the one proposing a *séance oraculaire* or "nomination" is more convincing. What is certain, however, is that this text, due to the presence of Thutmose II, certainly does not relate Thutmose III's accession to sole rule. In the case of a coregency, the order of accession (to sole rule) and coronation for the junior partner is reversed, given that the new incumbent of the office would have appeared in public in a religious festival in his capacity of king for the first time (i.e. appearance ceremony) by being elevated to the status of coregent, and that he would have risen to the throne as sole ruler upon the death of the senior partner (i.e. accession).[704] Therefore, if the *Texte de la jeunesse* is to be taken as a (semi-)historical text not relating a *séance oraculaire*, then it must be the case that it describes not Thutmose III's accession, but the Egyptian equivalent of a coronation ceremony: the appearance ceremony.[705]

Redford distinguishes between two types of coregencies; in both cases the two coregents are kings in the full sense of the word, but in the first type, the "junior" partner "defers to the senior in matters of regnal dating," and "begins dating his own regnal years with the death of his predecessor."[706] Based on the scanty surviving archaeological evidence to support a coregency of Thutmose II with his son, Redford concludes that "the coregency, if it is historical, was of the first type," and that Thutmose III "began numbering his years only on the death of his father."[707] The evidence therefore does not exclude the fact that there may well have been a coregency of Thutmose II and Thutmose III, but it is certainly clear that they both had their separate distinct regnal dating years. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the kings of the New Kingdom reckoned their reigns as king from the day of their accession.[708] Thutmose III's accession date of I *šmw* 4 is well known; it survives three

[704] Redford, *History*, 18; Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 35, 38–9.

[705] It must be noted that "accession" here is taken to mean only as the rise to sole rulership, rather than include the rise to status of coregent, in order to more easily illustrate the "reversal" of accession and coronation in the case of a coregency. In actuality, however, the term "accession" can be used to denote the rise to the throne, whether or not in the status of coregent.

[706] Redford, *History*, 50–1.

[707] *Ibid.*, 54.

[708] Gardiner, "Regnal Years", 23.

times: in his "Annals,"[709] in his festival calendar,[710] and finally in his inscription on the 7th Pylon, just after the other passages from the same text cited above.

Under the assumption that the *Texte de la jeunesse* relates Thutmose III's "coronation ceremony" (i.e. promotion to coregent), if the biography of Ineni is to be believed, one is left with two possibilities: that (1) it is a fictitious account with little-to-no historical value (carved after Ineni's death), given that the presence of Thutmose II is completely contradictory with Ineni's account (*infra*, discussion on the historicity of the inscription); or that (2) the coregency is not mentioned by him for reasons an examination of which lie beyond the scope of this thesis. On the other hand, if the *Jeunesse* is seen as relating not Thutmose III's elevation to king as coregent (and certainly not his accession), but a *séance oraculaire* on which occasion kingship was predicted to him during the reign of Thutmose II, there would be no conflict with Ineni's biography. This notion appears confirmed when one examines the text of the 7th Pylon in its entirety.

4. The remainder of the 7th Pylon inscription and its ramifications

After the passage describing the prediction of kingship to Thutmose III, there is unfortunately a break in the text, but when it picks up again, in the second column, it states: *ḥꜣ.t-sp tpy šmw sw 4 ḫpr swt ḥꜥ.t sꜣ-nsw.t Ḏḥwty-ms ꜥnḫ(.w) ḏ.t r nḥ*[*ḥ*] [*m nsw.t-bỉty*] "Year 1, first month of *Shemu*, day 4: there occurred the appearance of the son of the king, Thutmose, living eternally to eterni[ty] [as King of Upper and Lower Egypt]."[711] To the extent of the knowledge of the author of this thesis, this passage has been interpreted along with the one preceding it, as evidenced by the views presented above, as part of one single event: the only clear exception is Dorman in *The Monuments of Senenmut*, who makes the brief remark that, after kingship was predicted to Thutmose, "[i]t is only in the next line following that Thutmosis' accession date is given."[712] This point is unfortunately not elaborated in his chapter in *Thutmose III: A New Biography*, but this could account for the careful, but ambiguous, description he

[709] *Urk.* IV, 648,9.

[710] *Urk.* IV, 177.

[711] *Urk.* IV, 180,15–17.

[712] Dorman, *Monuments*, 28. On the other hand, it is well known that this date and particular passage refer to the accession of Thutmose III (Redford, *History*, 23–4 no. 94, 26 no. 104; Schunck, *Wortstamm*, 69–70).

provides for the 7th Pylon text, calling it a "coronation inscription," which mentions the king's accession date and tells of his "oracular selection."[713] Whether the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription*, for example, relate their respective kings' accession or "coronation ceremony," the label "coronation inscription" can ambiguously be applied to these texts, for they do contain instances of the king being crowned; the same may not be said of the 7th Pylon inscription however, for even taking the generally-accepted restorations by Sethe at face value, this text still lacks a reference to the act of crowning. It does, however, according to the restoration by Sethe at least, mention Thutmose III's induction, but the relationship between *bs-nsw.t* and "coronation" is an unclear one however, given Horemheb's account where the royal induction alone did not transform him into a king.[714]

As is known from the biography of Ineni, Thutmose III acceded to the throne at the death of his father.[715] It is therefore impossible to speak of either the *Texte de la jeunesse* or the inscription on the 7th Pylon as Thutmose III's accession or "coronation," since Thutmose II is known to have been present at the events of both; unless, of course, this is the case of a coregency, but neither Dorman nor Troy mention this possibility.

Cannuyer's views on the text of the 7th Pylon are interesting, but are based on the notion that *sr* can only exceptionally, if ever, signify "une prévision à long terme:"[716] "je suis enclin à croire que les deux hypothèses (*r-gs* = 'en présence de' ou 'au côté de') peuvent être conciliées. Par ce texte, Thoutmosis III relaterait son élévation à la royauté en présence et au côté d'un Thoutmosis II mourant; cette corégence plus ou moins fictive … aurait de toute façon presque immédiatement précédé le décès de Thoutmosis II et l'accession au trône de son fils en tant que seul pharaon."[717] This compromise does not work however, for the announcement of an event which has yet to come, even though soon, is precisely just that: an announcement; the declaration that Thutmose III was the next in line to the throne would still not have made him coregent, Pharaoh in every sense of the word, just as much as Thutmose II.

---

[713] Dorman, "Early Reign", 41.

[714] Chapter 5, 209–12 (s.v. "On the meeting place of Horemheb with Amun"); Kruchten, *Annales*, 174.

[715] *Urk.* IV, 59,13–60,11.

[716] Cannuyer, "Brelan", 108 no. 53.

[717] *Ibid.*, 109.

The key to understanding the inscription of the 7th Pylon is simply a matter of viewing its various contents as not describing a single event, but more than one, as implied by Cannuyer. This would certainly not be a unique phenomenon for Thutmose III's Annals, for example, clearly mention multiple events occurring on various dates.[718] This would resolve the statement by Spalinger that the inscription tells of the prediction of kingship to Thutmose III, as with block 287 of the *Historical Inscription*, but who states that his "accession date is included" (probably as part of the prediction).[719]

The start of the 7th Pylon text is missing, and may well have contained a separate date for the oracular session or Thutmose's promotion to coregent (whichever was indeed the case), which would have ended with the prediction of kingship to Thutmose III (col. 1). Following these events by an unknown amount of time, his accession would have taken place (col. 2), this new section introduced with the date *tpy šmw sw 4*. This notion is reinforced by the infinitive introductory sentence *ḫpr sw.t* + infinitive (*ḫˁ.t*). While it is true that *ḫˁi* could be used to express the accession, appearance ceremony, or any public appearance of the king, Redford has demonstrated that the term *ḫˁi-nsw.t*, which is also the one encountered in the 7th Pylon text, refers exclusively to the accession during the New Kingdom.[720] The event said to have occurred on *tpy šmw sw 4*, the accession, therefore did not take place at the same time as the foretelling of kingship to Thutmose, but at some point after. It is also for this reason that I believe that Thutmose's Horus Name does not refer to the events related in either the *Texte de la jeunesse* or the 7th Pylon inscription. Rather, it probably refers to his actual later accession on I *šmw* 4, which would incidentally have also taken place in Thebes, as the name suggests.

This leaves us with two possible interpretations for the event preceding the accession on the 7th Pylon, on which occasion kingship was predicted to Thutmose III: (1) that this is an account of the elevation of Thutmose III to the status of coregent in a coregency of Redford's first type, where Thutmose III would have used his father's regnal years during their coregency until I *šmw* 4, when he officially acceded to the sole rulership of Egypt. (2) Alternatively, this could still be simply seen as an oracular

[718] *Urk.* IV, 647–756.

[719] Spalinger, "Drama", 285.

[720] Redford, *History*, 22–5.

session, as with those of Hatshepsut on block 287 of the *Historical Inscription*. Due to the inconclusive nature of the evidence, it will ultimately remain unknown which of the two really was the case, but in light of the observation that the accession of Thutmose III on I *šmw* 4 most likely did not coincide with the prediction of kingship to him (during the reign of Thutmose II), allows new arguments to be made in favour of the interpretation of the *Texte de la jeunesse* as an account of an oracular session.

5. *The historicity of the Texte de la jeunesse*

There exists a rarely discussed palimpsest text carved over the second known copy of the *Historical Inscription* in the Upper Colonnade in Hatshepsut's temple at Deir el-Bahari which purportedly gives an account of the accession of Thutmose I.[721] Interestingly, this was carved by Thutmose III, presumably to hide Hatshepsut's text. Redford proposed that the underlying inscription by Hatshepsut was a prototype for both coronation inscriptions of the Thutmoses I and III, which therefore are "fabrications."[722] This, however, was before the publication of the *Historical Inscription*, and is now clearly fallacious given that, as demonstrated in this chapter, the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription* are different in form (parallel sentences are only rarely encountered) as well as in function, in that the *Texte de la jeunesse* most likely consisted of the prediction of kingship, and the *Historical Inscription* certainly of Hatshepsut's accession (exceptionally, as well as her appearance ceremony). Redford did, however, point out several interesting parallels, some almost *verbatim*, between the text of Thutmose I and the *Jeunesse*, and one of his other suggestions, that Thutmose III, in the latter, was relating a fictitious account of his rise to kingship based on an original of his father's (which he later proceeded to carve over the copy of the *Historical Inscription* in Deir el-Bahari), is entirely possible.[723] But the borrowing, heavy though it may be, from another text does not necessarily mean that the newer text is fictional.

Spalinger, referring to the *Historical Inscription*, states that "[t]he parallels between this inscription and that of the nomination of Thutmose III are so strong that

---

[721] *PM* II, 356 (77); *Deir el Bahari* VI, 8–9, pls. 166–7; see also: Sethe, *Hatschepsut-Problem*, 77–81; Redford, *History*, 74–6; Murnane, *Coregencies*, 116–17. Brief mention in: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 153, no. 567; Römer, *Priesterherrschaft*, 478 no. 2.

[722] Redford, *History*, 76, cf. Murnane, *Coregencies*, 117.

[723] Redford, *History*, 75–6.

one ought not to hesitate in assuming some type of borrowing by the latter from the former."[724] He does not, however, see the *Texte de la jeunesse* as fictitious, "but rather a reiteration of what had occurred earlier."[725] Spalinger never mentions Thutmose II in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, and argues that some of its events took place during Thutmose III's coregency with Hatshepsut, and some even after her death.[726] Despite this, it is with his views that my own coincide most, in that while it is inevitable that the *Texte de la jeunesse* did borrow from similar preceding texts, it is not a "fabrication," but an account, albeit altered and embellished, of an event which did actually take place.

Over the course of the analysis of the *Texte de la jeunesse* presented in this chapter, this text was compared with the *Historical Inscription*, and it was demonstrated that these two events are clearly different. The events of the former, while they contain unexpected events, do not interrupt the overall course of the religious occasion, but were merely added on to them. This is more reminiscent of the evidence from block 287: there, the religious occasion is named, and we are informed that it was on this occasion that kingship was predicted to Hatshepsut. In the inscription of the 7th Pylon, regardless of whether or not it relates the same event as the *Texte de la jeunesse*, had the start of the text not been missing, the religious occasion might have been mentioned there as well, in the same manner as Thutmose III's later *ḫʿi-nsw.t* "accession" to the throne (at the death of his father) introduced a new section of the text. In the case of the *Historical Inscription*, on the other hand, it was demonstrated that there was a direct "rupture" in the expected sequence of events which could only be resumed after the wish that Amun had expressed, to make Hatshepsut king, had been fulfilled.[727]

Both the *Historical Inscription* and the *Texte de la jeunesse* are realistic in their relating of events and appear historical. This is done through references to real locations and/or actual dates, but is also apparent, as Spalinger piercingly points out, from the fact that it is the statue of the god in procession who makes his will known via *bi3y.t*-signs, while "[s]uch is not the case at Deir el Bahri with regard to Hatshepsut's

[724] Spalinger, "Drama", 284.

[725] *Ibid.*, 277.

[726] *Ibid.*, 277–8.

[727] Chapter 3, 106, 109–10 (s.v. "Hatshepsut's appointment at the *Station*, and the performance of an offering").

birth and subsequent accession."[728] There, the gods are said and represented to be performing their actions themselves. Bonhême and Forgeau note the "forme historisante" of the *Texte de la jeunesse* as well.[729]

Interestingly, the *Texte de la jeunesse*, right up to Amun appointing Thutmose at the *Station* and performing a *bi3y.t* for him (col. 7), and then opening the doors of the sky for him (col. 9), remains realistic in its description, but then abruptly "moves to a religious setting."[730] Thutmose is transformed into a falcon, flies to the sky, sees the gods themselves, as they are, and it is Ra himself (*ḏs=f*) who crowns him. It has been demonstrated that this consisted of Thutmose's *bs.t* "induction," in the sense of his being led past the world of the living, and into the secret areas of the temple, where the divine and mortal worlds met.

The interpretation proposing to see what was said to have taken place past the 5th Pylon, that is, Thutmose III's *bs-nsw.t*, as actually having occurred (but related in mythological guise), as pointed out above, does not necessarily entail that he became king. Horemheb, after his own royal induction, is afterwards referred to with non-royal titles, and received his royal titulary only after he was crowned. The *bs-nsw.t* by itself does not appear to transform an individual into a king; the reception and donning of the royal crowns, in contrast, is a purely royal privilege. In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, Thutmose records that he was crowned by Ra after he flew past the horizon (i.e. what has been proposed to be seen as his royal induction). This leads to the logical conclusion that Thutmose must have indeed become king as a result. On the other hand, the textual evidence from the *Texte de la jeunesse*, which indicates that Thutmose II was present, in turn leads to the conclusion that Thutmose III was therefore being elevated to the status of coregent.

The presence of Thutmose II, confirmed through the *Texte de la jeunesse* (and the 7th Pylon inscription as well, if they both refer to the same occasion), when combined with the textual evidence from the biography of Ineni, according to which Thutmose III acceded to the throne upon the death of his father, entails a different conclusion, however: that the events related in the *Texte de la jeunesse* consist of a *séance oraculaire*, that is, that it consists of a *sr* "prediction" of kingship, as a result of

[728] Spalinger, "Drama", 288.

[729] Bonhême and Forgeau, *Secrets*, 250.

[730] Spalinger, "Drama", 272.

which Thutmose III will become king, but in the future (after Thutmose II's passing). This would mean that Thutmose III did not become a king as result of his crowning which is related in the text, which must therefore be seen as having taken place only figuratively rather than in actuality. It is interesting to note at which point in the text take place the events which are described in a mythological setting: almost immediately after Amun's *bỉꜣy.t*-sign for Thutmose III, who had just previously been placed at an exclusively royal location, the *Station of the Lord*. Perhaps the correct interpretation would therefore be to see only the events which took place before the shift to the mythological plane as actually having taken place.

As argued above in light of Černý's views and via comparison with block 287, the 7th Pylon inscription most likely did not mention the royal induction of Thutmose III (*contra* Sethe), for divine oracular pronouncements seem to have occurred in public spaces within the temple. It would have certainly defeated the legitimising purpose of a divine selection to have only had a handful of temple officials—if not merely the high-priest—hear it. By analogy, in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, the same could be said of the performance of *bỉꜣy.t*-signs which would have also similarly taken place in public areas of the temple, and so would have the posting at the *Station* which, as argued, would have been located in the forecourt. The two texts by Thutmose therefore give the precise same order of events wherein the prediction (*sr*) made by the god and his *bỉꜣy.t*-signs, both oracular revelations of Amun's will, are to be seen as equivalents. This, furthermore, would not be in contradiction with the statement early in the *Jeunesse* where Thutmose declared that his induction as *ḥm-nṯr* did not take place: once it was revealed that he would become king, there was no need for him to be initiated as a priest. This, furthermore, lends even more support to the notion that the events of the *Texte de la jeunesse* described in mythological language did not actually take place, but were the symbolic consequence of the oracular selection of Thutmose, and the religious experience he underwent as a result.

In the less likely scenario where Sethe's restorations are correct, in that the 7th Pylon inscription did indeed mention the induction of Thutmose III and that this took place in his sanctuary, it could still be argued that his two texts still relate the same type of event, if not the very same one, given that they would still match: *bs-nsw.t* (but not explicitly described as such in the *Jeunesse*) that is, meeting with the god in his sanctuary ([*pr-wr*] or [*r-pr*] for the 7th Pylon Inscription and the "flight" past the 5th

Pylon in the case of the *Jeunesse*)—but not actual induction into the office of kingship.[731] The distinction between the *sr* "predicting" of the *ns.t* "throne" and *i3.t* "office" of kingship in this inscription and their *swḏ* "transfer" and being given (*di.t*) to Horemheb in his Turin inscription further reinforces the notion that Thutmose III did not necessarily become a fully-fledged king by the end of the narration of these events in the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

Whether one prefers the view that the *bs-nsw.t* of the *Jeunesse* and 7th Pylon did indeed take place, or that it must be understood symbolically, it is highly unlikely that Thutmose III became king, and therefore that either text describes his accession or "coronation ceremony." These are accounts of *séances oraculaires* done for the benefit of Thutmose III when he was not yet king, on the occasion of a public outing of Amun.

The first scenario fits almost perfectly with the evidence from block 287 of the *Historical Inscription*, where we are informed that the overall occasion of the part of the festival of Amun during which offerings are made to Sekhmet, consisted of (using the *m* of predication) the predicting (*sr*) to her of kingship. A new sentence immediately following it states that Amun, after he had appeared (*ḫꜥ*) for his festival, performed *bi3y.t*-signs for her, after which he appointed her at the *Station*, and then performed a large number of *bi3y.t*-signs for her. It is my belief that the account of the events starting "the new sentence" (introduced by *ist*), after the introductory sentence naming the date and the occasion, is none other than an elaboration thereof.

In short, the overall occasion therefore consisted of the prediction of kingship to Hatshepsut, and what this consisted of in detail was (1) the god's festival appearance, (2) the presence of the current reigning king, (3) the appointment to the *Station*, and finally (4) the performance of very many *bi3y.t*-signs as an expression of the god's great approval of the new situation.[732]

We find all four of the criteria in the *Texte de la jeunesse* as well: (1) the god's appearance in an unknown festival, (2) the indirect reference to the presence of Thutmose II, and then, after finding him, (3) Amun appointing Thutmose III to the *Station*, followed by (4) his performance of *bi3y.t*-signs for him. It is therefore likely that, as with block 287, no specific action consisted of Amun's prediction of kingship,

[731] Kruchten, *Annales*, 174.

[732] Cf. Gillen, "Historical Inscription", 10–11.

but his many actions, such as stopping for Amun, placing him in front of, appointing him to the *Station* (most likely next to his father, the king), and then finally taking him beyond the 5th Pylon, (mostly) all royal privileges, overall signify that Thutmose III would one day become king.

This could explain why it was precisely at the point where Thutmose III was inducted past the 5th Pylon that the description suddenly resorts to a mythological setting. As Spalinger argues, "this portion of the account must be seen in a different light than the explicit historical observations."[733] It is not so much an account of what took place from this point, but a description of its significance, what it entailed. It is thus an action by Amun which consisted of the "revelation" of his intentions (note the theme of the hidden will of the gods running throughout the text), just like in the *Historical Inscription*, where the action of being about to enter the palace from a specifically royal location (the *s.t n.t šms.wt-nsw.t r ḥw.t-nṯr n.t* [*Im*]*n*) was when "the god revealed that which he had hidden" (*BL* 33; *H* 14, # 142,19).

This alternative interpretation of Thutmose III's being crowned and invested with kingship in the sky sees these not as a figurative description of his having been crowned and become king in actuality, but as a vision, a "revelation" which he might have experienced, of the eventual outcome of his becoming king, thus consisting of their being predicted (*sr*) to him. If this is correct, then it is certain that this was indeed, like the events in the 7th Pylon inscription (before the mention of the accession date) and block 287, a *séance oraculaire*. That block 287 contains two similar, but distinct, oracular sessions allows the same argument to be made for the two texts of Thutmose III: that they also both relate almost identical oracular sessions does not mean that they are one and the same event, though this possibility cannot be ruled out with certainty.

A part of the revelation Thutmose would have received as a result of his oracular selection was his royal titulary. In reality, he would have thought of it, as argued above, in advance of his accession, so that his titulary could be ready for immediate administrative use. But in hindsight, in the 42nd year of his reign, Thutmose III chose to declare that it was at this point, before his accession, that the god *wd* "installed, established" his titulary. As with the passage referred to from Hatshepsut's coronation reliefs in the Middle Terrace at Deir el-Bahari, the gods themselves had predetermined what Thutmose's names would be, and proceeded to reveal this to him

[733] Spalinger, "Drama", 286.

when he was chosen by the god or, in the second and less likely scenario, when he was inducted into the sanctuary of Amun for the first time. His royal protocol was thenceforward ready to be announced to the far reaches of the borders of Egypt at his eventual accession.

IV. Conclusions

In short, the interpretation of the *Texte de la jeunesse* that Thutmose III did become king is unlikely, but ultimately not impossible (in which case, however, the 7th Pylon inscription, still an account of a *séance oraculaire*, would need to be seen as an altogether different event and type of event). It has also been demonstrated, thanks to the presence of Thutmose II at these festivities, that this could not possibly consist of his accession to sole rule on I *šmw* 4. Rather, it would be an account of his elevation to the status of coregent.

The alternative interpretation, more likely simply because it does not rest on the assumption of a hypothetical coregency, is that, even if the events of the first column of the inscription of the 7th Pylon are not synonymous with those of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, they are both still a part of the body of texts usually described as accounts of *séances oraculaires* or "divine nominations," along with the events of block 287 and perhaps also Thutmose III's palimpsest text for Thutmose I in Deir el-Bahari's Upper Court. In these cases, the protagonist does not become king, but the gods' divine will that s/he will one day become king is made manifest. Later, as the *Historical Inscription* and second column of the 7th Pylon text make clear, this is actualised in the protagonist's eventual *ḥꜥi-nsw.t* "accession."[734] Regardless of whether it is an "accession" or "nomination," the public aspect of the festivities, expressed through (1) the setting, that is, parts of the temple where the *rekhyt* are allowed (*wꜣḏy.t*, *wsḫ.t n.t ỉp.t-rsy.t*), (2) the mention of their presence or that of *tꜣ r-ḏr=f* "the entire land," in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, block 287 and the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription*, has been demonstrated to have been an element of the highest importance. From a purely practical standpoint, these events, which could be manipulated to a king's advantage, were extremely effective legitimising tactics due to their public nature.

What the *Texte de la jeunesse* is not, however, is a coronation inscription, even in the loose sense of the term that has been adopted, that is, the first public appearance

[734] For *ḥꜥi-nsw.t* as "accession," see: Redford, *History*, 22–5.

of a king since his accession to sole rulership in a festival occasion in which s/he is publicly acknowledged as the ruler.

Apart from the events taking place in the texts, the very inscription itself is a legitimising tool for, even the references to real locations and specific occasions are still set in the same framework of a king's divine, pre-ordained, right to rule. Despite the great importance that was given to him throughout the coregency with Hatshepsut, Thutmose was the junior coregent, and he was still subtly subordinate to her.[735] He therefore still had to legitimise his own rule, and consolidate the claim that he was, as the start of the *Texte de la jeunesse* informs us, always meant to rule, while he was still *ỉmy sš=f* "in his nest" (col. 1),[736] especially in light of Hatshepsut's own claims to divine birth and predestination. In this, it is not different from certainly fictitious accounts such as Hatshepsut's divine birth and coronation in the Middle Terrace at Deir el-Bahari.

[735] O'Connor, "Enigmatic", 25; Dorman, "Early Reign", 41–57 (esp. 52).

[736] *Urk.* IV, 157,3.

CHAPTER V

The Turin Inscription of Horemheb

The text inscribed on the back of a group statue of Horemheb and his Great Wife Mutnedjmet, currently in the Turin museum, has long been cited as describing his coronation.[737] The beginning of lines 1–18 is broken off, with as much as a fourth of some of these lines being missing. One other, fragmentary, copy of this text is also known; it was discovered in Ramses II's temple of Ptah in Memphis.[738] It is not an exact copy, but they agree *verbatim* in some parts. There also exists yet another, much briefer and very fragmentary, "coronation" text in the temple of Montu in Karnak, carved on a block from a doorway of Amenhotep III which is occasionally referred to in this chapter.[739] Given that the Turin inscription is the better preserved, and provides more content than the Ptah stela does, it is this text which will be followed throughout the discussion.

It was first published, with transcription and translation, in 1874 by Samuel Birch,[740] according to whom the text "appears to refer to the coronation of Horus."[741] In 1884, Heinrich Brugsch provided a transcription and described the events as being part of Horemheb's "Thronerhebung."[742] Maspero (1912) furnished both a transcription and a translation, and ambiguously saw the "coronation" section of the text as an account of Horemheb's accession and coronation.[743] Breasted (1900: translation; 1906: transcription and translation),[744] Moret (1902),[745] Schunck (1985),[746] and Barta

---

[737] Turin Cat. 1379. *PM* VIII, 58–9 (800-642-650); *Urk.* IV, 2113,7–2120,17; Gardiner, "Coronation", 13–31.

[738] *PM* III, 832; *Urk.* IV, 2121,5–2124,8; Gardiner, "Coronation", 28–31.

[739] *PM* II, 6; *Urk.* IV, 2124,13–2126,12.

[740] Birch, "Haremhebi", 486 ff.

[741] *Ibid.*, 487. "Horus" refers to Horemheb.

[742] Brugsch, *Thesaurus*, 1073–8.

[743] Maspero's translation is included in: Davis, *Tombs of Harmhabi and Touatânkhamanou*, 9–11 § II (ll. 1–11: "Harmhabi Before his Accession to the Throne"), 19–21 § III (ll. 12–21: "The Accession and Coronation of Harmhabi"), and 40–1 § VI (ll. 21–6: "The Restoration and the Cult of Amon and the Constructions in the Temples").

[744] *Records* III, 12–19 (§ 22–320); Breasted, *Chapter*, 18–20, 22.

[745] Moret, *Caractère*, 80.

[746] Schunck, *Wortstamm*, 81.

(1985)[747] similarly saw the events described in the Turin inscription as giving an account of this king's coronation and used it to support their ideas about the coronation ceremony in general. Hornung (1964), on the other hand, who doubts the existence of a "coronation ceremony," states that "da bisher kein Beispiel einer Trennung von Krönung und Thronbesteigung bzw. Erhebung zum Mitregenten bekanntgeworden ist, besteht kein Anlaß, für die Krönung Haremhabs eine Ausnahme zu machen."[748] The most comprehensive and accurate publication is by Gardiner (1953), the contents of which were further discussed by Dorman and Meyer.[749] Gardiner provided a transcription and translation, and went on to make important points about the "coronation ceremony" in general, as well as about the specific one recounted in this text. For example, noting the absence of any mention of some of the rituals expected to appear in the context of a "standard" coronation ceremony, like the purification, he made one of his most important points, that "some abbreviation of the ordinary ritual is not unlikely, since the coronation of Horemheb had to be fitted into the regular programme of this greatest of the Theban festivals" (the Opet).[750]

It has unfortunately not been possible to gain access to either original source on which the two versions of this text are carved. For this reason, this chapter primarily relies on the two most recent transcriptions by Gardiner and Helck, provided in Appendix D Part 1 of this thesis. There are only a few differences between them, all of which are noted over the course of this chapter.

Besides its importance in terms of shedding light on the coronation ceremony in the New Kingdom, this text also clearly shows, as has long been pointed out, that Horemheb did not hide his non-royal origin; in fact, he made public knowledge of it, and relied instead on his background as one of the highest officials in the country and on his good service to a previous ruler (ll. 4–12).[751] On the other hand, through

[747] Barta, "Rituale", 10, 11.

[748] Hornung, *Untersuchungen*, 38–9.

[749] Gardiner, "Coronation", 13 ff.; Meyer, *Senenmut*, 23–4; Dorman, *Monuments*, 25–6.

[750] *Ibid.*, 24.

[751] Breasted, *Records* III, 13 (§ 22). Birch, however, suggested that Horemheb might have, in fact, been of royal descent ("Haremhebi", 488), while Brugsch did not address this issue. The previous ruler in question was presumably Tutankhamun, even though he is not explicitly named in the text. It has also been argued that his Great Wife, Mutnedjmet, may have been related to the royal family, being the sister of Nefertiti (or nursling of Tey, Ay's wife), but the evidence is inconclusive and scholarly opinion divided, mainly because of the unclear reading of the name of this "sister" of Nefertiti: it is unclear whether the second element of the name, after *mw.t*, should be read *nḏm* (M29) or *bnr* (M30). Brugsch read the sign as *nḏm*, and therefore believed that this "sister" and the wife of Horemheb were one and

statements such as *ỉmn nsw.t-nṯr.w rnn sw* "Amun, king of the gods, was the one who nurtured him" (l. 2), this text makes it seem that Horemheb was intended to be king since birth.[752] Though this may appear paradoxical, it must be remembered that "[p]ossessing the royal *ka* and being possessed by it were *potential* at a person's birth, but they were *actualized* only at his coronation."[753]

The aim of this chapter is to analyse and provide an interpretation of the events related in the Turin and Memphite versions of the text, as well as to attempt to establish whether they give an account of Horemheb's accession to the throne, or his "coronation ceremony" (that is, the first public appearance and participation in a religious festival as king, in the process of which he would have been crowned, since his accession). It is determined that the evidence does not fully support either conclusion, probably due to Horemheb's exceptional circumstances. It is likely, however, that the events of the text did signal the official start of his reign.

As with the preceding chapters, comparisons are made with other sources, textual as well as pictorial. The latter group thus far mostly consisted of references to instances of the coronation sequence, and these served to underline the similarities between them and the events related in coronation inscriptions. The situation is more complex in this chapter due to (1) the uncertainty as to how much of Horemheb's account reflects the standard ritual procedure of the Opet festival, a situation further complicated by the similarities referred to above, and due to (2) uncertainty regarding when a given coronation sequence is meant to be representing episodes of the Opet festival. (3) Complicating matters even further is the uncertainty regarding where the bulk of the events of the text are taking place, in Thebes or in Luxor, the temples of both of which contain reliefs matching events from the "coronation" texts of

---

the same person (*Geschichte*, 438). Davies followed the same reading (*Rock Tombs of El Amarna* II, 6–7, 13–15), until Sethe ("Schwägerin", 134–35) pointed out the *bnr* alternative (*Rock Tombs of El Amarna* VI, 4 no. 1 and 18 no. 1). Most recently, Kawai does not believe that the two of them were the same person ("Ay Versus Horemheb", 269), unlike Booth (*Horemheb*, 85). As for Dodson (*Amarna Sunset*, 98 and 114), while he admits that it is not certain whether she was related to the royal family, states that the "identity between Nefertiti's sister and Horemheb's wife is probably the most attractive solution," and adds that while she never bore the title of King's Daughter, "given the treatment meted out to Ay, this may well have been a connection Horemheb would not have wished to publicize" (*ibid.*, 114).

[752] In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, Thutmose III similarly declared that "he (Amun) commanded that I shall be on his throne since I was one-who-was-in-his-egg" (col. 1; *Urk.* IV, 157,2–3), and Hatshepsut, in the *Historical Inscription*: "I am a king because of the command of my father, from whom I came forth" (# 147,21: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 32).

[753] Bell, "Divine", 140. See also: Bell, "Luxor", 251 ff.; Bell, "Aspects", 31 ff.

Horemheb. Egyptological opinion is divided, but it is argued here that it would have been Luxor. For this reason, whenever a ritual or series thereof matches a sequence of scenes in Karnak, perhaps representing episodes of the Opet festival, corresponding ones from Luxor Temple are cited as well.

I. Analysis of the Text

1. Beginning of the procession in Karnak (ll. 12–13; Urk. IV*, 2116,9–2117,1)*

The section of the Turin text which deals with the "coronation" ceremony begins in the twelfth line.

(12) [*… ḫr m-ḫt hrw.w ꜥšɜ.w*] *swɜ*(*.w*) *ḥr nn*
sɜ sms n Ḥr m r-ḥry m ỉry-pꜥt n tɜ pn mỉ ḳd=f
ỉst rf nṯr pn šps Ḥr nb Ḥw.t-nsw.t ɜb.n ỉb=f smn.t sɜ=f ḥr ns.t=f n nḥḥ
wḏ (13) [*…*] *ỉmn*
wḏɜ.ỉn ḥr m ḥꜥw.t r Wɜs.t nỉw.t nb nḥḥ
sɜ=f m ḳnỉ=f r ỉp.t-Sw.t
r bs=f m-bɜḥ ỉmn
r swḏ n=f ỉɜ.t=f n nsw.t
r ỉr.t ꜥḥꜥw=f

(12) [After many days] had passed by on these things,
the eldest son of Horus was the chief of the *pꜥt*-people ("hereditary nobles") of this entire land.
Now, this noble god Horus, lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, his heart wished (to) establish his son upon his throne of eternity.
[Subject] commanded (13) […] Amun.
Horus then proceeded amid rejoicing to Thebes, the city of the Lord of Eternity,
his son in his embrace, to Karnak,
in order to induct him into the presence of Amun,
in order to transfer to him his office of king
and in order to make his lifetime.

That the festival occasion here is the Opet is based on two passages from this text: (1) "… in his (i.e. Amun's) beautiful festival, the foremost of Southern Opet (i.e. Luxor)" (l. 14), and (2) "Afterwards, this foremost festival of Southern Opet came to an end" (l.

21).[754] Furthermore, according to Horemheb's coronation inscription in the temple of Montu in Karnak, assuming that it tells of the same event: *tỉ ḥm=f ḥr sḫˁi.t ỉt=f m ḥb=f nfr n ỉp.t* "while his Person (Horemheb) was causing his father to appear in his beautiful festival of Opet."[755]

The text informs us that a long time had passed by then, since Horemheb had risen through the ranks, eventually becoming the *r-ḥry* "chief" and *ỉry-pˁt* "hereditary noble" (l. 6) under an unnamed preceding king, even being the one whom he summoned for his counsel at a point when *ˁḥ wɜ=f r nšn* "the palace, it fell into rage" (l. 7).[756] It is fitting that the sentence following this introductory passage is introduced with the particles *ỉst rf*: Oréal, citing an instance from the story of Sinuhe, argues that one of the functions of *ỉst rf* is to "lancer le récit lui-même après la mise en place descriptive du cadre"[757], with the sentence which it marks being grammatically and syntactically independent.[758] In Horemheb's inscription, too, the particles mark a sentence following a statement which set the scene with Horemheb having reached the highest echelons of society after a long and successful career. The setting now described, the narrative may resume, but not before the text makes one more remark, through the sentence marked with *ỉst rf*: that Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* was there to make Horemheb Pharaoh. The narrative of the text can then resume.

After a laconic sentence from which it can only be ascertained that its verb is *wḏḥ* "to command" (l. 12), and that it ends with "Amun" (l. 13), the text mentions the god Horus, in procession, going to Karnak temple with Horemheb in order to introduce (*bs*) him to Amun so that he may be given the royal office (l. 13). What is described here is the very beginning of the Opet festival: Horemheb entered Karnak temple with

[754] *Urk.* IV, 2117,2–3 and 2119,8.

[755] *Urk.* IV, 2125,9 (l. 6). Note the similar phraseology in a caption of a scene of one of the doors communicating the ritual palace in Medinet Habu with its First Court which depicts Ramses III leaving the palace and entering the court *r sḫˁi ỉt=f ỉmn m ḥb=f n ỉn.t* "in order to cause his father Amun to appear in his Festival of the Valley" (*PM* II, 493 (65), *MH* II, 123 B).

[756] Tutankhamun is the king in question (Gardiner, "Coronation", 21).

[757] Oréal, *Particules*, 237.

[758] *Ibid.*, 235, 237; this, however, is a function of *ỉst* alone, and not of its combination with *rf*: *ibid.*, 233. The role of these particles is discussed further below: *infra*, 208 nos. 778–81. The particles *ỉst* and *rf* together appear up to four times in the part of the inscription covered in this chapter, in ll. 12, 13–14, 14, and 21. The second instance is uncertain, given that *ỉst* survives at the end of l. 13, with the *rf* which may have followed being missing, along with the remainder of the start of l. 14.

the image of Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, with the people of Thebes celebrating and cheering, so that he could encounter Amun inside. It must be noted, however, that Horus of the site of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, the ancient name for el-Kom el-Ahmar Sawaris, near Sharuna[759], is out of place here in the context of the Opet festival, so he must have been of great importance to Horemheb for him to have ordered that his image be brought all the way from el-Kom el-Ahmar Sawaris.[760] It has reasonably been assumed that this town was perhaps Horemheb's birthplace, but this is uncertain.[761] The participation of Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* might have been important to Horemheb as a legitimisation technique through a play of words on his *nomen*. Whatever the reason, the presence of this god meant something to Horemheb, and the transportation of the images of gods on special occasions is well attested. An example is the *Sed*-festival, when the images of gods from many temples throughout Egypt were brought to one place. This is evidenced by the many scenes depicting this festival, as well as by an inscription in the tomb of Setau, the high-priest of Nekhbet at El-Kab.[762] This inscription says that, on the *sp tpy Sd* "first occasion of the *Sed*(-festival)" of Ramses III, *wḏ.n ḥm=f dỉ.t m-ḫr-n ỉmy-r nỉw.t ṯɜty tɜ r* [*ỉṯɜ tɜ dp.t nṯr n nḫb.t r pɜ ḥb-Sd*] *r ỉr.t n.t-ꜥ=s m ḥw.t ḥb-Sd* "His Person commanded the instruction of the Overseer of the City, the Vizier, Ta, to [fetch (lit. "to take, seize") the divine barque of Nekhbet to the *Sed*-festival] in order to perform her rituals in the shrines of the *Sed*-festival."[763]

---

[759] That Gardiner, in his translation of the text, calls this god "Horus of Ḥnēs," must be understood as a mistake, for "Ḥnēs" refers not to el-Kom el-Ahmar Sawaris, but to modern Ihnasya el-Medina (*Eg. Ḥw.t-nn-nsw.t*, *Gk.* Herakleopolis) further north (Gardiner, *Onomastica* 2 *Text*, 106*–108* (387A) and 113* (389); Baines and Malek, *Atlas*, 129). However, it is obvious that Gardiner, in his article, was in fact referring to el-Kom el-Ahmar Sawaris when he mentioned "Ḥnēs" ("Coronation", 16,b and 21). The reason behind the confusion probably has to do with what Gardiner himself pointed out in his *Onomastica*, saying that the pronunciation of the names of these two places was probably very similar (*Onomastica*, 108*).

[760] While it may seem surprising specifically in the context of this festival, it is to be remembered that Horemheb had a fondness for the various aspects of Horus: in his rock-cut temple at Abahuda (modern Gebel Adda), now submerged under the waters of Lake Nasser, a scene depicted him standing before Thoth and four local forms of Horus, namely, Horus of Maam, Buhen, Bak and Maha (*PM* VII, 121, 3; Murray, *Egyptian Temples*, 236).

[761] Dodson, *Amarna Sunset*, 111.

[762] *PM* V, 181–2 (plan p. 178). For the discussion on this text, see: Gardiner, *Nekhbet*, 47–51. For other *Sed*-festival scenes which show that gods would have attended this festival: Naville, *Festival-Hall*, pls. 5, 13, 25; Kees, *Grosse Festdarstellung*, 28, 53, pls. 9 [193], 10 [198, 201–4].

[763] *Ibid.*, 48–49.

The Identity of Horus

Before venturing further into the text, an important detail must be highlighted: Horus is referred to as "Horus, the lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*" (ll. 12 and 14), while elsewhere he is named merely "Horus" (l. 13). This leads one to wonder whether these were one and the same, and if they were not, then who this "Horus" could have been. Ay has been proposed as a possible candidate, "Horus" being reference to the reigning king at the time, who was present "in order to induct him [Horemheb] into the presence of Amun in order to transfer to him his office of king" (l. 13), therefore making him his coregent.[764] This, however, would be likelier in the absence of enmity between Ay and Horemheb.[765] It is nevertheless conceivable for Horemheb to have used the previous king's "legitimising" power to make him coregent in the presence of the rest of the court and the population, regardless of Horemheb's own views on Ay's legitimacy. Another explanation for this reference to Horus might be that it was the image of another Horus that was ferried upriver to Thebes on this joyous occasion, but this seems doubtful.[766]

Textual context supports the notion that the Horus without epithets in line 13 was one and the same as the Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* in lines 12 and 14. It is stated that the former came to Karnak with Horemheb "*in his embrace*" "in order to *induct him* in the presence of Amun" (l. 13), after which the text continues: "he (Amun) saw the Person

[764] Dodson, *Amarna Sunset*, 111–12; Booth, *Horemheb*, 91; Aldred, *Amarna Period*, 71. Dodson leaves the question open (*Amarna Sunset*, 112), while Booth is certain that Ay nominated Horemheb as his successor during the Opet festival, and argues that it would not have been possible for Horemheb to have forced Ay to do so against his will due to the public nature of the festival (*Horemheb*, 80, 82). This argument, of course, need not be true, for the simple reason that Horemheb need not have suddenly forced Ay to name him as his heir right then and there. This scenario, while conceivable, is of course also wholly hypothetical.

[765] Much has been written on this subject, of which Kawai provides a concise summary at the beginning of his article ("Ay Versus Horemheb", 263–4). His own opinion is that Horemheb "did not plot revenge on Ay, probably because Ay was old and would likely die soon" (*ibid.*, 287), until which time he simply kept his power, and ignored and discredited Ay (*ibid.*, 271 f.). Booth, on the other hand, suggests that there was a "long-term collaboration between them starting under the reign of Tutankhamun" with regard to how the succession was going to play out (*Horemheb*, 76). Dodson makes arguments for both positions (*Amarna Sunset*, 112–14), but it must be added that his argument for a smooth transition from one reign to the other is largely based on his hypothesis that Nakhtmin was a son of Ay (*ibid.*, 99), which is unfortunately also another big point of contention. Kawai also regards Nakhtmin as his son ("Ay Versus Horemheb", 286), but Booth makes a strong case for this not having been the case (*Horemheb*, 67). See also: Schulman, "Some Observations", 62–3; Habachi, *LÄ* III, s.v. "Königssohn von Kusch", 633, 638 n. 86; Morkot, "Nakhtmin", 7–8.

[766] Cf. Dodson, *Amarna Sunset*, 112.

of this god Horus, Lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t, his son with him* in the *royal induction* in order to give him his office and his throne" (l. 14). The flow of the narrative and proximity of these two specific events indicate that there is little room for doubt in the identification of the Horus without epithets with the lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*. Nor could the reference in this light possibly be to Ay, for "lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*" would in this case be an epithet of his, whereas non-divinized kings are never named as the lord of a specific locale.[767] The assumption that *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* is a reference not to el-Kom el-Ahmar Sawaris, but to the palace ("the House of the King" being its direct translation), therefore resulting in "Horus, lord of the Palace" (i.e. the king: Ay) does not work either.[768] *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* is an attested archaeological site and its local god is said to have been Horus; there is therefore no reason to believe that Ay was present. In short, it appears that Horemheb, along with Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, entered Karnak temple so that the meeting with Amun could take place.

2. *The encounter of Horemheb and Horus with Amun (ll. 13–14; Urk.* IV*, 2117,2–6)*

ỉst (14) [*rf ỉmn nb ns.wt tɜ.wy pr.w m ḥ*]ʿy[769] *m ḥb=f nfr ḫnty ỉp.t-Rsy.t*
mɜ.ỉn=f ḥm n nṯr pn Ḥr nb Ḥw.t-nsw.t sɜ=f ḥnʿ=f
m bs-nsw.t r rdỉ.t n=f ỉɜ.t=f ns.t=f

Now, (14) [Amun, the lord of the thrones of the Two Lands, had gone forth in jo]yousness in his beautiful festival, the foremost of Southern Opet (i.e. Luxor).[770]

He then saw the Person of this god, Horus, Lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*,
his son with him in the royal induction in order to give him his office and his throne.

[767] In other coronation texts, other kings are also not referred to by name, but indirectly, through the use of titles and epithets. In the case of the Historical Inscription of Hatshepsut, another king is referred to with *nṯr nfr* (# 287,5: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 26; cf. Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 135 (§ 179 b,l,p); Gillen, *Historical Inscription*, 22), while Thutmose III's *Jeunesse* refers to another king with *ḥm=f* (*Urk.* IV, 158,4).

[768] There is no entry for this in the Wörterbuch. Hannig, on the other hand, does list *ḥw.t* under "Palast," but according to him this usage is rare (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Deutsch–Ägyptisch*, 950).

[769] Restoration by Sethe (*Urk.* IV, 2117, 2).

[770] Kruchten translates: "Pendant que [Amon-Rê …] était dans Sa belle fête de la 'Navigation d'Opet du Sud'" (*Annales*, 169).

The beginning of the next line (l. 14) is broken off; two alternative reconstructions have been proposed, the one presented above by Helck. Gardiner proposed: "Behold, [Amun] ... [arisen] in his beautiful festival."[771] It is with the Opet festival in mind that the subject "Amun" of the stative construction [*ỉmn*] ... [*ḥꜥy*] has been restored, while the predicate has been restored as the stative *ḥꜥy* based on the fact that half of the arm hieroglyph (D 36 of Gardiner's sign-list) survives, along with the two diagonal strokes (Z 4); Gardiner supported his restoration by comparing the preserved parts of the hieroglyphs with the writing of the stative of *ḥꜥy* in l. 20.[772] The gap left between the restored stative and its subject is not a long one, and probably consisted of one or two epithets of Amun. Helck thought so as well: he added the name of the sun-god Ra to "Amun," and inserted the epithet *nb ns.(w)t tꜣ.wy* "the lord of the thrones of the Two Lands." He restored the rest of the lacuna differently, however: "[Amonre ... aber war herausgegangen in Jube]l an seinem schönen Fest."[773] In the contemporary inscriptions accompanying the depictions of the Opet festival on the side walls of the processional colonnade in Luxor Temple,[774] it is the verb *wbn* that is used to denote the appearance of the god.[775] Helck's restoration could thus be slightly altered while still keeping the same meaning. This, however, cannot be applied to Gardiner's suggestion, the last word in the restoration of whom is the *tertiae infirmae* verb *ḥꜥỉ* as a stative with an *.y* ending for the third person singular masculine.[776] All things considered, all three verbs are appropriate for Helck's restoration, since both *wbn* and *ḥꜥỉ* could be used to describe the rising of the sun and therefore, metaphorically, the "appearance" of a god or king in public on the occasion of a festival, and since it is attested for the verb *prỉ* to describe the public appearance of a god in a festival.[777] Whichever verb was used, the meaning

[771] Gardiner, "Coronation", 15.

[772] *Ibid.*, 15, 22 (ee).

[773] *Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 17–22)*, 2117 on p. 405.

[774] *PM* II, 314–15 (77–86); *Urk.* IV, 2037–43; Murnane, "Grande fête d'Opet", 22–5.

[775] Example: *Urk.* IV, 2038,4,13. The interchangeability between the words *ḥꜥ* and *wbn* is especially clear on a scene in the Great Hypostyle Hall (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 36 cols. 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 39 and 42).

[776] Hoch, *Grammar*, 130–1, § 84.

[777] For *wbn*: *Wb.* I, 293; *ḥꜥỉ*: *Wb.* III, 239; *prỉ*: *Wb*. I, 519, 525. For a detailed general discussion of *ḥꜥỉ*, see: Schunck, *Untersuchungen*. For a study of the *ḥꜥỉ* of a king: Redford, *History*, 3–27.

of the sentence is clear: Amun "appeared" in procession for the Opet festival or was at least about to do so.

The role of *ỉst*, and the accuracy of Sethe's restoration of *rf* as the first word in the lacuna immediately following it, bears discussion. The particle *ỉst* marks its sentence as unrelated to the ones preceding and following it, with or without *rf*.[778] According to Oréal, *ỉst* intervenes "à un moment de décrochement du récit, où le progrès de l'action cesse pour laisser place à une information placée sur un autre plan énonciatif."[779] In our text, this sentence beginning with *ỉst* accordingly interrupts the flow of the narrative: the sentence preceding it tells of the god Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* arriving in procession to Thebes in order to bring Horemheb into Amun's presence to make him king (l. 13); the following sentence immediately resumes this narrative, with Horemheb and Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* in Amun's presence (l. 14); while the sentence beginning with *ỉst*, interrupting the narrative, informs us that, in the meantime, Amun had already emerged out of his sanctuary in order to participate in the Opet festival (ll. 13–14). As for *rf*, its presence in combination with *ỉst* "est liée au changement du topique caractéristique de ces lieux de rupture textuelle."[780] Applying this to Horemheb's text, it is clear that there is a change in the main agent: whereas it was Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* beforehand, the clause beginning with *ỉst* introduces Amun as the subject of the sentence (ll. 13–14), on whom the action centres afterwards (ll. 14–16). This therefore suggests that the particle *rf* should indeed be restored in the lacuna after *ỉst*, making it the first word in the next line (l. 14). The role played by *ỉst rf* here would therefore match the one Oréal attributes to it, in that they mark the content of their sentence as "une circonstance préalable qui constitue une indication pertinente pour visualiser ce qui va suivre".[781] This is similar to the role of *ỉst rf* in l. 12, where it introduced new additional background information as well, but without interrupting the narrative of the text, instead launching it after a sentence which set the scene.[782]

[778] Oréal, *Particules*, 233 (without), 235 and 237 (with).

[779] *Ibid.*, 235, cf. 232.

[780] *Ibid.*, 235.

[781] *Ibid.*, 237.

[782] On these two roles played by the particle *ỉst*, see: *ibid.*, 232.

On the meeting place of Horemheb with Amun

Even though it is not known where inside Karnak temple the king would have first met ("seen") Amun on the occasion of the Opet festival, guesses can still be made. Bell believes that the procession would have started in the Akhmenu;[783] Refai agrees, but adds that this was only the case until the building of Karnak's Great Hypostyle Hall.[784] In the time of Horemheb, the Great Hypostyle Hall in its complete form did not exist yet, but the central two rows of columns may have been constructed in the reign of Amenhotep III.[785] By analogy with the trend at the time, when temples proper were entered through a pylon, there might have been one in between this gateway and the 3rd Pylon of Amenhotep III, fronting the colonnade. This would have then formed the entrance to the east-west axis of Karnak, only to be later removed to make room for the construction of the 2nd Pylon, if the two were not one and the same.[786] Before the columns surrounding the two central rows were added, those forming this central row would have formed a colonnade very similar to Luxor Temple's Processional Colonnade, which is of the same date.[787] Starting with its construction and until Ramses II later added his pylon and peristyle court in front of it, this colonnade was probably also fronted by a pylon—again exactly like its counterpart in Karnak temple.[788] Back to the procession: during the time of the events recounted in the Turin inscription, then,

---

[783] Bell, "Divine", 160.

[784] Refai, "Notes", 394.

1. *[785] Chevrier, "Chronologie", 35–6; Lauffray, Karnak d'Égypte, 63. This, however, appears to have been called into question (Blyth, Karnak, 106).*

[786] While the accepted theory is that Horemheb was the one who built the 2nd Pylon (*PM* II, 36 f.), it could not have been built yet at this point, so early in his reign. This is unless it was already complete, and Horemheb had the cartouches replaced with his own; but I am unaware of any such argument. Donadoni says that there is no doubt that this pylon was built by Horemheb, the reason being that its filler material came from temples of Amenhotep IV (*Thèbes*, 35). This, however, obviously does not take the reigns of Tutankhamun and Ay into account, who may have built it in accordance with an overall plan by Amenhotep III.

[787] For the similarity between the two colonnades, see: *ibid.*, 34; Chevrier, "Chronologie", 35–6. For Amenhotep III having begun the construction of the Processional Colonnade at Luxor Temple: Bell, "Divine", 153; *PM* II, 312. This has long been known: Wolf, *Schöne Fest*, 1. While the decoration was also begun in Amenhotep III's reign, it was mostly done in the reigns of Tutankhamun and Ay, whose cartouches Horemheb had later replaced with his own (Bell, "Divine", 153). Haeny includes the Great Hypostyle Hall in his work on the "basilical layout" of certain ancient Egyptian structures (Haeny, *Basilikale Anlagen*, 29–61), while Borchardt—interestingly—had earlier mistakenly described the Processional Colonnade at Luxor Temple as an unfinished basilica (Borchardt, "Geschichte Luqsortempels", 133).

[788] Bell, "Divine", 289, no. 72.

the Hypostyle Hall would not have existed yet; a colonnade may have been in its place, one which could have acted as a departure point for the procession. Indeed, in a dedication inscription by Ramses II on one of the columns of the Great Hypostyle Hall, which would have taken over the role of the preceding colonnade, this structure is referred to as *s.t n.t ḫˁ n nb nṯr.w* "the place of the appearance of the lord of the gods."[789]

Complicating matters however, is the fact that there existed two principal images of Amun residing in Karnak temple, one being the hidden, cult image of god kept in the *Akhmenu* which would never have left the temple, and the other being the god's processional image used during his outings on the occasion of certain rituals and great festivals, such as the Opet, housed in Thutmose III's granite barque shrine.[790]

The statement that Amun "saw the Person of this god Horus, lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, his son with him in the royal induction in order to give him his office and his throne" therefore poses a problem: was this meeting in the *Akhmenu*, with the secret image of the god, or in the granite barque shrine, with the god's processional image? While the passages inside the *Akhmenu* were narrow, this does not mean that there was no room for Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* to have been carried by a group of priests in his barque.[791] The mention of the *bs-nsw.t* itself, at least according to Kruchten, suggests that the meeting place was the sanctuary inside the *Akhmenu*, given that the "induction" meant being made to enter into the presence of the main, hidden statue of the god, his "image de

[789] *KRI* II, 558,4. Cf. Refai, "Notes", 395.

[790] Kruchten, *Annales*, 253–4.

[791] Regardless of whether it actually happened or not, it has been suggested that the barque of Amun, before the enlargement of the platform on which it would have been placed for carrying (the "pavois") during the reign of Thutmose III between his first and second *Sed*-festivals, would have at least been able to proceed through the *Akhmenu* (Kruchten, *Annales*, 254 f.; Legrain, "Logement et transport", 44–5). According to Carlotti, the barque of Amun would not have entered the *Akhmenu* even before the size of the *pavois* was increased ("Essai de datation", 238–9) toward the end of Thutmose IV's reign (*ibid.*, 244–8; *contra* Karlshausen, who had dated the enlargement of the *pavois* to the reign Tutankhamun: "L'évolution", 122–5, 127, 130–1; Wiercińska has since argued for the reign of Thutmose III, after regnal year 42: "Change of Dimensions", 225–6). It seems relatively certain, however, that images of other gods in barques were carried in the *Akhmenu*, as evidenced by the fact that, as Carlotti points out ("Essai de datation", 239, no. 23), there is a representation of the barque of Sokar (the *pavois* of which was smaller) on the south wall of this god's hypostyle hall inside the *Akhmenu* (*PM* II, 116 (369)), as well as another representation of a barque procession, this time in the *ḥr.t-ib*, of which only the legs of the carriers of the barque remain. I have found two scenes on the west wall of the same room (*PM* II, 115 (366) and (368)) which bear the remains of the depiction of a procession.

culte" (as opposed to his "image de procession"), to which simple *wꜥb*-priests, who had not undergone an induction, would not have had access.[792]

Kruchten clearly sees the induction of Horemheb in Turin lines 13–14 as an exceptional case: "en l'occurrence, le verbe *bs*(*i*) se rapporte, donc, plutôt, à l'entrée effective (le *bs-nsw*) d'Horemheb dans Karnak, sous la direction de son dieu local, qu'à l''initiation' de ce roi, qui ne peut avoir été le fait que du Seigneur d'Ipet-sout en personne," referring to a literal "passage" as opposed to an "induction" into the royal office.[793] It must still be wondered, however, how Horemheb, who was not yet king, could access the sanctuary, or at least the restricted parts of the temple. The caption of an induction scene on the inner (eastern) face of the north half of the 2nd Pylon (the west wall of the Great Hypostyle Hall), *bs-nsw.t r ḥw.t-nṯr ꜣḫ-Sty-mry-n-ỉmn-m-pr-ỉmn mꜣ*[*=k*] *ỉt=k nb nṯr.w* "Royal induction to the temple 'Sety-beloved-of-Amun-in-the-estate-of-Amun' so that you (Sety I) may see [your] father, the lord of the gods," shows Sety being introduced into the presence of Amun in the Great Hypostyle Hall, and thus that the *bs-nsw.t* need not always have taken place with the god's hidden image, but that this could have been with the processional image, in a semi-public part of Karnak temple (fig. 13).[794] That the meeting in this case is with the processional image is supported by the epithet *nb nṯr.w* used to describe the deity.[795]

Further strengthening this notion is the induction scene of a coronation sequence on the same wall, the purpose of which was also so that Sety can "see" the "lord of the gods" (fig. 3).[796] This is followed by a culmination scene in which Amun's caption makes it clear that the setting here too is the Hypostyle Hall (fig. 4).[797]

This supports Kruchten's argument that *bs* can refer to the act itself of entering into the presence of the statue of a god, but also argues against the fact that this need

[792] Kruchten, *Annales*, 166, 173–7, 251–4.

[793] *Ibid.*, 174. He argues, based on Papyrus Turin 1882 which relates the induction of Ramses IV, that it would have been the processional image of Amun's role to introduce the individual to be inducted into the *Akhmenu*, into the presence of the main cult image (*ibid*., 174–5).

[794] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 137 cols. 1–2.

[795] Kruchten, "Maître des dieux", 179 ff.; cf. *Djéhoutymose*, 337–54.

[796] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 149 cols. 1, 3–4. See also the discussion in the Hatshepsut chapter and scenes of the doors on the south wall of the First Court at Medinet Habu connecting the ritual palace with the forecourt (e.g. *PM* II, 495 (77) d, *MH* IV, 237 A; chapter 3, 47–8, 60–1). For a collection of primary sources mentioning the "appearance" of Amun in public locations on the occasion of the Valley festival: Seyfried, *Fest des Tales*, 28–9.

[797] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150, cols. 6–7.

necessarily have been into that of his hidden, non-processional, image, and therefore inside the *Akhmenu*. Horemheb's induction thus need not necessarily have been in the *Akhmenu*, into the presence of Amun's cult image, but could have taken place in the granite barque shrine or in the forecourt (or colonnade, had it existed yet) in front of the 3rd Pylon, to meet the processional image. The mention of Amun having "[appeared in joy]ousness in his beautiful festival, the foremost of Southern Opet" (l. 14) (whichever of the three verbs suggested above was used), that is, out of his sanctuary, favours the latter explanation.

3. *Amun joins the festival and leads Horemheb to the pr-nsw.t and pr-wr (ll. 14–16; Urk.* IV*, 2117,7–13)*

ỉst rf ỉmn-Rᶜ ꜣbḫ(.w) m rš rš

mꜣ.n=f […] (l. 15) *hrw rdỉ.t ḥtp.w=f*

ᶜḥᶜ.n ms.n=f sw n smsw pn ỉry-pᶜt ḥry-tp tꜣ.wy Ḥr-m-ḥb

wḏꜣ.ỉn=f r pr-nsw.t rdỉ.n=f sw ḫr-ḥꜣ.t=f r pr-wr n sꜣ.t=f šps.t Wr.t-

(l. 16)[*Ḥkꜣ.w*]

[ᶜ.*wy* (*?*)=*s*](*y*)[798] *m nyny*

Now, Amun-Ra had joined in the celebration.[799]

He saw […] (l. 15) the day of making his offerings,

then went up to[800] this elder, the hereditary noble (*ỉry-pᶜt*), the one who has authority over the Two Lands (*ḥry tp tꜣ.wy*), Horemheb,

and then proceeded to the *pr-nsw.t* and placed him before himself at the *pr-wr* of his noble daughter Weret-(l. 16)[Hekau],

---

[798] The restoration of ᶜ.*wy*=*s*(*y*) proposed by Helck (as well as Gardiner: "Coronation", 15) is entirely plausible based on the context and on a partially preserved horizontal line (the suffix pronoun, =*s*, Gardiner sign-list O 34); however, I think that this, along with *Ḥkꜣ.w*, does not fill out the entire lacuna.

[799] As with the preceding two instances of *ỉst rf* (ll. 12, 13–4), this is translated as "now." The role of these particles is similar the one they played in the second instance, where the presence of *ỉst* "va de pair avec l'apport d'une information que l'on peut qualifier d'arrière-plan, dans la mesure où elle est pertinente pour interpréter l'enchaînement des actions que p interrompt" ("p" being the clause marked with the particle: Oréal, *Particules*, 232). The particle *rf*, on the other hand, signals "le franchissement d'une étape dans le récit, avec l'ouverture de la scène qui commence par p" (*ibid.*, 74). In our text here, *ỉst* serves to interrupt the narrative, before resuming it, to inform the reader that Amun had now joined the festival. *rf*, aside from reframing the text's attention around another figure, a "protagoniste" (in this case, Amun; *ibid.*, 75), indicates and emphasises the beginning of a new section in the events related by the text, this being that Amun had now become an active participant in the festival.

[800] *ms* (with reflexive pronoun and *n*): "sich begeben zu jem." (*Wb*. II, 135,19); "betake o'self" (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 116).

[h]er [arms] in the *nyny*-gesture.

The sentence describing Amun joining the celebration is not preserved in the Memphite stela, but the sentence describing the procession to the *pr-nsw.t* and the *pr-wr* is exactly the same in both versions.[801] Weret-Hekau, conventionally translated as "The Great of Magic," could refer to a goddess in her own right, but could also be used as an epithet for several goddesses including Isis, Mut and Sekhmet, as well as for the crown and the Uraeus, as discussed in the previous two chapters.[802] After Horemheb and Horus went to Karnak temple, they certainly met with the processional image of Amun.

The precise act which made the god join the procession is unfortunately unknown due to a lacuna in the middle of the pertaining sentence "he saw […] on the day of making his offerings" (ll. 14–15). Its second half, however, is interesting. It will be remembered that the presentation of offerings had a great part to play in both the *Historical Inscription* and the *Texte de la jeunesse*: in the former, this ritual was postponed (due to Amun not having performed his expected *bỉꜣy.t* at the *Station*) until Hatshepsut could be made king, only at which point were the offerings presented. In the *Jeunesse*, no such interruption took place, but the *bỉꜣy.t*-signs Amun performed for Thutmose III at the *Station* were done soon after the presentation of offerings. One of the oracular sessions related on block 287 of the *Historical Inscription* also mentions the occasion being one of the making of offerings (for Sekhmet), and this was also not only in a *wsḫ.t* "court" (but of Luxor Temple), but also at a *Station* (*BL* 40; *H* 25–6, # 287,3–7). The shared factors between these four are therefore (1) public location, (2) presentation of offerings, on which occasion (3) Amun exhibits exception favour toward an individual who was either already king, or was to become one. It appears therefore that in Horemheb's text as well, Amun joined the procession on the day of a presentation of offerings, a public event, by "betaking" himself to a non-royal individual. Hatshepsut was already king by the time of the presentation of the offerings

[801] Turin ll. 15–16: *Urk.* IV, 2117,9–12; Memphis Stela l. 5: *Urk.* IV, 2121,18–20). While the second element in *wr.t-ḥḳꜣ.w* is not preserved in the Turin text, falling at the beginning of the line, there can be no doubt as to this restoration: only the *kꜣ*-hieroglyph (D 28) and the plural strokes (Z 2) are missing in the Memphite stela, but the presence of the cobra determinative confirms this reading. Gardiner mentioned how this passage had previously been seen as referring to Horemheb's marriage with Mutnedjmet, an interpretation which had since been refuted by Sethe (Gardiner, "Coronation", 19,ll).

[802] *Wb.* I, 328. For a discussion of the word *ḥḳꜣ*, see: Ritner, *Mechanics*, 14–28; Borghouts, "*ꜣḫ.w* (akhu) and *ḥḳꜣ.w* (hekau)", 29–46. For the Uraeus-goddess, see: Troy, "Mut", 301 ff.; Troy, "Religion", 125–7, 132.

in the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription*, but was not so in the oracular session related on block 287. Thutmose III's case, as stated in the previous chapter, is debatable, but he may not have actually become a king, the overall event having consisted of the prediction (*sr*) that this would one day happen (as in Thutmose III's text on the 7th Pylon and Hatshepsut's block 287). What is clear, however, is that he was not yet Pharaoh at the start of the text. Horemheb, similarly, was clearly not yet royalty at this point in his text through the references to him as "this elder, the hereditary noble (*iry-pʿt*), the one who has authority over the Two Lands" (l. 15); unless, of course, historical accuracy was abandoned in favour of artistic liberty to portray the events of the text (which relates his coming to power from humble non-royal origins) in such a way that Horemheb, who had actually officially acceded to the throne already, only became Pharaoh starting the moment that he was acknowledged by Amun on the occasion of the Opet festival.

Due to the unfortunate lacuna however, it is unclear whether the presentation of offerings took place (in the gap) before the procession moved to the *pr-nsw.t*, or at some point afterwards, but still on the same festival day. It is known that a meeting between Horemheb and Amun took place in a public setting, presumably a forecourt and/or colonnade (probably between the 3rd and 4th Pylons). It is also known that among the functions of such temple forecourts was their use as the setting for the presentation of offerings.[803] A likely explanation would therefore be that the offerings were made before the procession to the *pr-nsw.t*. This would of course be in contrast with the *Historical Inscription* however, where the presentation of offerings was done only after she had become king, but would be in agreement with the *Texte de la jeunesse*, where Thutmose III was certainly not royal yet at the performance of this ritual. This interpretation encounters a problem however: in the former it was argued that it was a representative of Thutmose III who presented the offerings, while in the *Texte de la jeunesse* that it would have been Thutmose II. If Horemheb was not king at the time of the presentation of the offerings, and since, as argued in the previous chapter, it was among the king's roles to do so, then it is unclear who it was that performed the presentation in the Turin inscription. This seems to lend support to the notion that the offerings were made after the events in the *pr-nsw.t* had taken place.

[803] Gabolde, "Cour", 55–61.

Amun having joyfully joined the festival, he led Horemheb to the *pr-nsw.t*. This term is of great importance, and requires analysis.

a. *The term pr-nsw.t and "cultic" palaces*

Literally, this term means "house of the king" or "royal house" and refers to the palace or parts thereof in the sense of the actual residence of the king ("Wohnpalast"), as an administrative centre ("Regierungspalast") or, as might be the case here, as the small structure adjoining a temple which would have been used as a resting place by the king during festivities. Noteworthy however is that although it is clear that such "cultic" palaces did exist, only the first two possibilities are listed in the *Wörterbuch* under *pr-nsw.t*, as well as the dictionary by Hannig.[804] Gardiner himself, although he argued that *pr-nsw.t* designated not a palace, but a temple in this case (Luxor Temple), acknowledged that the "Berlin dictionary quotes no other case of *pr-nsw.t* to designate a temple."[805] The same term, furthermore, appears earlier in the text, before the "coronation" section, where Horemheb related his rise to power (l. 10) "[…] the councillors (*ḏꜣḏꜣ.t*) bowing down (*ms ksy*) at the gates (*r rw.ty*) of the *pr-nsw.t*."[806] This detail, overlooked by Gardiner, who translated it the same way as he did the other two instances of the term in the text, as "the King's House," along with *pr-nsw.t* being otherwise unknown to refer to temples, strongly suggests that this term, in l. 15 as well, refers not to a temple, but to a palace.

Several examples of cultic palaces are known from temples on the west bank, and apart from one attested exception, all of these lie to the left (south) of the first court of their respective temples.[807] According to Dieter Arnold, cultic palaces derive

[804] *Wb.* I, 513,3–5. Cf. Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 281; *Wörterbuch* II, 900–02. In the *Wörterbuch*, two references under "der Palast und seine Teile" are to instances of *pr-nsw.t* from Horemheb's Turin inscription, one is the same as the one currently under discussion (from l. 15), while the other appears earlier in the text (l. 10); there can be little doubt that this second instance clearly refers to the administrative palace (*Wb.* I, *Belegstellen*, 513,3).

[805] Gardiner, "Coronation", 25.

[806] *Urk.* IV, 2115,18. Gardiner noted that, due to the absence of a gate-determinative, *r rw.ty* may have alternatively be a compound preposition meaning "outside" ("Coronation", 18,w). There are no such determinatives in the *Historical Inscription* either however, where the translation of *rw.ty*, which appears three times, as "gates" has not been called into question (# 222 + 35,6–7 and 11; # 142,20; Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 8, 14).

[807] The exception is Hatshepsut's, at her Deir el-Bahari temple, which is located in the upper colonnade, but also on the left. It has, however, been argued that this structure may not have consisted of a "palace," since it has been argued that the window it features was not necessarily a "Window of Appearances" (Vomberg, *Erscheinungsfenster*, 250–2). Other known examples of palaces attached to

ultimately from the Early Dynastic Period's "Fortresses of the Gods," a feature which was copied in funerary enclosures of the Early Dynastic period. He states this because these "palaces" are all also to be found "to the *left*, behind the entrance."[808] This theory cannot be proven, as an actual "Fortress of the Gods" has yet to be identified for certain. Furthermore, O'Connor does not call the structures discovered in the southeast quadrants (i.e. to the left of the entrance) of the Early Dynastic funerary enclosures "palaces" but "chapels," in three of which, supporting this notion however, traces of incense burning and libation were discovered.[809] Some of these chapels furthermore have the "palace façade" on some of their exterior walls.[810] These structures could have simultaneously acted as the stage for the performance of rituals for the deceased king (i.e. chapels), as well as symbolizing the actual structure used as a resting place by the king in places where he would have performed or participated in ceremonies (such as the *Sed*-festival and the biennial collection of taxes)—presumably the "Fortress of the Gods."

The buildings which concern us here are the palaces of Karnak and Luxor temples. There is much disagreement as to the role and function of these palaces. Bell describes Luxor Temple's cultic palace as the place where "the king garbed, rested, and ate."[811] With regard to the "funerary"[812] temple palaces, Stadelmann makes good arguments for their having been used by the living as well as by the deceased king.[813] By analogy with the temple palaces of the Mansions of Millions of Years, and based on the interpretation of the *Historical Inscription*, it has been convincingly argued that the palace attached to Karnak temple, at least during the reign of Hatshepsut, was also

---

temples include those of the *ḥw.t-nṯr n.t ḥḥ.w m/n rnpw.t* of Ay/Horemheb, Sety I at Qurna, Ramses II (the Ramesseum) and Ramses III's at Medinet Habu. That of Karnak during the reign of Hatshepsut is attested only textually, but it too seems to have been located in an analogous position in relation to its temple. For discussions on the matter, see: Kemp, *Anatomy*, 212; Stadelmann, "Tempelpalast", 221–42; Gitton, "Palais", 65 (fig. 1 no. 7), 71–2, note 3; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 163,n); Stadelmann, *LÄ* VI, s.v. "Totentempel", 694–711; O'Connor, "Beloved", 298–9 (figs. 7.3 and 7.4).

[808] Arnold, "Cult Complexes", 32–6, 260 (no. 26). Italics not original.

[809] O'Connor, *Abydos*, 171–2.

[810] *Ibid.*, 172.

[811] Bell, "Divine", 154.

[812] I place this word in between quotation marks, since this term has been proven to be inaccurate. Haeny makes an excellent case ("'Mortuary Temples'", 86–126).

[813] For use by the living king as sacristy: Stadelmann, "Tempelpalast", 221 ff. (esp. 241); Kemp, *Anatomy*, 211. For use by the deceased king: Stadelmann, "Totentempel", 312.

somewhere on the left (to the north-west) of its then first court or main entrance.[814] The nature of this palace remains unclear: was it, like that of Luxor Temple and (most probably) those of the west bank temples, also cultic or was it, as has been argued, the administrative and residential palace *par excellence* of the king during his stay in Thebes?[815] Interesting though it is, the focus of this thesis steers it away from establishing the various functions of such palace structures; rather, attention is devoted to determining the location of the *pr-nsw.t* mentioned in the Turin inscription.[816]

b. The pr-nsw.t in the Turin inscription

All scholars agree that the procession would have undoubtedly gone to Luxor Temple at some point during the festivities due to the Opet festival setting: Amun had [arisen] (*wbn*, *prỉ*, or *ḫʿỉ*) "in his beautiful festival, the foremost of Southern Opet" (l. 14); "Afterwards, this foremost festival of Southern Opet came to an end" (l. 21). The majority of the disagreement lies in at which point the journey south occurred, and whether any of the events which would have taken place there are related at all. O'Connor, for example, believes that the journey to Luxor and Opet festival rituals, even though not mentioned explicitly, would have taken place after the royal induction, but before the return to Karnak to enter the *pr-nsw.t* which he identified as the temple-adjacent palace (ll. 14–15).[817] Both Meyer and Dorman also argue that the *pr-nsw.t* is the Karnak palace, where Horemheb was first crowned (ll. 13–21), after which the journey to Luxor, entirely unmentioned in this text, would have taken place (l. 21).[818] According to Bell, Barta, and Gardiner, on the other hand, *pr-nsw.t* refers to Luxor Temple, or a room inside.[819]

---

[814] Gitton, "Palais", 65 (fig. 1), 71–2; Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 103 (§ 163,n); O'Connor, "Beloved", 271–6.

[815] It is clear that by the mid-18th Dynasty, Memphis was the administrative capital of Egypt and therefore where the main Royal Palace would have been (Kemp, *Anatomy*, 208), and this may even have been the case earlier (O'Connor, "Beloved", 279).

[816] Helck and Stadelmann, for example, do not see the Karnak palace as a *Regierungspalast* (arguing for the west bank), but as the temple's "Ritualpalast" (Helck, "Sinai-Inschrift", 205–6; Stadelmann, *LÄ* VI, s.v. "Theben", 467). Others believe this was the main *Regierungspalast* on the east bank of Thebes (O'Connor, "Beloved", 271–6; Redford, "Akhenaten at Thebes I", 88–90; Otto, *Topographie*, 25–6).

[817] O'Connor, "Beloved", 278, 282.

[818] Meyer, *Senenmut*, 23–4; Dorman, *Monuments*, 25–6.

[819] Gardiner, "Coronation", 25; Bell, "Luxor", 273; Barta, "Rituale", 10–11.

i. The *pr-nsw.t* as the palace of Karnak Temple

O'Connor believes that Horemheb met Amun's image outside of Karnak temple (l. 14), and says that they would have then proceeded to Luxor, adding that "the event is not specifically described, but is implied by the Opet Festival setting."[820] Once there, Horemheb would have been announced as king. It was only after this that he and Amun would have gone to the *pr-nsw.t* (l. 15), which he interprets as the Karnak palace, "for in the *pr-nsw.t* Horemheb undergoes essentially the same ceremonies as those held for Hatshepsut in *her* Karnak palace."[821] They would have then gone back to Karnak temple, thus bringing the festivities to an end. There are several problems with this scenario. According to O'Connor, the events of the *Historical Inscription* "provide the basis for a reinterpretation of Horemheb's 'Coronation Text'."[822] It cannot be argued that the *pr-nsw.t* is the Karnak palace simply by comparing it with the *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f* in the *Historical Inscription* however, for the occasion of the events described therein, although unknown, certainly did not consist of the Opet festival.[823] The very lack of any mention of events which would have taken place in Luxor Temple (between lines 14 and 15), is itself problematic: in line 14 is related the *bs-nsw.t* in Karnak, following which is the mention of the day of making offerings, after which it is immediately stated that the procession moved to the *pr-nsw.t* (l. 15). If in the meantime "Horemheb's identity as pharaoh is presumably proclaimed" in Luxor Temple before the procession to the *pr-nsw.t*, then it would be unclear why the text would still refer to him with non-royal titles such as *iry-pˁt* and *ḥry tp-tꜣ.wy* (l. 15) at this point, and even more puzzlingly why Horemheb would have wished not to record this moment when he was transformed into a king, but the later, and therefore less significant, one once back in Karnak. We are therefore left with two options at this point: that (1) the procession had not left Karnak yet before it moved to the *pr-nsw.t* (also in Karnak) or, as is concluded in this chapter, that (2) the sentence *wḏꜣ.in=f* should be seen as referring to the procession moving to Luxor.

[820] *Ibid.*, 278.

[821] *Loc. cit.*

[822] O'Connor, "Beloved", 278.

[823] See chapter 3, 56–7.

Both Meyer and Dorman describe the passage, discussed below, "Going forth out of the *pr-nsw.t* by the Person of this noble god, Amun, the king of the gods, his son in front of him" (ll. 19–20), as relating the start of the journey toward Luxor for the Opet festival, while the entry into the temple and the pertaining rituals are not mentioned.[824] Dorman also notes: "The purpose of the journey to Southern Opet is vague: 'Going forth… in order to hand over to him that which the sun's disk encircles,'" but in fact, this is not the goal of the "going forth."[825] The full sentence, including the part omitted by Dorman, is: "Going forth out of the *pr-nsw.t* by the Person of this noble god, Amun, the king of the gods, his son in front of him. He (Amun) embraced his beauty, he (Horemheb) having arisen with the *khepresh*-crown in order to transfer to him the circuit of the Aten" (ll. 19–20). This shows that the transferring of the circuit of the Aten is the result not of the exit from the *pr-nsw.t*, but of the act of Amun embracing Horemheb. Furthermore, while their views support the notion that the journey to Luxor would have taken place at some point before the 21st line of text (ll. 21–2: "Afterwards, this foremost festival of Southern Opet came to an end, and Amun, the king of the gods, came in peace to Thebes"), it must be noted that this does not exclude an earlier departure toward Luxor than they have suggested.

In the Memphite version of the text, it is clear that Luxor Temple would have indeed been involved in the events of the text, cementing the connection with the Opet festival: a passage of the text from before the section in which it begins matching the Turin text (this being the procession to the *pr-nsw.t*) states [*ỉw=f ḥr ḥt*]*p m ḥw.t=f n*(*.t*) *ỉp.t-rsy.t* "[he (Amun) res]ting in his temple of Luxor."[826] If, as is clear from the Turin version, the royal induction took place in Karnak (ll. 13–14; not preserved in the Memphite version), which is soon followed by the proceeding to the *pr-nsw.t* which, in turn, as according to the Memphite version, took place at some point after Amun was already inside Luxor Temple, then it clearly follows that the proceeding to the *pr-nsw.t* cannot refer to a procession from Karnak temple to its adjacent palace as argued by Meyer and Dorman. Neither can it refer to the journey back to Karnak from Luxor as argued by O'Connor, for the return to Thebes is explicitly stated later in the text (ll. 21–2). We are therefore left with the *wḏꜣ* to the *pr-nsw.t* as referring to the movement of

[824] Meyer, *Senenmut*, 23–4; Dorman, *Monuments*, 25–6.

[825] *Ibid.*, 26.

[826] Memphite ll. 1–2: *Urk.* IV, 2121,6.

the procession from Luxor Temple to its adjacent palace, or perhaps a section of the temple designated here with the term *pr-nsw.t*.

ii. The *pr-nsw.t* as the palace of Luxor Temple

Let us now examine the possibility that it was the Luxor temple cultic palace that was meant by *pr-nsw.t*. This is the view held by Bell, who believes that it would have been accessed from a doorway in the east wall of the temple's Portico.[827] This would place this structure to the left (east) of the front of the temple as it was under Amenhotep III, interestingly mirroring the temple palaces of the west bank, as well as the hypothetical location of the *Nn-wꜣ=i̯-r=f*. He also confusingly argues that these terms "could have been applied at Luxor generally to the Eighteenth Dynasty temple from the Portico to the Barque Sanctuary or, more narrowly, to the First Vestibule itself, where the king's barque and *ka*-statue probably resided."[828] This possibility is examined further below.

If Bell's Luxor Temple palace was indeed the one referred to in Horemheb's texts, then the sentence beginning with *wḏꜣ.in=f* (l. 15) must be understood as telling of the movement of the procession from Karnak to Luxor, therefore the location of the *pr-nsw.t*. Whereas during Hatshepsut's reign the procession from Karnak to Luxor would have been on land and the return journey via the river route, "by the time of Tutankhamun, the river route apparently was used for both legs of the journey."[829] While the Turin inscription describes the events occurring between lines 12 and 22 (the "coronation" ceremony) in a continuous manner, the vast majority of the episodes of the Opet festival are not described. For example, it is known that it did not merely last a single day, but eleven during the reign of Thutmose III, twenty-four during Ramses III's, and finally twenty-seven by the end of his reign.[830] The day of the main events of the "coronation" section of the Turin inscription, it will be remembered, seem to have taken place, or at least begun, on a day of presenting offerings to Amun (l. 15); in the

[827] Bell, "Divine", 154.

[828] Bell, "Luxor", 273–4.

[829] Bell, "Divine", 162, nos. 118 and 120; cf. Darnell, "Opet", 3–4 and Waitkus, *Kult und Funktion* I, 243–4.

[830] Darnell, "Opet," 1; Murnane, *LÄ* IV, s.v. "Opetfest", 574. For the duration of the Opet festival in the reign of Thutmose III (11 days, starting II *ꜣḫ.t* 15): *Urk.* IV, 824,10 (cf. *Urk.* IV, 742,1–2). Ramses III (24 days, from II *ꜣḫ.t* 19 to III *ꜣḫ.t* 12): Schott, *Festdaten*, 85, no. 40; *MH* III, 154 and 156, lists 29–35. Ramses III (27 days, from II *ꜣḫ.t* 19 to III *ꜣḫ.t* 15): Schott, *Festdaten*, 85, no. 41.

Memphite version of the text, a passage after the one cited above mentioning Amun resting in Luxor Temple, and before the procession to the *pr-nsw.t*, is more specific: *ḥḏ.n tɜ 2-nw* [*n h*]*rw* [*ḫp*]*r.w* "The land brightened, and the second [d]ay [hap]pened."[831] A concrete example of an episode of the Opet festival but that is not mentioned in the Turin inscription are the hymns that would have been sung to the barques arriving at Luxor temple's quay.[832] I am reminded of a statement made by Fairman, that the main rituals constituting the coronation ceremony "must have been accompanied by many hymns and by other ceremonies of which we have no suspicion."[833] If the Opet festival lasted so long, the king would have needed a place to stay in order to undertake more mundane actions such as to rest, eat and change clothes, be it due to the effects of heat and intense physical activity on one's body, or to change into different garments required for different rituals.[834] Several sources refer to the king staying in a palace before ceremonies or festivals and then leaving it to participate in them.[835] While this makes a good case for a palace along with its ritualised mundane

[831] *Urk.* IV, 2121,8. For the combination of *ḥḏ* and *tɜ* to express the start of a new day (morning, or dawn): *Wb.* III, 207–8. For ordinal number preceding and connecting with its noun with a genitive: Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 263,2.

[832] These and other hymns are inscribed on the side walls of Luxor Temple's Processional Colonnade (*Urk.* IV, 2037–43).

[833] Fairman, "Kingship", 79.

[834] If, for example, the land route was taken, the walk under the Theban sun from Karnak to Luxor, weighed down by the weight of the barques carried by priests, would have been a tiring affair. This procession would have taken even longer than otherwise, as stops would have been made at six Way Stations. These stops would have, aside from their ritual purpose, also conveniently had the double function of much-needed rest. See: Bell, "Divine", 161, no. 116.

[835] A scene in the Great Hypostyle Hall, for example, shows the king leaving the palace (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 51 A), as does another in Medinet Habu so that Ramses III could participate in the Min festival (*MH* IV, 197). For the first study of the daily investment of the king with the symbols of his office, especially of his crowns through Papyrus Moscow 314, see the detailed work by Bommas pointed out to me by my supervisor, Prof. Mark Smith, which would have otherwise certainly escaped my attention (*Investiturritual*, 1 ff.). According to Goyon, a ritual guide to the New Year's Festival, begins with: "Cérémonial du Grand-Siège lu pendant les fêtes de la terre, (quand) le Seigneur s'éveille dans son Palais" (Goyon, *Confirmation*, 53). As is the case with other monarchies, such as the *grand lever* of Louis XIV in 17th century France (Bommas, *Investiturritual*, XIV–VI), the waking and dressing of the ancient Egyptian king also had ritual significance, and the Brooklyn Museum Papyrus includes a hymn for this (*ibid.*, 53–4; cf. Bommas, *Investiturritual*, 20, 27–30, cf. 164–7 (PT 468)): "[c]eci indique que le Cérémoniaire vient chercher le roi au Palais" (Goyon, *Confirmation*, 19 footnote 5; cf. Bommas' study: "Ort und Zeitpunkt des Rituals" (*Investiturritual*, 118–21)). This palace, therefore, was probably in close proximity to the festival venue, and was probably cultic in nature, not unlike the ones known of Luxor Temple, most of the New Kingdom West Bank temples and (possibly) Karnak temple (Goyon, *Confirmation*, 14). It is also important to note that this New Year's Festival also lasted more than one day (*ibid.*, 41–2), which would have also necessitated a palace(-like) to have been located nearby.

activities as being part of the Opet festival, a third alternative interpretation is possible as well.

iii. The *pr-nsw.t* as Luxor Temple itself

Carved on the north (inner) face of the west wing of Karnak's 8th Pylon, a scene matches a passage from the Turin text: it depicts a procession (*wḏȝ*) consisting of the barque of Amun-Ra, carried by priests.[836] Marching at the front of the procession is the king, led by Montu, as in an induction scene.[837] Let us now recall the rest of line 15 of the Turin text: "he then placed him (Horemheb) before himself at the *pr-wr* of his noble daughter, Weret-[Hekau]."[838] The following pylon scene depicts none other than Weret-Hekau presenting the king to Amun—the culmination scene. In other words, this is a variation of the coronation sequence. The caption of the *bs-nsw.t* with Montu is not published, but most induction scenes having variations of the same, it can be safely assumed to have at least said "Entering and going forth: the induction of the king into the temple,"[839] therefore clarifying the destination of this scene as a temple, and not a palace. The question is which temple this was.

There is much debate regarding the movements of the Opet procession. By the reign of Tutankhamun, it has been argued that the procession would have begun in the *Akhmenu* with the barque of Amun, meeting with Khonsu and Mut in their respective temples, to go to an embarkation-area or *tp-ỉtrw*, to go to Luxor Temple from there.[840] Cabrol states that there is as of yet no archaeological evidence to support the existence

[836] *PM* II 174 (519) I, 1.

[837] *PM* II 174 (519) I, 2. This pylon was built under Hatshepsut, but her names were later replaced by those of Thutmose II.

[838] *Urk.* IV, 2117,11–12.

[839] Cf. two coronation sequences, also on the inner face of the same pylon: *PM* II, 174 (519) II, 3–4 and *PM* II, 174 (517) I. This second is nearly identical to the one under discussion: Amun's barque carried by priests with the king marching in front, but with the *bs-nsw.t* done by Weret-Hekau instead, again anthropomorphic and leonine-headed, while the procession is greeted by Hathor, who is performing the *nyny*-gesture, welcoming the king and the procession to their destination. For *nyny*, see: *Wb.* II, 203. In various contexts, many goddesses were regarded as different forms of one another: Hathor/Isis are other forms of Sekhmet/Tefnut, to name but two (Daumas, *LÄ* II, s.v. "Hathor", 1026–7). Depending on the context, they could be regarded as the mother of the king. Similarly, the crown (i.e. the Uraeus, that is, the daughter/mother of Ra/Horus/the king), Weret-Hekau, also thought of as the mother of the king, could be identified with any of these goddesses (Strauss, *LÄ* III, s.v. "Kronen", 811; Martin, *LÄ* VI, s.v. "Uräus", 865–6). Hathor and Weret-Hekau, already identifiable with one another and, in this scene, performing similar actions of leading the king into the temple/welcoming him into it, must be regarded as being one and the same.

[840] Darnell, "Opet", 4; Bell, "Divine", 160.

of a *tp-ỉtrw* in South Karnak, but refers to her interpretation of the *Historical Inscription* to do so.[841] Waitkus, in disagreement, based on representations of the Opet in the Luxor colonnade, argues that all three barques of the Theban Triad would have first met inside Karnak.[842]

All the sources cited thus far being on the north-south axis of Karnak temple (the 3rd and 4th Courts between the 8th/9th and 9th/10th Pylons respectively), it could be argued that they pertain to the Opet festival,[843] though this is far from certain: given that the north-south axis is attested to have only been used as a part of the land route to Luxor Temple on the occasion of the Opet festival during Hatshepsut, then it must be wondered why some of these later Opet reliefs were carved here. One reason could be that they depict not what took place there specifically, that is, only the bringing of the barques of Mut and Khonsu, but in this case it must be wondered why it is that Amun's is represented as well. Waitkus suggests that these reliefs are simply representing not what would have specifically taken place in these courts, but the general sequence of events from Karnak to Luxor.[844] It could therefore be conceivably be argued that the scenes on the 8th Pylon depict what might have taken place inside Luxor Temple, but the evidence is too ambiguous. Waitkus also adds that the possibility that these scenes do not pertain to the Opet festival should not be excluded.[845]

Perhaps more useful, therefore, are representations on the east-west axis of the temple. According to El Sharkawy in his detailed work, some scenes on both wings of the east (inner) face of the 2nd Pylon (therefore the west wall inside the Great Hypostyle Hall) represent the Opet festival: the north wing with the departure of the barges bearing the divine barques to Luxor Temple,[846] and the southern with their return to Karnak.[847] He concludes that while the east-west axis of the Great Hypostyle Hall (and therefore its north and south walls) "versinnbildlicht... den *täglichen* Sonnenlauf und die Erneuerung des Gottes, an welche die Erneuerung des Königs gekoppelt ist, vor

[841] Cabrol, *Voies processionnelles*, 142–6, 594, 650–2.

[842] Waitkus, *Kult und Funktion* I, 239–41, 243–4.

[843] Murnane, *LÄ* IV, s.v. "Opetfest", 578 no. 15 (9).

[844] Waitkus, *Kult und Funktion* I, 241–4, (see also his discussion on all the available monumental sources: *ibid.*, 238–54).

[845] *Ibid.*, 244.

[846] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 36–9.

[847] *Ibid.*, 151–2; Sharkawy, *Amun-Tempel*, 243.

allem auf der Südwand," that the north-south axis "ist auf den *jährlichen* Sonnenlauf ausgerichtet, mit dem die Vorstellung von der jährlichen Erneuerung Amun-Res und die damit verbundene Wiederbelebung des Königs ausgedrückt wird; aus der Regeneration beider resultierte die Regeneration des gesamten Landes,"[848] which is the very goal of the Opet festival.[849] On the same wall as the Opet scenes depicting the journey over to Luxor is a coronation sequence (second register from top; figs. 2–4) including induction and culmination scene which, had it been on the same (third) register as the Opet scenes,[850] would have been directly on their left.[851] This raises the possibility which Waitkus did for the 3rd and 4th Courts of the north-south axis, that is, that these scenes—just as I argued above for those carved on the 8th Pylon—could also be depicting what may have happened not just inside the Great Hypostyle Hall, but in Luxor Temple as well.

It will be remembered, however, that this sequence, discussed above, was seen as supporting the Hypostyle Hall as the place where Amun met ("saw") Horemheb. Furthermore, El Sharkawy argues that this sequence is not a part of the Opet festival, putting it under the heading of "Inthronisationsriten."[852] He explains: "Die Tafeln 147 und 148 werden durch eine Randzeile getrennt. Weil sie die einzige Randzeile in diesem Register ist, lassen sich die folgenden Tafeln 148 bis 150 als Einheit begreifen."[853]

These two arguments, while apparently decisive at first, can be countered. Regarding the coronation sequence: the culmination scene which mentions the Great Hypostyle Hall does specifically say that this was the setting of the ritual, but only that it is the Amun who is *ḥry-ỉb* this temple. The preceding induction scene, furthermore, as pointed out, refers to him as *nb nṯr.w*, thus making it clear that this is the processional image of the god, the one to be taken to Luxor Temple on the occasion of

[848] Sharkawy, *Amun-Tempel*, 252. For the journey back north to Karnak: cf. Darnell, "Opet", 7–8.

[849] Bell, "Divine", 157.

[850] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 148–50; *PM* II, 44 (151) II, 7–9; *LD* III, 124 d. Pl. 148 depicts a purification by Horus and Seth (fig. 2), pl. 149 the *bs-nsw.t* (fig. 3), and pl. 150 (fig. 4) the encounter of the king with Amun (culmination).

[851] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 262.

[852] While I have not studied the "Handlungsstruktur" of ritual scenes as much as he has (*ibid.*, 209–11), I hope that the case that I make concerning pls. 148–50 is found to be acceptable. These scenes have also been cited by others as being part of the "coronation ceremony:" Moret, *Caractère*, pl. II; Barta, "Rituale", 8 (for pl. 148), 10–11 (pl. 149), 11 (pl. 150).

[853] Sharkawy, *Amun-Tempel*, 245.

the Opet festival. There is therefore nothing which ties this Amun exclusively with events which would have taken place in the Hypostyle Hall. Which brings us to El Sharkawy's argument: accepting his proposition that the north-south axis, and therefore the west wall (where the scenes under discussion are carved), pertains to the annual regeneration of nature, it is unclear why he includes the coronation sequence "Inthronisationsriten" into the overall program of this wall. Furthermore, El Sharkawy states that the "Ostwand ist aus dem axialen Schema herausgelöst,"[854] and includes the *Inthronisationsriten* as part of the *Bildprogramm* of the east wall as well.[855] This makes his inclusion of more *Inthronisationsriten* into the *Bildprogramm* of the west wall all the more puzzling. Kings were crowned as a part of the standard procedure of the Opet festival and, as the discussion in the following section shows, many scenes inside Luxor Temple itself match, or resemble, the coronation sequence/*Inthronisationsriten*. There therefore seems to be no reason to separate the scenes on plates 148–150 from the remainder of their Opet-related context; their place on the north wing of the pylon, where the journey to, and rituals in, Luxor are represented, is appropriate.

This explanation, however, does not account for the *Randzeile*; I very tentatively propose the following: as El Sharkawy notes, the same wall contains depictions of another major religious event, the Min festival[856] which, as scenes from Ramses III's temple in Medinet Habu show, also involved the confirmation of the power and office of the king.[857] It will be remembered that the Opet scenes would have been directly to the right of the coronation sequence had they been on the same register; the situation is even more explicit with the Min festival scenes which are directly on its left. The absence of a margin separating the scenes depicting the Min festival from those of the *Inthronisationsriten* could therefore have excluded the latter from the Opet festival (on the register below), whereas its presence could have been a way to signal that these specific rites were shared by both major festivals.[858]

---

[854] *Ibid.*, 252.

[855] *Ibid.*, 247.

[856] *Ibid.*, 269 (plan 14), dark green showing the *Inthronisationsriten*, light green the Min festival, and light blue the Opet.

[857] Brunner-Traut, *LÄ* IV, s.v. "Minfest", 142–3; *MH* IV, 205. Admittedly, this is not a scene depicting the crowning of the king, but the ritual of the releasing of four doves or geese so they can announce to the gods of all four cardinal directions that "he (Ramses III) has seized the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt."

[858] Interestingly, a coronation sequence in the Second Court of Medinet Habu, consisting of purification (north wall: *MH* IV, 234), *bs-nsw.t*, and culmination (east wall: *ibid.*, 235) is carved alongside depictions

In short, I argue here that the scenes referred to are purposefully ambiguous, depicting not only rituals of the Opet festival, both in Karnak as well as in Luxor, but also of altogether different religious occasions. In this light, it appears that both of Waitkus' apparently mutually exclusive suggestions regarding the apparent inconsistencies of the scenes on the north-south axis, that (1) they represent not only events which would have taken place in the 3rd and 4th Courts, but also on the way to Luxor, or that (2) they do not represent the Opet festival at all were quite close to the mark: the ambiguity was purposeful. In this light, it could be argued that these particular scenes also include representations of the Valley festival for, even though there would have been no southward journey to Luxor as with the Opet, both Mut and Khonsu would have used this axis to move northward to the main Karnak temple itself in order to eventually exit from the east-west axis for their westward journey to the Valley.

This interpretation, furthermore, clarifies another apparent inconsistency of the scenes carved on the inner face of the 2nd Pylon, noted by El Sharkawy:[859] why the two largest scenes on each wing of the pylon on either side of the main entrance (figs. 13–14; nos. 151 and 156 in fig. 6),[860] three registers in height, do not depict Amun looking out towards the exit from his hypothetical position inside the temple, and do not depict the king coming into the temple towards him, as would have been in accordance with the accepted principles of ancient Egyptian relief representation.[861] The reason El Sharkawy proposes is that the purpose of these scenes, as their inscriptions indicate, was to strengthen the power and role of the king as the builder of the Great Hypostyle Hall. This, while not mutually exclusive, seems to hardly explain why the king, in a scene (the one on the northern wing of the pylon) specifically labeled an induction scene, furthermore explicitly clarifying the place of induction as the Great Hypostyle Hall itself, is shown leaving the temple through its main exit. In light of the arguments presented in this section, the reason could simply have been to indicate that this

---

of the festivals of Min (north wall: *ibid.*, 197, 200–1, 203 A; east wall: *ibid.*, 203 B, 205, 207), Sokar (east wall: *ibid.*, 226; south wall: *ibid.*, 224, 223, 221, 218), and even though not stated (but judging from the barques of the Theban Triad), the Valley festival (north wall: *ibid.*, 231, 229; cols. 40–1 of this last plate mentioning Ramses receiving crowns).

[859] Sharkawy, *Amun-Tempel*, 211, 238–9.

[860] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 7 (southern wing) and 137 (northern).

[861] See Wilson's section "The practice of temple wall decoration" in: "Temple Architecture and Decorative Systems", 793–9.

induction into Amun's presence inside the Hypostyle Hall was not meant to only represent the initial meeting between the king and Amun at the start of the Opet festival, but also the one after their return from Luxor. In other words, the scene is purposefully ambiguous, so as to allow it to be read in more than one way.

In this light, yet another apparent inconsistency is explained: why, in contrast to what has been regarded as its northern equivalent, the large scene on the south wing of the 2nd Pylon is not described as a *bs-nsw.t* scene. The differences lie in more than the caption: while the northern scene (pl. 137) actually depicts the king being inducted, that is, held by the hand by a deity, being brought into the presence of Amun, the southern (pl. 7) seems to consist strictly of a culmination scene, with Mut's caption mentioning the Uraeus being placed on the king's head (this reflected in the pictorial representation as well), and Amun bestowing life and many *Sed*-festivals unto him, while Thoth writes down his titulary—in other words, the result of the successful completion of any annual festival of regeneration of royal power and nature. In terms of the Opet festival at least, this could also explain the positioning of these two major scenes: the culmination scene (pl. 7) is carved on the southern wing because this event, the climax of the Opet, would have taken place in the south, inside the sanctuary of Luxor Temple, while the induction scene (pl. 137) is carved on the northern because this entry into the Great Hypostyle Hall, regardless of whether it was before going to Luxor or after the return journey, would have obviously taken place in this same location, and therefore in the north as opposed to Luxor.

Ultimately, whether it was only the land (north-south axis) or river route (east-west axis) that was used on a given occasion, or both, remains unknown, and could have been dictated by any number of factors: out of necessity (low water levels), or simply out of preference (to display a new barge which a king had commissioned).[862]

The in-depth discussion in this section, while it lends support to the notion that there exist striking similarities between coronation sequences, various other festivals, and coronation inscriptions—Horemheb's in this case—no unambiguous depiction of what would have occurred in Luxor has come forth. Given that it is the possibility that the passage from the Turin text, "he (Amun) then proceeded to the *pr-nsw.t* and placed him before himself at the *pr-wr* of his noble daughter Weret-[Hekau]," refers to the procession toward Luxor, with the *pr-wr* being located inside the temple, and not the

[862] Bell, "Divine", 162.

palace, that is under discussion here, the locating of equivalent scenes inside Luxor Temple itself would serve as less ambiguous evidence than scenes carved on either axis of Karnak temple.

Even if similarities between the pictorial evidence, including inside Luxor Temple, and the events of the Turin inscription is demonstrated, therefore arguing for the possibility that Horemheb's *pr-nsw.t* refers to Luxor Temple itself or a section therein, this interpretation still encounters problems: there is still the fact that the term *pr-nsw.t* is otherwise unknown to explicitly refer to a temple, and that the reference in line 10 of the same text seems to have been to a royal palace. Furthermore, the scenes referred to above in support of the *pr-nsw.t* being the temple were from a *bs-nsw.t* context. This, it will be remembered, is said in the text to have already taken place—in Karnak: it is stated that "he (Amun) then saw the Person of Horus, the lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, his son with him in the royal induction in order to give him his office and his throne" (l. 14) after it was said that "Horus proceeded amid rejoicing to Thebes … his son in his embrace, to Karnak temple, to induct him in the presence of Amun" (l. 13). If one were to argue that Horemheb going inside the *pr-wr* in the *pr-nsw.t* also consisted of a *bs-nsw.t*, but in Luxor Temple, a reason why it is not described as such, while the *bs-nsw.t* in Karnak is mentioned twice earlier, would still need to be provided.

A royal induction would have taken place in a temple, and it therefore follows that (1) if the comparison with *bs-nsw.t* scenes is correct, then *pr-nsw.t* must refer to Luxor Temple or a part thereof, and not an adjoining palace, or that (2) the search for similarities with induction scenes is in itself irrelevant, these depicting distinct, but similar, events to those in the Turin inscription. It must be borne in mind, however, that a perceived discrepancy between the textual and pictorial evidence need not be significant for several reasons: (1) if they are not central to its purpose, the Turin inscription could be omitting the mention of events otherwise depicted in Luxor Temple; (2) the pictorial evidence, too, cannot be seen as accurately depicting what would have occurred in the room or area of the temple in which they are located: limitations of space, for example, would have necessitated the omission of certain scenes and rituals. Even excluding this, it must also be remembered that any analysed scene in question may represent a ritual for more than one occasion, as argued above, which could serve as an explanation for the ambiguity exhibited by many scenes.

4. *The crowning moment of the festival (l. 16; Urk.* IV, *2117,14–15)*

   ḥpt.n=s nfrw=f

   smn.n=s s(*y*) *m ḥɜ.t=f*

   She (Weret-Hekau) embraced his beauty,

   and she established herself on his forehead.

After having reached the *pr-nsw.t*, and once inside the *pr-wr*, Horemheb is crowned. As established in the previous section, while the evidence is more in favour of seeing the *pr-nsw.t* as a palace structure adjoining Luxor Temple rather than a reference to the temple itself (or a section therein), the textual evidence from Horemheb's accounts does interestingly match several *bs-nsw.t* and "culmination" scenes in key points, and these are worth noting.

Similarities with the pictorial evidence

Regardless of whether or not the *pr-nsw.t* was a palace structure or a part of Luxor Temple, it has been concluded that the setting of the events related in these passages was at the very least somewhere in Luxor, which would be in keeping with the ritual procedure of the Opet festival. For a full concordance between this and the Horemheb inscriptions, however, one would expect the temple as the location of the crowning of Horemheb.

According to Bell on the ritual procedure of the Opet festival at this point in Luxor Temple (whose views are based on the reliefs inside), the king would have performed various rituals including the presenting of food offerings to Amun.[863] His views as related in his "Cult of the Royal Ka" article on the one hand, and those in his chapter on "divine" temples in *Temples of Ancient Egypt* on the other, differ slightly. In the latter, the author distinguishes between two important encounters with Amun before the final meeting with Amenemopet in his sanctuary at the south end of Luxor Temple:[864] (1) the first in the so-called "Chamber of the Divine King" (the First Antechamber in the *Topographical Bibliography*),[865] where the king would have knelt

[863] For a discussion of these rituals, see: Bell, "Luxor", 276–8, and 278–85 for more offerings and rituals, especially the censing.

[864] Bell, "Divine", 173–6.

[865] *PM* II, 320–1 (117–23), no. V in plan XXXII.

before the god, his back turned to him, who would have lain his hands on the crown.[866] This would have consisted of the transmission of the royal *ka* from the god to the current holder of the office of kingship, as evidenced by the fact that the god's arms are depicted in such a fashion as to form the *ka*-hieroglyph.[867] (2) The second would have taken place inside the barque sanctuary,[868] after the presentation of offerings, where the king would have knelt before Amun once more, facing him this time, who would have crowned him.[869] No such distinction appears in Bell's article on the cult of the royal *ka*, where he mentions that the king would have presented offerings to Amun in the room surrounding the barque sanctuary (the Third Antechamber; Room XI: fig. 15)[870] after he had made other offerings, performed various rituals, and knelt before the god to receive the crown(s) in the preceding vestibule (the Second Antechamber; Room VIII: fig. 15).[871] While his more recent views are the ones to be followed in this thesis, noteworthy is that in either case the presentation of offerings is followed by the king being crowned, which is reminiscent of the *Historical Inscription* and the *Texte de la jeunesse*.

Bell seems to mistakenly conflate two different parts of Horemheb's Turin inscription in his article on the cult of the royal *ka*: regarding the crowning of the king, he refers to the discussion from Gardiner's "Coronation of King Haremhab" dealing not with the crowning of the Horemheb in the *pr-nsw.t* (ll. 15–16), but to the one regarding a later episode of the Turin inscription where the king was said to have been "embraced" (*ḫpt*) by the god after he had "appeared" (*ḫꜥ*) with the *khepresh*-crown (l. 20).[872] It is clear, however, that this specific event took place in a public area, and certainly not an inner part of the temple, since (1) an exit from the *pr-nsw.t* (regardless

[866] Bell, "Luxor", 278. It is to be borne in mind that Bell speaks of the Opet festival in general, and therefore that the king in question would have been a Pharaoh since the outset of festivities, meaning that he would have already been equipped with crowns for the god to touch them.

[867] Wilkinson, *Reading*, 49; Bell, "Divine", 173, no. 154 in p. 298. Bell refers to two examples: a culmination scene in the coronation sequence of Philip Arrhidaeus' Karnak sanctuary (fig. 1; *PM* II, 100 (290) I, 1–4), and another carved on the pyramidion of Hatshepsut's broken obelisk near the Sacred Lake (*PM* II, 218 (33)). Frankfort saw what he called the "mystical embrace" as the episode in which the *ka* was transferred (*Kingship*, 66–7).

[868] *PM* II, 324–6 (143–50), plan XXXII.

[869] Bell, "Divine", 173–4.

[870] *PM* II, 323–4 (136–41), plan XXXII.

[871] *PM* II, 321–3 (124–35), plan XXXII. Bell, "Luxor", 276–8.

[872] Bell, "Luxor", 276 no. 131; Gardiner, "Coronation", 27–8.

of what it was) is mentioned just before (ll. 19–20), and (2) given the mention of people celebrating (ll. 20–1). This event could therefore not have taken place in the vestibule (the *Topographical Bibliography's* Second Antechamber; Room VIII: fig. 15).[873] If it is indeed correct at all to find parallels between the Turin inscription and the Opet festival in general, the crowning of Horemheb in the *pr-wr* inside the *pr-nsw.t* (and not the public embrace of Horemheb), would therefore match the crowning of the king (facing the god) in the barque sanctuary, mentioned by Bell in his chapter on "divine" temples.

While in the Turin inscription it is not explicitly stated that Amun actually placed the crown on the king's head, the action is attributed to Weret-Hekau, who in this passage is identified with the Uraeus itself: "she established her(self) on his forehead" (l. 16).[874] It is also interesting to note that all this takes place in the *pr-wr*, the importance of which to the "coronation" ceremony has been mentioned by various scholars.[875] Other primary sources which refer to the act of crowning attribute this action to other related goddesses, while others show Amun actually crowning him.[876] The sentence referring to the act of crowning, "Weret-[Hekau], [h]er [arms] in the *nyny*-gesture, embraced his beauty, and established herself on his (Horemheb's) forehead" (ll. 15–16), like the royal induction scenes on the 8th Pylon discussed above, has its own exact pictorial parallel: a lioness-headed [Sekhmet?]-Weret-[Hekau] is depicted crowning Amenhotep III, who is kneeling before Amun, facing him, who is seated under the *pr-wr* shrine—precisely like the passage being analysed here.[877] This scene is on the east side of the south wall of the room in which the barque sanctuary is located—one of the most central, secluded and holiest rooms in Luxor Temple (fig. 15

[873] Gardiner himself seems to have mistakenly seen the events of the *pr-nsw.t* and the embrace as identical, even though this is clearly not the case ("Coronation", 25–6).

[874] The verb *smn* is frequently used to refer to the "establishing" of the crown on the king's head, whether the crown is establishing herself or whether it is Amun who is doing the establishing, as in the *Texte de la jeunesse* (*Urk.* IV, 160,1,3 and possibly 10). In Hatshepsut's fictitious "coronation" account, the inscription accompanying the scene depicting the crowning by Horus and Seth includes this same verb, but it is her *sʿḥ* ("dignity") "as king" that is being "established" (*Urk.* IV, 264,2,16; *Deir el Bahari* III, pl. 64 A and B).

[875] *Wb.* I, 517. Barta, "Rituale", 6 f.; Fairman, "Kingship", 79; Gardiner, "Coronation", 25; Moret, *Caractère*, 87–94.

[876] E.g. the culmination scene in the Great Hypostyle Hall (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150) which follows that of the *bs-nsw.t* (*ibid.*, 149). Gardiner mentioned how the crowning of the king could variously be ascribed to Amun or Weret-Hekau ("Coronation", 25–6). In the Memphite Theology, Weret-Hekau "sprouted" (*rd*) on Horus' head (*tp*) (cols. 13 c–14 c: Junker, *Götterlehre*, 23; Sethe, *Dramatische*, 32).

[877] Bell, "Divine", 174 and fig. 77 on 175.

no. 141).[878] All of this suggests that the crowning of Horemheb by Amun could have taken place in this very room.[879] Therefore, if the *pr-wr* is in the *pr-nsw.t*, and if the *pr-wr* was somewhere in the core area of Luxor Temple, where Amun placed the king in front of him and "established" (*smn*) the crown on his head, then it would appear that the *pr-nsw.t* in this case refers to Luxor Temple.

The multiple offerings which the king would have made to Amun, discussed by Bell, at this juncture, before being crowned inside the sanctuary, could also suggest that it was similarly at this point that Horemheb would have made offerings to the god: it will be remembered that it was stated earlier in the text that these main events were taking place on "the day of making offerings" to Amun (l. 15), and that it was refuted, on grounds that only a king could perform this ritual (whereas Horemheb was referred to with non-royal titles at that point). Assuming therefore that it is correct to identify the regular ritual procedure of the Opet festival, as depicted on the walls of Luxor Temple, with the events of the Turin inscription, it would appear that Horemheb would have presented his offerings around this time rather than before having left Karnak.

It could also be pointed out, however, that a *bs-nsw.t* had occurred earlier as well, when Horemheb was not yet king, and therefore that there is no reason to assume that the offerings were made back in Karnak. Firstly, it must be noted that there is no reason to assume that offerings would have been made only once on this particular day. Secondly, these arguments are based on the assumption that the *bs-nsw.t* and offerings were done by Horemheb himself. Although he was indeed present, it will be remembered that Horemheb was not alone (at the *bs-nsw.t* at least), but accompanied by Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*. In this light, a tentative explanation for the presence of this deity can be suggested: Horemheb could have been presenting this Horus as the current reigning Pharaoh who, as the deity of what could have been his home town, could thus act as his "predecessor" whom he was succeeding. The earlier passages surrounding the induction thus gain a whole new meaning: "this noble god Horus, lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, his heart wished (to) establish his son upon his throne … Horus then proceeded … his son in his embrace, to Karnak, in order to induct him into the presence of Amun, in

[878] *PM* II, 324 (141) III, 1; Waitkus, *Kult und Funktion* I, 50; *ibid.* II, 84–5; Abdel-Raziq, *Sanktuar*, 71–2 (E 112). This scene occurs twice: its sister is on the same wall, but on the west side, with Sekhmet-Weret-Hekau crowning the king (*PM* II, 324 (142) III, 1; Waitkus, *Kult und Funktion* I, 50; *ibid.* II, 88–9; Abdel-Raziq, *Sanktuar*, 65–7 (E 103).

[879] Bell, "Divine", 174–5; "Luxor", 273.

order to transfer to him his office of king" (ll. 12–13). Horus is presented as Horemheb's father, the previous king. Horemheb thusly bypassed Ay (who would have been deceased already), and relied instead on his "father," Horus, for legitimisation, presenting the unfolding events as if they were a regular instance of royal succession, with the royal office being transmitted from father to son.

What the *pr-wr* is, which could help in ascertaining whether it was located in a palace structure or a temple, is unfortunately difficult to say. That it may refer to a portable shrine of a god, and not necessarily the archaic shrine of Upper Egypt or one fashioned after its canonical form, is well known.[880] Therefore, since texts such as the caption to the Amenhotep III crowning scene and the Turin inscription designate the shrine of Amun with the term *pr-wr*, then its evocation as such may simply be a fanciful interpretation by the ancient Egyptians, depicting the crowning of the king, via word-play, as ideally taking place in the archaic shrine of Upper Egypt, where all legitimate kings were believed to have been crowned (with the White Crown, at least) since time immemorial. In reality, however, based on the evidence from the Amenhotep III relief, the third attested sense of *pr-wr* appears likeliest, as a reference to a temple sanctuary.[881] A scene in the "outer sanctuary" of Hathor in Hatshepsut's Deir el-Bahari temple depicts the barque-shrine of Hathor with offerings in front of it which are being consecrated by Hatshepsut.[882] The caption says: *ḥtp m pr-wr* "resting in the *pr-wr*," suggesting that the reference is to the sanctuary(-area?) of Hathor in the sector of the Deir el-Bahari temple dedicated to her. This term has the determinative of the archaic shrine (O 19), while the sanctuary in this case, hewn into the hillside, obviously did not look anything like it. The crowning of kings in Luxor Temple, therefore, while *depicted* as occurring in a *pr-wr*, need not have taken place in a shrine which was in the form of the archaic one of Upper Egypt. Just like the *pr-wr* in the Deir el-Bahari scene, the one in our text, while it appears to refer to the sanctuary of the temple, it has the archaic shrine determinative.

Another interesting scene, from Luxor Temple itself this time, could shed more light on the passage from the Turin inscription relating the crowning of Horemheb. It

---

[880] *Wb*. I, 517,4 (517,2 for Upper Egyptian shrine); Spencer, *Temple*, 112. In this sense, it seems to share this meaning with one of those of *s.t-wr.t* (*ibid.*, 108–14).

[881] *Wb*. I, 517,3.

[882] *PM* II, 352 (48); *Deir el Bahari* IV, pl. 104.

depicts the king being led by Atum and Montu to Amunet, who is making the *nyny*-gesture, and Amun, who is seated behind a table laden with offerings (fig. 15 no. 137).[883] As stated above, before the ritual of crowning the king, the latter made many offerings to Amun who, in his barque, would have been based in the barque sanctuary at this point.[884] It was only Amun's barque that proceeded into this area of the temple, "[b]ecause there is but a single shrine in the Sanctuary, on each side of which only the barque of Amun is depicted."[885] Amun's position in the barque sanctuary while he receives offerings from the king is further strengthened by the location of this scene: it is located on the northern wall of the room in which the barque sanctuary (Room XII) is located (Room XI), directly to the left of the entrance (fig. 15). This scene therefore represents the introduction of the king into this room, where he comes into the presence of Amun, and consecrates the offerings to him. In response to the king entering this room, Amunet welcomes him in, doing the appropriate *nyny*-gesture. According to the Turin text, after the king proceeds to Luxor Temple, Amun placed him in front of him inside the *pr-wr* while Weret-Hekau welcomed him in by doing the *nyny*-gesture, after which he was crowned (ll. 15–16). There can be no doubt that this passage skims over a large number of rituals but, in light of the scenes presented thus far, it could be interpreted as such: once the king entered the temple (*pr-nsw.t*), he was both the subject and object of many rituals, eventually after which he entered and was welcomed (with the *nyny*-gesture) into the sanctuary area (*pr-wr*), where he performed more rituals and consecrated more offerings to Amun, after which the climax of the festival was reached, wherein he was crowned by this deity.

The Hatshepsut scenes on the north face of the 8th Pylon referred to above[886] may also be depicting summarized versions of this same series of events, since they bear many similarities with the Amenhotep III scenes[887] just described. The first register, for example, (1) depicts the procession moving (towards Luxor Temple), (2) the king being led inside (*bs-nsw.t* by Montu), followed by the meeting with Amun.[888]

---

[883] *PM* II, 323 (137) III. Its sister scene, on the other side (west) of the wall, separated by the door, does not contain the *nyny*-gesture, but does also depict the king making offerings (*PM* II, 324 (139)).

[884] Bell, "Luxor", 278.

[885] *Ibid*., 263.

[886] *PM* II, 174 (519) I–II.

[887] Offering scenes: *PM* II, 323 (137); *PM* II, 324 (139). Crowning scenes: *PM* II, 324 (141 and 142) III, 1.

[888] *PM* II, 174 (519) I, 1–3.

It could therefore be seen as being a pictorial form of the key passage from the Turin inscription currently under discussion. The king, wearing the *ḫprš*-crown, is depicted standing inside a shrine, in front of Amun (*ḥr-ḥ3.t=f*), facing him. The god has one arm around him/her, and the other extends the *ꜥnḫ*-hieroglyph to the king's nose. Khonsu is standing outside the shrine, behind Amun, while Mut/Weret-Hekau,[889] also outside, stands behind the king, extending her hand into the shrine, touching the back of his head (*ḫpt.n=s nfrw=f*). Behind her, Thoth is writing down her names on the year-hieroglyph. The caption of the goddess is: [*ḏd mdw ỉn Wr.t-Ḥk3.w ḥ*]*r* [*ỉmn nb ns.*(*w*)*t t3.wy nb*] *nṯr*[*.w ỉ*]*mn-*[*Rꜥ*] *nb n*[*s.*(*w*)*t*] *t3.wy sn*[*ḏm*] *ḏs=k m pr-wr sḫꜥy=k* {*wỉ*} *m ḥ3.t s3*[*=k*] *nsw.t-bỉty Mn-Mɜꜥ.t-Rꜥ* "[Words spoken by Weret-Hekau t]o [Amun, the Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, Lord of] the God[s: 'A]mun-R[a! Sea]t yourself[890] in the *pr-wr* so that you may cause {me} to arise on the forehead of {your} son, Menmaatra!"[891] The crown, Weret-Hekau, identified with and depicted as Mut, speaks to Amun, and asks him to place her on the king's forehead. The identification of the goddess with the Uraeus, by no means an uncommon one, is clear in this case, bearing in mind the conception that lioness-headed Tefnut/Sekhmet, the daughter of Ra, was also regarded as his eye—the Uraeus.[892] What we therefore have in this scene and the

[889] The part of the inscription where the goddess' name was written is unfortunately missing, but her identification with the crown, as a Uraeus-goddess, is clear.

[890] This phrase (*snḏm ḏs=k*) is translated in the *Wörterbuch* as merely "der du dich selbst …" (*Wb.* V, 607). I prefer Redford's translation: one of his references to the word *ḫꜥy* is from Thutmose I's Tombos stela (Redford, *History*, 15), and the sense of "to be seated" is clearer here than in the Hatshepsut text: *snḏm=f ḥr ns.t Gb* "(when) he (Thutmose I) had seated himself upon the throne of Geb" (*Urk.* IV, 82,16). This sense is clear not only because it is followed by "upon the throne," but also because between *snḏm* and the suffix pronoun is a hieroglyph which depicts a king (with flagellum, Uraeus, and false beard) seated on a throne.

[891] *Urk.* IV, 286 B; *PM* II, 174 (519) I, 3. This text was originally carved in the reign of Hatshepsut, whose cartouches were replaced by Thutmose II's, and then ultimately by Sety I's (the feminine pronouns were changed accordingly). My restoration of the first person singular dependent pronoun *wỉ* and of the second person singular masculine suffix pronoun *=k* is based on a very similar passage, also dating to the reign of Hatshepsut, from her Speos Artemidos temple (*Urk.* IV, 286 C). In this case, the crown is identified with a syncretized form of Weret-Hekau-Pakhet. Also a leonine and Uraeus-goddess, her identification with Weret-Hekau, Hathor, Sekhmet or Mut is an understandable one (Martin, *LÄ* VI, s.v. "Uräus", 865–6; Troy, "Mut", 301 ff.; Troy, "Religion", 125–7, 132; Quirke, *Religion*, 27–32).

[892] An excellent example is the fascinating inscription from Speos Artemidos (*Urk.* IV, 286,10–287,1; chapter 3, 85–6). The syncretized Weret-Hekau, after Amun "caused her to arise" on the king's forehead, addresses the king and says, with all the first person suffix pronouns *written in the shape of a lion-headed seated goddess*: *wnwn=ỉ ỉmytw ỉnḥwy=ṯ ḥh=ỉ m sḏ.t r ḫftyw=ṯ* "I curl up between your eyebrows, and I breathe with scorching fire onto your enemies" (*Urk.* IV, 15–16). It is the terrifying aspect of the daughter of Ra, Tefnut/Sekhmet, as opposed to the benevolent Hathor that is evoked here.

caption of the goddess is another metaphorical reference to the act of crowning. Extremely interestingly, in the first scene, the king is not wearing any crowns, but in the third (culmination) scene, this is no longer the case. Therefore, even though this specific scene does not explicitly show Amun placing the crown on the king's head, as is the case in other scenes, this fact and the accompanying inscriptions make it clear that this is exactly what is meant.

Aside from a designation for Luxor Temple in general, Bell suggests yet another meaning for *pr-nsw.t*: he argues that it might also be the case that it refers to a specific part of the temple, perhaps the barque sanctuary area from the portico/hypostyle hall onward[893] or according to a suggestion in personal communication by Murnane, that it might refer to the two rooms of the Coronation Suite (fig. 15, Rooms XIII–XIV).[894] This assumption is based on the interesting remark made by Murnane that the presence of the *ḫkr*-frieze in these two rooms might identify them as the "Palace." I am reminded of the "coronation sequence" on the south face of the south wall of Philip Arrhidaeus' granite barque sanctuary in Karnak, where only the scene of the imposition of the crowns by Horus and Thoth is surmounted by a *ḫkr*-frieze. Bell states, however, that Murnane "has since noted this frieze in the Portico," and that he (Bell) has "also found it in Room XXII."[895]

The coronation sequences, as exemplified in the one carved on the granite sanctuary, do, however, mention two instances of crowning: (1) the one usually called "the imposition of the crowns," usually by Horus and Thoth or Seth (depicted with a *ḫkr*-frieze in the case of Philip Arrhidaeus), and (2) the "culmination" scene, where the king kneels before the god, who touches his crowns (fig. 1). The latter, in this case at least, is known to have taken place in the temple sanctuary (given the nature of the structure on which it was carved), so could the presence of the *ḫkr*-frieze shed light on the location of a supposed preceding "imposition of the crowns"? The *ḥw.t-ꜥ.t-Mꜣꜥ.t* is thought to be the area surrounding the barque sanctuary in Karnak and the part of the temple where many ritual objects and regalia were seemingly stored (it was seen that

[893] Bell, "Luxor", 274; *PM* II, 321 (Room VIII), 323 (Room XI) 324 (Room XII). Barta sees the *pr-nsw.t* as referring to the "Allerheiligste," but does not say of which temple ("Rituale", 10).

[894] Bell, "Luxor", 274 (no. 112); *PM* II, 326–9 (Rooms XIII–IV).

[895] Bell, "Luxor", 274 (no. 112). Room XXII: *PM* II, 332–3 (197–9).

Hatshepsut donned her priestly garb in this location).[896] It is interesting to note that the Coronation Suite (Rooms XIII–IV) and Room XXII, mentioned by Bell and Murnane as featuring *ḫkr*-friezes, are all similarly in the inner areas of Luxor Temple on the sides of the axial sanctuaries (Rooms XII and XIX; see fig. 15). The other location with such a frieze mentioned by Murnane and Bell is the Portico/hypostyle hall, the position of which does not match that of the other rooms. It is in this case also interesting to note that it has been hypothesised that hypostyle halls were also the location of the imposition of the crowns.[897] Could the presence of the *ḫkr*-frieze, as initially suspected by Murnane and Bell, be suggestive of an area being used for the imposition of crowns, and perhaps other rituals which centered around the king as well? The suggestions made here in this paragraph, while interesting, are entirely hypothetical and circumstantial, and require further investigation in a different study to establish the validity thereof.

Assuming a concordance between the events of the Turin inscription and the pictorial evidence, it would similarly be expected that Horemheb had perhaps worn the crowns in an earlier, unmentioned, instance equivalent to the "imposition of the crowns." This, however, does not appear to be the case, for (1) Weret-Hekau (the Uraeus) is said in the Horemheb inscription to have "established herself on his forehead" (l. 16), implying not only a sort of finality, but is also similar to various inscriptions accompanying crowning scenes.[898] This, furthermore, was in turn was followed by (2) a celebratory speech by the Ennead (discussed below) which has them say that "Amun has come … in order to establish his crowns on his head" (l. 17), implying the action having been thought of as done by Amun (as well as Weret-Hekau), which in turn would tie it in not with the episode of an initial "imposition of the crowns," but with the "culmination" scene where, as depicted on the 8th Pylon, both Amun (seated in his shrine inside the sanctuary) and Weret-Hekau (standing behind the kneeling king) are touching the king's head.[899] It will also be remembered that in these scenes on the 8th Pylon, the king is not depicted wearing any crowns before the

[896] Hegazy and Martinez, "Palais de Maât", 56–8.

[897] Cf. Barguet, *Temple*, 312–13; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 292.

[898] Cf. for example the caption of Weret-Hekau in the scene carved on the 8th Pylon referred to above (*Urk.* IV, 286 B), as well as the very similar caption for Weret-Hekau-Pakhet in a scene from Speos Artemidos (*Urk.* IV, 286 C).

[899] This is the case in the Speos Artemidos reliefs as well (*PM* IV, 164 (5)).

"culmination" scene, implying that he received them only then; an initial "imposition of the crowns" and "purification" scenes are, in fact, not present (omissions by the authors of the reliefs notwithstanding due to various restrictions such as space). What is also to be concluded is that what is depicted on the 8th Pylon (argued above as most likely representing events in the Opet festival due to its presence on the north-south axis of Karnak temple) differs from the "standard" coronation sequence. It follows therefore that if the events in Horemheb's texts follow the ritual procedure of the Opet festival (a part of which is depicted on the 8th Pylon), then a concordance with the coronation sequence on the granite sanctuary in Karnak should not be expected. What this in turn also suggests is that Horemheb, during his "coronation ceremony" on the occasion of the Opet festival, in the same manner the scenes on the 8th Pylon (which also presumably depict instances from the Opet), may have also directly received the crowns from Amun in the sanctuary instead of having initially received them elsewhere in the temple.

It has therefore been established that the Turin inscription, if the events therein follow the Opet festival's series of expected rituals, does not necessarily match what is depicted in coronation sequences. Many similarities between Horemheb's texts and the pictorial evidence were found. A scene carved on the north face of the east wing of the 8th Pylon, mentioned above, depicts the king at the front of the procession bearing the divine barque, led by Weret-Hekau to a Hathor who is in the *nyny*-gesture, after which he would have encountered the Theban Triad inside a temple.[900] Evidence was presented supporting the notion that the *ḥw.t-nṯr* in question was Luxor Temple, given the scenes' presence on the north-south axis of Karnak. It was also demonstrated that these events pertaining to the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr* took place not in Karnak, but Luxor. The scenes on the 8th Pylon were therefore likened to the events which transpired in the Horemheb texts.

Even if it is incorrect to assume that the scenes carved on the 8th Pylon refer to the Opet festival, and are therefore irrelevant to Horemheb's texts, scenes carved in Luxor Temple itself, in the area of its sanctuary (*pr-wr*) represent a similar train of events: directly to the left of the northern (axial) entrance into the room (Room XI) in which the sanctuary (Room XII) is located is the scene referred to above depicting the king being led by Atum and Montu to Amunet, who is doing the *nyny*-gesture, behind

[900] *PM* II, 174 (517) I–II.

whom Amun is seated behind a table laden with offerings (fig. 15 no. 137).[901] In the same room, but on the southern wall, on either side of the temple's main north-south axis, are two mirroring scenes which depict the king kneeling before Amun (facing him), who is inside a *pr-wr* shrine, while a Uraeus-goddess crowns him (fig. 15 nos. 141–2).[902] The position of these scenes indicates not only that this room was the setting of what is depicted in the scene, but also that it would have taken place after the offerings depicted on the opposite (northern) wall from which direction the king would have come. The events related in Horemheb's two texts therefore find their pictorial parallel in representations of the rituals in Luxor Temple, thus suggesting that the *pr-nsw.t* was in fact either a designation of Luxor Temple or of a section inside.

As discussed above however, one might be mistaken to liken of the pictorial evidence regarding the Opet festival with the events from the inscriptions of Horemheb for several reasons: (1) based on the evidence from the Turin inscription, the fact remains that the term *pr-nsw.t* is otherwise unattested to refer to temples; and (2) based on the *bs-nsw.t* scenes, it was argued that a temple must have been the setting of many of the scenes discussed. Horemheb's texts do not describe the events in the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr* as such however; if this is significant, then it would be incorrect to compare his crowning in the text's *pr-wr,* wherever it was, with *bs-nsw.t* scenes in Luxor Temple: any similarities would be merely coincidental. These points cast doubt on Horemheb's crowning having taken place in a temple setting.

A king being crowned inside a palace is, furthermore, not unattested: it was demonstrated in the third chapter of this thesis that Hatshepsut acceded to the throne not inside a temple, but inside a palace structure, which was probably located to the left (north) of the forecourt fronting the temple at the time. Could it therefore be similarly said that Horemheb was crowned inside a palace as well? Several similarities were noted between the events of the texts of both rulers, and some of these fall in parts of the Turin inscription which this thesis has not yet covered. The examination of this possibility will therefore have to wait until the end of the analysis of the "coronation" of Horemheb.

[901] *PM* II, 323 (137) III.

[902] *PM* II, 324 (141–2) III, 2.

5. *The Ennead celebrates, and gives a speech (ll. 16–18; Urk.* IV, *2117,16–2118,10)*

psḏ.t nb.w pr-nsr m ỉhhy n ḥᶜᶜ=f

Nḫb.t Wɜḏ.yt N.t S.t Nb.t-ḥw.t Ḥr Swtḫ psḏ.t tmm.t ḫnty s.t-wr.t

(17) [*rdỉ.n=s*]*n ḥknw r ḳɜ n p.t*

ḥᶜ.w n ḥtp ỉmn

mṯn ỉs ỉmn ỉw sɜ=f ḫr-ḥɜ.t=f r ᶜḥ

r smn ḥᶜ.w=f ḥr tp=f

r sḳɜỉ ᶜḥᶜw=f mỉ-ḳd=f

twt.n=n smn=n n=f

(18) [*s*]*ỉp=n n=f ḫkrw Rᶜ*

swɜš=n ỉmn ḥr=f

ỉn=k n=n nḏ.ty=n

ỉmy n=f ḥb.w-Sd n Rᶜ rnp.wt Ḥr m nsw.t

ntf ỉrr=f hrr.t ỉb=k m-ḫnw ỉp.t-S.wt m-mỉt.t ỉwnw Ḥw.t-kɜ-Ptḥ

ntf šps<s>=f s.t

The Ennead, lords of the *pr-nsr* were in acclamation at his appearance,

Nekhbet, Wadjyt, Neith, Isis, Nephtys, Horus, Seth, the entire Ennead, the foremost of the *s.t-wr.t*

(17) They raised praises to the heights of the sky,

rejoicing at the contentment of Amun.

"Behold, Amun has come, his son in front of him, to the ᶜḥ

in order to establish his crown on his head,

in order to prolong[903] his entire lifetime.

We have assembled so that we may establish for him

(18) and (so that we may) [al]locate[904] to him the insignia of Ra,

---

[903] On this sense of *sḳɜ*: Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch—Deutsch*, 769,2 (cf. Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 249, where the references are only from this text).

[904] Gardiner began this line directly with [*s*]*ỉp* "allot, assign" (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 212). Helck, on the other hand, has *sḫm.ty* "the Double Crown" (S 6), before it, resulting in the translation "Wir wollen uns versammeln und ihm seine [Doppelkrone] befestigen," but did not include the corresponding suffix pronoun *=f* "seine" in his transcription (*Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 17–22)*, 2118 on p. 406). Based on Gardiner's transcription, however, there is very little room before the half-preserved *ỉ* in [*s*]*ỉp* at the start of l. 18, which suggests to me that there is not enough space for either *sḫm.ty*(*=f*). It is probably for this reason that Helck has the *s* in [*s*]*ỉp* written with the horizontal door-bolt (O 34) above the *ỉ* and the *p* rather than the vertical folded cloth (S 29) in front of them (*Urk*. IV, 2118,5). Brugsch's transcription

so that we may pay honour to Amun on account of him.
You have brought to us our protector.
Give him the *Sed*-festivals of Ra and the years of Horus as king,
it is he one who shall do[905] what contents your heart inside Karnak, and likewise Heliopolis and Memphis,
it is he who <shall> enrich[906] them."

It is interesting to note the similarity between the vocabulary used to express the joyousness of the occasion of Horemheb's being crowned (and then later at Amun "embracing" him in public) with the way this was expressed in the *Historical Inscription*, and also on the occasion of Horus' victory over Seth in the *Contendings of Horus and Seth*; this was discussed in the third chapter of this thesis.[907] Before delving into an interpretation of this passage, a grammatical comment must first be made.[908] In the preceding sentence, *rdỉ.n=f sw ḫr-ḥ3.t=f r pr-wr n s3.t=f šps.t Wr.t-*[*Ḥk3.w ꜥ.wy=s*](*y*) *m nyny* "he placed him (Horemheb) before himself in the *pr-wr* of his noble daughter, Weret-[Hekau], (*while*) [h]er [arms] in the *nyny*-gesture," *ꜥ.wy=s*(*y*) *m nyny* must be taken as a subordinate clause, denoting simultaneous action with the preceding *sḏm.n=f* construction *rdỉ.n=f sw ḫr-ḥ3.t=f*, *after* which "she embraced his beauty (and) she established her(self) on his forehead." Similarly, the following sentence also comes directly after a *sḏm.n=f* construction (*rdỉ.n=f sw ḫr-ḥ3.t=f*), which is followed by a non-verbal subordinate clause with adverbial comment (predicate) *psḏ.t nb.w pr-nsr m ỉhhy*

---

has indecipherable traces of signs before the suffix pronoun subject of [*s*]*ỉp*, *=n* (*Thesaurus*, 1077), while Maspero's has a lacuna before the papyrus-roll (Y 1) determinative of [*s*]*ỉp* (Davis, *Tombs of Harmhabi and Touatânkhamanou*, 19).

[905] For the construction *ỉn* + noun + *sḏm=f* or independent pronoun + *sḏm=f* emphasising the (pro)noun with future meaning, see: Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 227,2.

[906] The text actually reads *ntf šps.n=f s.t* "it is he who enriched them." For the construction *ỉn* + noun + *sḏm.n=f* or independent pronoun + *sḏm.n=f* emphasising the (pro)noun, see: Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 148,1. Gardiner suggested emending *šps.n=f* to *špss=f*, with the second *s* consisting of the door-bolt (O 34) which, like the *n* (N 35), is a horizontal sign. This is supported by the fact that the verb with the meaning "erhaben sein," "wohl ausgestattet" (*Wb.* IV, 452,12 and 14), "to enrich" (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 265) is always written with two phonetic *s* signs (Gardiner, "Coronation", 20,ww). This, furthermore, would better fit the context, with Horemheb, who will act out Amun's wishes in temples throughout the country, thereby enriching them.

[907] Turin inscription (ll. 16–17 and 20–1): *Urk.* IV, 2117,16–18 and 2119,2–7; *Historical Inscription* (# 109,3–5): Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 24 (and possibly # 72,14 (*ibid.*, 25) onward); Papyrus Chester Beatty I (recto), page 16, ll. 6–7. See chapter 3, 103–4.

[908] I am thankful to Prof. Mark Smith for his help on this sentence, without which I would not have been able to interpret it correctly.

n ḫᶜ=f, thus denoting simultaneous action, *after* which [*rdi.n=sn*] *ḥknw*. Therefore, while the crowning was going on, the Ennead, lords of the *pr-nsr*, was celebrating the king's appearance.

The term *pr-nsr* bears discussion. This term was commonly used to refer to the archaic shrine of Lower Egypt.[909] In the Turin inscription, similarly to the *pr-wr*, it is clear that it is not the actual shrine which is meant, but in contrast, where the *pr-wr* clearly refers to a physical location in either Luxor Temple or the palace attached to it, the *pr-nsr* does not seem to do so: the Ennead and various deities are simply described as "the lords of the *pr-nsr*." It might simply have been included in the text to stand in contrast to the *pr-wr*, as a semi-subtle reference to the coronation ceremonies of the earliest kings. If this was the case, then the choice of the determinative of the *pr-wr* in this text, of the archaic Upper Egyptian shrine (O 19), (possibly) for the sanctuary of Luxor Temple, might be more understandable—but this is probably over-interpretation. An alternative interpretation is that the *pr-nsw.t* is a palace structure in which two temporary shrines in the shapes of the *pr-wr* and *pr-nsr* were set up.

The term *s.t-wr.t* appears three times in the *Historical Inscription*.[910] From context, it was demonstrated that this term, in the first two cases at least, certainly refers to the royal throne inside the palace structure *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*.[911] It is otherwise attested to also refer to the throne of a deity inside his/her temple, or to the sanctuary.[912] This term therefore does not help in determining the location of the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr*.

Regarding the celebrating by the Ennead: that it is not a mythological metaphor for the crowds that must have been waiting for the king's "appearance" out of the inner parts of the temple after the climax of the festival is clear from the fact that the king's emergence is related on lines 19–20, below. The celebrating by the Ennead and their speech must therefore be understood as having taken place inside the *pr-nsw.t*, whatever it was. The presence of the Ennead is no more helpful at determining the nature of the *pr-nsw.t* as (a part of) a temple or as a palace structure than the term *s.t-*

[909] *Wb*. I, 517–18.

[910] (1) # 142,24 (Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 15); (2) # 48,5 (*ibid.*, 18); (3) # 54,3 (*ibid.*, 30).

[911] Chapter 3, 80–1.

[912] *Wb.* IV, 7; Spencer, *Temple*, 108–14. For *s.t-wr.t* as "barque sanctuary," see: Nims, "Dishonoring", 99 no. 20; *MH* VI, 409 (l. 13), 441 C; *MH* VII, 501 A and B (l. 9).

wr.t, however: (1) reliefs in the room in which the sanctuary of Luxor Temple is located (Room XI) depict the Ennead, suggesting that it would have indeed been present there. The Ennead is also depicted on the north face of the 8th Pylon, while the king is before Amun in the sanctuary.[913] (2) It was seen in the *Historical Inscription* that the Ennead was present every step of the way, including inside the palace structure *Nn-wꜣ=i-r=f*.[914] The Ennead could therefore be present at either a crowning inside a palace or a temple. The term *s.t-wr.t* does, however, reinforce the notion that the procession was still indoors, given the fact that it seemingly refers to the throne area, and therefore heart of, a temple or a palace. It is also interesting to note that, just like the *pr-wr*, it could have the same Upper Egyptian archaic shrine determinative as well.[915] Assuming that the term *pr-nsw.t*, where Horemheb was crowned, was located inside a temple, this Ennead presiding over (*ḫnty*) the sanctuary, then, could be understood as images of the gods which are named, or as standards representing them, that would have been placed or set up in or near the sanctuary (*pr-wr* or *s.t-wr.t*), and which would have thus witnessed the crowning of Horemheb by Amun.[916] This being the case, it is likely that these images/standards would have been carried by priests, who were thus also likely to have witnessed the crowning of Horemheb. The Middle Colonnade reliefs depicting the crowning of Hatshepsut in her Deir el-Bahari temple also show standards, which are in procession with her in the sanctuary area of the temple in which these rituals were taking place.[917]

The reason why the Ennead is celebrating is, as stated in the text, *ḫꜥ=f* "his (Horemheb's) appearance," while, just before, it was his crowning that was described. It therefore follows that the verb *ḫꜥ* here refers not to a literal (public) "appearance" by Horemheb (the exit from the *pr-nsw.t* takes place later, in ll. 19–20), but to the very action of his being crowned; the act of moving out into a public space is here therefore only metaphorical, with reference to the daily "appearance" of the sun god at dawn.

[913] *PM* II, 174 (518).

[914] Chapter 3, 91, 100–4, 107, 112.

[915] Spencer, *Temple*, 109.

[916] The suggestion that the Ennead here refers to images of gods or banners representing them was kindly suggested to me by Prof. Mark Smith.

[917] *Deir el Bahari* III, pl. 64.

The speech of the Ennead contains an interesting passage: "Behold, Amun has come, his son before him, to the *ḥ* in order to establish his crown on his head" (l. 17).[918] As stated in the third chapter of this thesis, the term *ḥ* can refer to the residence of a king (a palace) or that of a god (a temple).[919] This, like the terms *s.t-wr.t* and *pr-wr* does therefore not help with the determination of the location of the crowning of Horemheb as having taken place in a palace or a temple. The reference to the *ḥ* does enable one conclusion, however, based on the following: (1) it was stated in line 15 of the Turin inscription that Amun and Horemheb entered the *pr-nsw.t*, where the *pr-wr* was located; (2) now, in line 17, it is stated by the Ennead that they have come to the *ḥ*; (3) it is furthermore stated later in the text, in lines 19–20, that the procession exited the *pr-nsw.t*, suggesting the possibility that this was their location since it had first entered the *pr-nsw.t* in line 15. It would therefore follow, as Gardiner and Bell have concluded, that the *ḥ* and the *pr-nsw.t* denote, in fact, the same location.[920] More specifically, the *ḥ*, like the *pr-wr*, could also refer to a part of the *pr-nsw.t*. While Gardiner and Bell believe that the *ḥ*, like the *pr-nsw.t*, therefore refers to Luxor Temple, it is clear, based on the evidence presented in this thesis, that the possibility that Horemheb was crowned inside a palace should not be excluded, with the *ḥ* referring to the inner area of the overall palatial estate (*pr-nsw.t*).

In support of the view that *ḥ* refers to Luxor Temple, Bell refers to the architrave inscription in the court of Amenhotep III, which describes Luxor Temple (*Ỉp.t*) as *s.t=f pw n.t mɜꜥ.t ḥwn=f im=s ḥ pr.n=f im=f m ɜw.t-ỉb m trỉ=f n ḫꜥꜥ=f* "his place of justification, where he is rejuvenated, the palace from which he sets out in joy (lit. "length of heart") at the (lit. "his") time of his appearance (i.e. in public, on the occasion of the Opet festival)."[921] Bell notes the third person singular masculine suffix pronoun *=f*: it can be understood in two ways, either as referring to the king, or to Amun.[922] After all, on the occasion of the Opet festival, both of them appear in public

[918] *Urk.* IV, 2117,19–2118,2. This matches line 6 from the Memphis text precisely (*Urk.* IV, 2122,8–9).

[919] Chapter 3, 43. See: *Wb*. I, 214; Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 152; Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 549–51; Balanda, *Society*, 133.

[920] Cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", 25; Bell, "Luxor", 273.

[921] Bell, "Luxor", 273–4; *Urk.* IV, 1683,1–4.

[922] Bell, "Luxor", 254 no. 5. Bell believes that the suffix refers to the king, but says that Murnane is of the opinion that it is Amun that is being referred to. I agree with the latter based on my disagreement with the way Bell translates the architrave inscription: it actually begins with *ỉr mnw m ỉp.t n ms* (*w*)*ỉ*. The *ỉ* in the first person singular dependent pronoun is written with the king determinative (A 41–42).

(*ḫ*ˁ), are rejuvenated (*ḥwn*), after which they set out (*prỉ*), to return to Karnak temple. Whichever was actually meant, the place where they are rejuvenated after becoming old and weary,[923] Luxor Temple, is here designated with the term ˁ*ḥ*. While this does seem to support Bell's argument that the ˁ*ḥ* in the Turin inscription refers to Luxor Temple, all it in fact does is simply lend support to the notion that temples (Luxor Temple in this case) could be referred to with the term ˁ*ḥ*, which is already attested. Given that this term could designate a palace or a temple, there is no reason to conclude with certainty that the one in the Turin inscription refers to Luxor Temple. If anything, the fact that *pr-nsw.t* is otherwise unattested to refer to temples supports the notion that the ˁ*ḥ* in Horemheb's inscriptions refers to a palace structure (or, once more, a part of it).

Another part of the Ennead's speech bears discussion: "Give to him the *Sed*-festivals of Ra and the years of Horus as king" (l.18).[924] It is well known from other sources that the reception of *Sed*-festivals is part of the standard set of results of coronation sequences. For example, turning our attention to the purification scene, the first in the Great Hypostyle Hall sequence already referred to above (figs. 2–4),[925] Horus says to the king: *swˁb.n=ỉ tw m ˁnḫ wȝs ˁḥˁw=k* [*mỉ*] *ˁḥˁw n rˁ ỉr=k ḥb.w-Sd ˁšȝ.t wr.t ḫˁ*[*.tỉ m nsw.t* (*?*)] "I purify you with life and dominion so that your lifetime may be <like> the lifetime of Ra, and so that you may celebrate (lit. "make") a great many *Sed*-festivals, you having arisen [as king (?)]."[926] Similarly, Seth says: *swˁb.n*(*=ỉ*) *tw m ˁnḫ wȝs rnpỉ=k mỉ ỉt=*[*k*] *Rˁ ỉr=k ḥb mỉ Tm ḫˁ.tỉ*[927] *m ḥḳȝ ȝw.t-ỉb* "(I) purify you with

The sentence before this has the king speaking it, so it would make sense for this speech to continue, with the king referring to himself in the first person, using this same hieroglyph to replace the normal seated man (A 1), as is well attested (Gardiner, *Grammar*, 446). Furthermore, the phrase *ms sw* "the one who made him," in reference to Amun as the father of the king, is widely attested (*Wb.* II, 138). After *ḫˁˁ=f*, the inscription continues: *ḫpr.w=f m ḥr nb tȝ.wy nb-mȝˁ.t-rˁ* "his forms/transformations being visible to (lit. "in the face of") the Lord of the Two Lands, Neb-maat-ra." While I take this to mean that Amenhotep III witnessed the transformations of Amun over the course of the Opet festival, Bell takes this as "his (the king's) transformations being visible to all (lit. "in every face"), the Lord of the Two Lands Nebmaatra" ("Luxor", 254). Regarding this confusion, Bell makes the important point that "the justification involved is surely the king's as much as the god's" (*ibid.*, 254 no. 5). Cf. the merging of the king with the royal *ka*, and (therefore) with that of Amun (*ibid.*, 278; "Divine", 173).

[923] Bell, "Divine", 157.

[924] *Urk*. IV, 2118,8. Missing in the Memphite version: *Urk*. IV, 2122,15.

[925] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 148–50.

[926] *Ibid.*, 148 cols. 6–9.

[927] While it is written with the tethering rope *t* (V 14), by comparing with other, similar, inscriptions, there can be no doubt that what was actually meant was the standard stative *.tỉ* ending for the second person singular.

life and dominion so that you may become young like yo[ur] father Ra and so that you may celebrate (lit. "make") a *Sed*-festival like Atum, you having arisen as ruler of joy."[928] In the culmination scene (fig. 4), Thoth writes down the Throne and Horus names of Sety I, along with numerous (the *ḥḥ* and *ḥfn* hieroglyphs are visible) *Sed*-festivals. It has been argued over the course of this chapter, however, that these "coronation sequences" do not necessarily have any bearing on the Opet festival, and therefore on what took place in the Turin inscription. The scenes carved on the north face of the 8th Pylon which, as argued, also possibly, but more likely, represent episodes of the Opet festival, do also show the bestowal of numerous *Sed*-festivals unto the king. The scene depicting the priests carrying the barque of Amun while Hathor is in the *nyny*-gesture (east wing) has Amun say: *dỉ.n=ỉ n=ṯ ḥḥ.w m ḥb.w-Sd* "I give to you millions of *Sed*-festivals."[929] Similarly, the "culmination scene" of the top register on the west wing of the same pylon, has Thoth say, while he is writing on the year-hieroglyph: *smn(=ỉ) gnw.t n sꜣ.t{=k} Mꜣʿ.t-kꜣ-Rʿ m ḥḥ.w m* [*ḥb.w*]*-sd ʿšꜣ(.t) wr.t ḫʿ.tỉ m nsw.t-bity m Ḥr ḥms*(.*w*) *ḫnm.n=k wr*(.*t*)*-ḥkꜣ.w m tp=k* "I establish the annals of {your} daughter Maat-ka-Ra with great many millions of *Sed*[-festivals], you having arisen as King of Upper and Lower Egypt, as a seated Horus, you having united Weret-Hekau on your head."[930] The culmination scene in the coronation sequence on the register directly below has the king receiving *Sed*-festivals from Amun and Amunet.[931] The reception of millions of *Sed*-festivals appears therefore to have been regarded as one of the outcomes of the successful completion of the rites of the Opet festival and, given its presence in "culmination scenes," this would have been understood to have taken place along with Amun's confirmation of the king's right to rule by touching his head inside the temple sanctuary. Another similarity is the mention of a long lifetime and the "years" of a god (Horus, or Ra): the speech of Horus in the purification scene just mentioned explains that he is doing so "so that your (Sety I's) lifetime may be (like) the lifetime of Ra, and so that you may celebrate a great many *Sed*-festivals," while the Ennead of the Turin inscription declares "Give him the *Sed*-festivals of Ra and the years of Horus as king." The reception of *Sed*-festivals, therefore, along with

[928] *Ibid.*, 148 col. 4.

[929] *PM* II, 174 (517) I; *LD* III, 14.

[930] *PM* II, 174 (519) I, 3.

[931] *PM* II, 174 (519) II, 4.

the similar sequences of the king being welcomed into a temple with a Uraeus-goddess performing the *nyny*-gesture, his making offerings inside, and then his kneeling in front of the god so that he may touch the crowns on head, are all episodes which are found in the Turin inscription, and could lend support to the notion that the crowning of Horemheb took place in the sanctuary area of Luxor Temple.

This conclusion, however, could simply be explained away with the following: if the crowning in question took place in a palace structure, the very bestowal of the crowns, the transformation of Horemheb into a king, a possessor of the royal *ka*, would have with it, as Leclant has argued, the promise of victory.[932] The transformation of an individual into a king, regardless of location, would have with it carried the bestowal of a long *ḥᶜw* "lifetime" so that he could live to see numerous *Sed*-festivals. While it is certainly tempting to see Horemheb as having been crowned inside a temple based on the many analogies with the pictorial evidence, the similar references to the reception of a long lifetime and *Sed*-festivals still need not entail that this interpretation would be correct. It is, however, interesting to note that what is mentioned next in the Turin inscription parallels yet another episode which appears in coronation sequences, and that is the composition of the royal titulary.

6. The making of the titulary (l. 19; Urk. IV*, 2118,11–15)*

(19) [*i*]*r.w rn-wr nṯr pn nfr nḫb.t=f mỉ ḥm n Rᶜ m*

Ḥr Kɜ-nḫt-spd-sḫr.w

Nb.ty Wr-bỉɜ.wt-m-ʾIp.t-S.wt

Ḥr-Nbw Hry-ḥr-Mɜᶜ.t-sḫpr-tɜ.wy

Nsw.t-bỉty Ḏsr-ḫpr.w-Rᶜ-stp-n-Rᶜ

Sɜ-Rᶜ Ḥr-m-ḥb-mry-ʾImn dỉ.w ᶜnḫ

(19) The great-name of this good god was [m]ade, his titulary like (that of) the Person of Ra, consisting of

Horus 'Strong-bull-ready-of-plans'

Two Ladies 'Great-of-wonders-in-Karnak'

Golden Horus 'Pleased-with-Maat-the-one-who-brings-the-Two-Lands-into-being'

King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *Djeserkheperura-setep-en-Ra*

[932] Leclant, "Suckling", 141.

The Son of Ra 'Horemheb-the-beloved-of-Amun,' given life.

As stated in the previous two chapters, the theme of the composition of the titulary appears in several so-called "coronation" inscriptions: in Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*, as well as in her other text in the Middle Colonnade in Deir el-Bahari, and in Thutmose III's *Texte de la jeunesse*.[933] The "rescript" of Thutmose I, while it does give his titulary in full, is not an account of this king's accession, but a report to the King's Son of Kush relating that Thutmose I acceded to the throne, which as such gives the titulary in full so that oaths and offerings could be made correctly with this new protocol; this text is therefore not an account of the composition of Thutmose I's titulary.[934]

There is a discrepancy at this point between the Turin inscription and the Memphite Stela: the former has this section immediately following the speech by the Ennead, after which the exit from the *pr-nsw.t* is related, while the reverse is true for the latter.[935] The reason for this may have been that there was in actuality more than one episode involving the titulary of the king, for which reason its position in-text could differ between versions. The phrasing of the sentence starting the formulation of the titulary may have itself been purposefully ambiguous to allow it to designate whichever episode relating to it, such as announcement, or actual first composition.

It is also interesting to note that the theme of the composition of the royal titulary is present in "culmination" scenes in coronation sequences (fig. 1). In the case of the one mentioned in the Great Hypostyle Hall, for example, Thoth is depicted writing down the Horus Name and *praenomen* of Sety I on a *rnp.t*-hieroglyph.[936] On the north face of the west wing of the 8th Pylon, where what could be episodes of the Opet festival are depicted, the culmination scene on the top register, where the king is represented meeting Amun in his sanctuary, includes Thoth, who is writing down the king's names.[937] The composition of the titulary in Horemheb's texts must therefore be added to the list of episodes they have in common with various sequences of reliefs.

[933] Hatshepsut: *Urk.* IV, 261,3,11; *Deir el Bahari* III, pl. 62 (right). Thutmose III: *Urk.* IV, 160,11–161,12.

[934] *Urk.* IV, 80,11–17; chapter 1, 23–4.

[935] Turin (ll. 19–20): *Urk.* IV, 2118,11–19; Memphite (ll. 7–8): 2123,1–10.

[936] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150.

[937] *PM* II, 174 (519) I, 3.

7. Exit from the pr-nsw.t and public confirmation of kingship (ll. 19–21; Urk. IV*, 2118,16–2119,7)*

pr.t r-ḥꜣ(20)*-m pr-nsw.t ỉn ḥm n nṯr pn šps ỉmn nsw.t nṯr.w*

sꜣ=f ḫr-ḫꜣ.t=f

ḥpt.n=f nfrw=f ḫᶜ.w m ḫprš

r swḏ n=f šnn.t ỉtn

pḏ.t 9 ḫr rd.wy=fy

p.t m ḥb tꜣ ḫr rš.wt

psḏ.wt n.wt Tꜣ-Mry ỉb=sn nḏm.w

(21) *ỉst rf tꜣ ỉdb tm.w m rš.wt*

sgb=sn r ḥr.t

wr.w ktt.w ṯꜣỉ=sn nhm

tꜣ r-ḏr=f ḥᶜ.w

Going forth out (20) of the *pr-nsw.t* by the Person of this noble god, Amun, the king of the gods,

his son in front of him.

He embraced his beauty, he (Horemheb) having arisen with the *khepresh*-crown,

in order to transfer to him the circuit of the Aten,

the Nine Bows under his two legs,

the sky in festivity, the earth joyful,

the Enneads of the Beloved Land, their heart pleased.

(21) Now, the land, the bank, and all the people were joyful:[938]

They cheered to the heavens,

great and small, they began (lit. "seized") shouting,

the entire land rejoicing. [does this actually *need* to be a subordinate clause?]

[938] The presence of *ỉst* is fitting, given that its sentence interrupts the main narrative of the text while providing a piece of additional, background, information (Oréal, *Particules*, 227, 232–3), while also introducing a secondary character (*ibid.*, 233). In our text, the people of Egypt (the secondary characters in question) unanimously received Horemheb's transformation into Pharaoh with great joy. As for *rf*, it is performing its role of reframing the text's attention around another figure, marking "l'intervention d'un nouveau participant autour duquel le point de vue se déplace momentanément" (*ibid.*, 72): it thus diverts our attention away from Amun and Horemheb, and centres it on the people of Egypt, who then temporarily are the "protagonists" for the next three clauses.

After Horemheb was crowned in the *pr-nsw.t*, the procession exited this structure, and was received with a general atmosphere of sheer happiness and celebration. Interestingly, this action is described as his "appearance," where it is the actual movement from a hidden area out into the public and sunlit world, whereas the previous instance of *ḫꜥ* (l. 16) referred to the result of the crowning of Horemheb, that is, his (figurative) "appearance" as king. Clearly, *ḫꜥ* is flexible and multi-faceted word.

It is clear, based on the mention of the population in general, that the space into which the procession moved, still in the temple, was one into which the public was allowed. The forecourt of Amenhotep III (a public space) or his hypostyle hall (also called the Portico, which may have been a semi-public space) seem to be the likeliest candidates for more than one reason. Firstly, due to their nature as settings for the performance of public rituals. Secondly, regardless of whether one considers the *pr-nsw.t* as Luxor Temple or an adjoining palace, the forecourt or portico would still be the likeliest location to which the procession would have moved: assuming that Bell is correct in that Luxor Temple certainly did have a palace attached to it, and that this would have been accessed from a doorway in the east wall of the temple's Portico, then it would be reasonable to assume that this, or perhaps the forecourt, would have been the setting of Amun's embrace; alternatively, if one were to consider the *pr-nsw.t* as a reference to an inner part of the temple, then the exit therefrom into a public space would have naturally meant going out into first into the hypostyle hall, and then into the forecourt.[939] The mention of the emergence from the *pr-nsw.t* is not helpful in determining the nature of this structure.

The king, crowned with the *khepresh*, therefore exited the *pr-nsw.t*, at the head of the procession, in front of Amun (*sꜣ=f ḫr-ḥꜣ.t=f*), while the entire land and its people (*tꜣ tmw*), rich and poor, young and old (*wr.w ktt*) celebrated the successful renewal of the king and his royal *ka*, of Amun, and of the entirety of the cosmos. It would most likely be incorrect to assume, however, that the Opet festival rituals which were to take place in Luxor were over by this point: if all the events related in the "coronation" section of the inscription took place on one single day, even if this was already preceded by a number of festival days—if not only one, as according to the passage from the Memphite version (l. 2), there is simply no reason to assume that the festivities

[939] Bell, on the location of the Luxor Temple palace: "Divine", 154. For the role of temple forecourts as the settings for public rituals: Gabolde, "Cour", 55–61.

would have concluded at the king's appearance after the successful completion of the climactic rituals in Luxor. What can at least be said with certainty, however, is that it was at this point that the events which Horemheb wished to emphasise concluded. It was the fact that he participated in these rituals, as king, that he received public legitimation from Amun in the eyes of all, which he wished to record.

8. *End of festivities and sailing northward (ll. 21–3; Urk.* IV*, 2119,8–14)*

   ỉr-m-ḫt mnḳ ḥb pn ḫnty ỉp.t-Rs.yt

   ỉmn nsw.t nṯr.w ỉw m ḥtp r (22) *Wɜs.t*

   nᶜ.t ỉn ḥm=f m ḫd m ḫnty n Ḥr-ɜḫ.ty

   ỉst sw grg.n=f tɜ pn

   ntᶜ=f sw r rk Rᶜ

   smɜw.n=f ḥw.wt-nṯr.w ḫɜ.t ỉdḥw r Tɜ-Sty

   msy.n=f ᶜḫm.w(23)*=sn nb.w*

   Afterwards, this foremost festival of Southern Opet (i.e. Luxor) came to an end, and Amun, the king of the gods, came in peace to (22) Thebes.

   Travelling by his Person in sailing northward with the statue of Horakhty.

   Now, he (then began to) set this land in order:[940]

   He organised it to (the way it was) (at) the time of Ra,

   he renewed the temples from the marshes of the Delta to Nubia,

   he fashioned all (23) their images …

Whether the events of the Opet festival in Luxor Temple had concluded with the public appearance of Horemheb with the Blue Crown and his being embraced by Amun, it was eventually finally time for him to go back to Karnak to bring the whole of the Opet festival to a close.

[940] The role played by the particle *ỉst* here is to resume the narrative after a short sentence which establishes the setting for a new section of the text (Oréal, *Particules*, 232). The introductory sentence mentions that, with the Opet festival concluded, Horemheb was now sailing northward with the statue of Ra-Horakhty. This sets the scene for Horemheb's administration of the land and his contributions to the cults of the gods which, in turn, resumes the narrative, and is henceforth the new subject of the text. It is to convey this sense that "then began to" has been added between parentheses. *ỉst* played the same role in l. 12, where it resumed the narrative, while also introducing a new phase of the text (the events of the Opet festival), after "the mise en place descriptive du cadre" (*ibid.*, 237), that a long time had passed since Horemheb successful carrier as a court official. As for the absence of the particle *rf* in l. 22, this can probably be explained by the fact that *ỉst sw grg.n=f tɜ pn* does not divert the attention of the reader toward Horemheb (on the usual role of this particle: *ibid.*, 72, 74–5, 235–6); the preceding sentence (*nᶜ.t ỉn ḥm=f*) has already done so.

There is ambiguity regarding the phrase *ḫnty ʾIp.t-rs.yt*. It is presented above as referring to "this festival," but it could alternatively refer to Amun: "Afterwards, this festival came to an end. The foremost of Southern Opet, Amun, king of the gods, came in peace to Thebes." It will, however, be remembered that in line 14 of the Turin inscription, this same phrase was used, and it is clearer there that the reference is to the festival, rather than to Amun: *ỉst* [*rf ʾImn nb ns.wt tɜ.wy pr.w m ḥ*]*ʿy m ḥb=f nfr ḫnty ʾIp.t-rsy.t* "Now, [Amun, the lord of the thrones of the Two Lands, had gone forth in jo]yousness in his beautiful festival, the foremost of Southern Opet."[941]

The "coronation" section of the Turin inscription ends here. A few notes on what follows in the text before moving on to concluding remarks: just as every *ḫʿỉ* was seen as the rise of the sun at dawn, so the events which followed the "appearance" of Horemheb paralleled the sun god, who went about setting the land and all that is in order after the moment of creation. According to Morris, regarding the beginning of a new king's reign, between his accession and coronation: "Much of this liminal period, it seems, was occupied by a ceremonial journey known as 'The Creation of Order in all Provinces.' During the course of this royal progress the king would travel throughout Egypt, visiting various temples, receiving regalia and endorsements from the deities, and propitiating the gods (and their priesthoods) in return."[942] This can be gleaned in the Turin inscription (ll. 22–6). For Nubian kings, Kuhrt similarly states:

> An elaborate ritual seems to have surrounded the installation of the new king. At the death of the king, the army went to the palace to lament the absence of a leader to the courtiers; then, apparently in a formalised response, the successor was named and the wish expressed that he be placed on the throne. The accession of the new king was formally broadcast by a ceremonial coronation journey, taking in Napata, Kawa and Tabo, receiving regalia from the gods in each location in return for his promise to continue to support the cult. This was done by confirming the temples' rights to property, and creating new cult-offices. The royal procession route was cleared of sand before the royal cortège, and must surely have been an occasion when local groups could present petitions to the new king and affirm their loyalty to the throne. This probably explains why the coronation journey was entitled 'the creation of order in all provinces.'[943]

Interestingly, in the Third Dynasty of Ur, Shu-Sin, as part of his enthronement rituals, visited the temples of Enlil, Inanna, and Nanna in Nippur (where he was crowned),

---

[941] *Urk.* IV, 2117,2–3.

[942] Morris, "Pharaoh", 205.

[943] Kuhrt, *Near East*, 633; cf. Wicenciak, "Centres", 258–63.

Uruk (where he participated in rituals pertaining to Inanna), and Ur (where he was crowned) respectively to obtain their blessing.[944] In this context, a section of Hatshepsut's inscription in the Middle Colonnade at Deir el-Bahari, usually called her "northward journey," is referred to often: before her alleged coronation in the presence of Thutmose I, she is stated to have journeyed north with him, along with a great number of deities, the purpose being to visit the temple of Atum in Heliopolis while, as Breasted stated, being an "occasion of an acknowledgement of her coming kingship by all the gods of Egypt."[945] It is also interesting to note that the beginning of the speech of these gods promises that Hatshepsut would one day perform kingly duties very similar to those stated for Horemheb at the end of the Turin inscription.[946]

There is a discrepancy between the two texts, however: even taking Hatshepsut's word for it, it is clear that this journey would have taken place before her coronation before Thutmose I, whereas Horemheb, whether or not he was king before the events of the Opet festival, certainly was one by its end, and therefore before his own journey northward. Ramses II was present for the Opet festival in the first year of his reign; Horemheb's travel could therefore be understood within the same context of a king visiting various places in Egypt in his first regnal year, as Kitchen and Redford have argued for Ramses II.[947] It is ultimately concluded, however, that Horemheb's participation in the Opet festival was not necessarily a part of this journey.

Regardless, the similarities pointed out above, both intra-cultural for Hatshepsut, Horemheb, and Ramses II, and cross-cultural for Nubia and Mesopotamia as well, are fascinating, but given the peripheral importance of the "journey" to the "coronation ceremony," this subject matter deserves its own study.

---

[944] Renger, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 5, s.v. "Inthronisationsriten", 129.

[945] *Urk.* IV, 246,12–247,10. Breasted, *Records* II, 90 (§ 221). Breasted found equivalents to this "journey" in the *Texte de la jeunesse*, Horemheb's Turin inscription, and in Piye's Great Inscription (*Chapter*, 17–18 no. 29; *Jeunesse* cols. 9–11: *Urk.* IV, 159,10–161,12; Piye (ll. 101–5): Grimal, *Stèle triomphale*, 130–9, §19). Frankfort mentioned this "journey" as well, the purpose having been that the gods of the temples visited could "acknowledge" Hatshepsut (*Kingship*, 105); cf. Blackman's "pilgrimage to Heliopolis" of Piye ("Purification", 8–9; "Sacramental", 191) and Fairman who briefly mentioned the "journey" as well ("Kingship", 78).

[946] *Urk.* IV, 247,11–17 (cols. 8–9).

[947] Dedicatory Inscription: *KRI* II, 325,5–6 (l. 30); *KRI* II, *Notes and Comments*, 192); Redford, "Earliest Years", 110 ff.

II. Final analysis

Several ambiguities were encountered in the text which can be summed up in the following:

1. It is not entirely clear what Horemheb's status is at the start of the "coronation" section of the Turin inscription. If he had acceded to the throne already, it would seem likely that the events related consist of a "coronation ceremony" in the sense of the first public "appearance" by the king on a festival day, some time after the accession to the throne (in order to allow time for necessary preparations to be made), in this case on the occasion of the Opet festival.
2. If Horemheb had not yet acceded to the throne, then the events related in the text would consist of his accession.

Each possibility, in turn, would respectively entail:

a. If the events of the Turin inscription are seen as relating a "coronation ceremony," that is, a festival appearance of the new king on a planned occasion, the Opet festival, then the crowning in the *pr-nsw.t* should be seen as designating Luxor Temple, or at least its sanctuary area.
b. The accession, given that it is the official seizure of royal power, would usually most likely have taken place inside a palace.[948] It was seen that the *Historical Inscription* most likely related the accession of Hatshepsut (as well as what may be called her "coronation," given her special circumstances), and that this accordingly took place in the palace structure that was *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*. Horemheb's accession to the throne could therefore similarly have taken place inside a palace—the *pr-nsw.t*.

1. Coronation ceremony and pr-nsw.t as a designation of Luxor Temple

Over the course of the analysis of Horemheb's Turin text, it was mentioned that some are of the opinion that Horemheb celebrated his coronation ceremony on the occasion of the Opet festival, and as a part of it. According to Kemp, "the whole coronation ceremony was integrated with the Opet festival so that the great Karnak-Luxor

[948] Cf. Redford, *History*, 22.

procession became a celebratory parade for the newly validated king."[949] O'Connor, on the other hand, argues that the Opet festival was celebrated as usual, with Horemheb going to Luxor Temple with the Theban Triad, except that after the rituals that usually took place in that temple were completed, the procession went to the Karnak temple palace first, where the actual coronation ceremony took place, before finally returning to Karnak temple.[950] This therefore suggests that O'Connor, unlike Gardiner and Bell, who believe that Horemheb's coronation ceremony "had to be fitted into the regular programme"[951] of the Opet festival, believes that it was merely celebrated on the same occasion, but separately both in terms of space (Karnak temple) and time (after the rituals at Luxor Temple). Several objections were raised to O'Connor's interpretation of the events. What about the theory that the Opet simply acted as his coronation ceremony, or perhaps that the events were a mixture of this festival and the coronation?

If there is one main thing which stands out in the analysis of this text, it is that the events described between lines 12 to 22 of the inscription on the back of Horemheb's statue in Turin seem to follow the standard programme of the Opet festival. Even the crowning of Horemheb has been demonstrated to have been standard procedure, through the examination of sources from the reigns of different kings which deal with the Opet festival.[952] It is for this reason that I refer to these scenes as depicting a king's "crowning" as opposed to his "coronation:" to avoid confusion between the ritual of placing the crown(s) on a king's head as a standard part of a festival or ceremony (in this case the Opet) on the one hand, and the same act, but as part of the (so-called) coronation ceremony. Gardiner and Bell regard the "coronation" ceremony of Horemheb as exceptionally having been celebrated on the occasion of the Opet festival. Many Egyptologists have argued before them that the coronation ceremony might have been celebrated on an important or significant date. It has, for example, been argued that it could have been made to coincide with the beginning of one of the three seasons of the ancient Egyptian calendar,[953] or with certain

[949] Kemp, *Anatomy*, 209. Cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", 23–4; Bell, "Luxor", 273, 276.

[950] O'Connor, "Beloved", 278.

[951] Gardiner, "Coronation", 24.

[952] Hatshepsut and Amenhotep III.

[953] Gardiner, "Notices", 122–5; Frankfort, *Kingship*, 103; Gardiner, "Coronation", 23; Fairman, "Kingship", 78.

astronomical events.[954] Instead of viewing the coronation ceremony as always having occurred on an auspicious day, with Horemheb as a further exception to the norm by his having celebrated it on the occasion of the Opet festival, another explanation is far more likely.

It is standard Egyptological theory to understand the word *ḫʿi*, when used of the king, as referring to one of three things: (1) his accession to the throne, (2) his coronation ceremony, and (3) any public appearance of his on the occasion of a festival or ceremony.[955] Redford beautifully argues that "where *ḫʿy* is used in a context in which a coronation is described, its use derives from the well-attested employment of *ḫʿy* to denote a festal appearance of a god. It had nothing to do with the act of crowning, and should not be paraphrased by the English word 'coronation'."[956] According to him, the formal crowning of the king would have occurred at the accession, while it was the kings who came to the throne "under far from normal circumstances" who celebrated "coronation" ceremonies, in order to legitimise their rules.[957]

The analysis of the "coronation" texts throughout this thesis is in agreement with Redford's views: such a ceremony did not exist, the term "coronation" therefore not being an accurate one to apply to the first festal "appearance" of a king. This is not to belittle the importance of the act of crowning itself, however.[958] In the *Texte de la jeunesse*, the climax was Thutmose III being crowned by Amun (although, as argued, admittedly most likely only on the metaphysical plane). The case of Hatshepsut is complicated, given that the *Historical Inscription* relates an occasion which could be seen as both her accession as well as her "coronation" (in the sense of her first appearance, as king, on a festival occasion). Regardless, the central event in that text was the *ḫʿw-nsw.t* which Amun "made" (*ỉr*), perhaps akin to the scene on the western wall of the Great Hypostyle Hall depicting Amun establishing (*smn*) the crowns, this described in the king's caption as Amun "causing (Sety I) to appear" (*sḫʿ*).[959]

---

[954] Full moon days: Borchardt, *Mittel*, 68–9. New moon days: Barta, "Thronbesteigung", 33–53.

[955] Gardiner, "Coronation", 23; Redford, *History*, 27. Schunck divides her study of the *ḫʿi* of the king in a roughly similar manner: Schunck, *Wortstamm*, 63–75, 76–7, 78–83.

[956] Redford, *History*, 27.

[957] *Ibid.*, 21.

[958] It is undeniable that *s/ḫʿ* could refer to the act of crowning itself, acknowledged by Redford as well (*ibid.*, 20).

[959] Chapelle Rouge # 164,9: Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 19; Nelson, Hypostyle, 150; chapter 3, 95.

Alternatively, the *ḫʿw-nsw.t* could be seen as the cumulative result of the enthronement and subsequent crowning Hatshepsut underwent in *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*, the preferred view in this thesis.

If the Horemheb text under discussion here does not relate a coronation ceremony *per se*, what, then are the events described? Under the assumption that Horemheb had already acceded to the throne before the Opet, then his crowning during this festival would not have been his first, this simply being a normal part thereof taking place in the sanctuary area of Luxor Temple: as suggested above, simply put, this inscription tells the normal course of events of the Opet festival. Based on my analysis of this text, what makes this occasion more special than usual, however, is that it would have been Horemheb's first time to participate in the Opet festival, or perhaps even in any festival, after his accession to the throne. While it is true that the date on inscription, if there ever was one, has not survived, the text, it will be remembered, describes Horemheb, before he went to the *pr-nsw.t* to be crowned, as a "hereditary noble" (*iry-pʿt*), and as "one who has authority over the Two Lands (*ḥry tp tꜣ.wy*)."[960] Horemheb is here not referred to as king, but by non-royal titles. The first, *iry-pʿt*, is actually attested on monuments from the time before he had become king,[961] and it has been argued that, seeing as this is the term used to denote the "crown prince" starting the beginning of the 19th Dynasty, that it might be describing Horemheb as such as well.[962] As for the second title, *sꜣ smsw n Ḥr*, it is unattested anywhere else, but according to Dodson, "it is clearly intended to parallel *sꜣ-nsw.t smsw*, 'Eldest King's Son' that had designated the heir to the throne since the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty."[963] Both titles, therefore, refer to Horemheb's status as heir apparent. The question is, of course, whose he was. According to Dodson and Kawai, the heir apparent of Tutankhamun was Ay, not Horemheb,[964] which would suggest that Horemheb is here referring to himself as the heir apparent of either Ay or of Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* himself. If Ay is who it was meant, Horemheb's reticence about naming

[960] Turin inscription l. 15: *Urk*. IV, 9–10. This important part is unfortunately not in the Memphite version, but it is unclear whether the reason for this is the fragmentary state of the stela, or that it was simply originally not included in it.

[961] Martin, *Memphite Tomb* I, 163.

[962] Dodson, *Amarna Sunset*, 101–2, 157 no. 9. Cf. Gardiner, *Tomb*, 9–10.

[963] Dodson, *Amarna Sunset*, 112; cf. Dodson, "Crown Prince Djehutmose", 88, 91–6.

[964] Dodson, *Amarna Sunset*, 94; Kawai, "Ay Versus Horemheb", 270–1, 289.

him would be understandable, considering his strong ties with the Amarna royal family.[965] On the other hand, Horemheb might be referring to himself as the heir apparent to Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* as a way to legitimise his new reign without leaning on his own ties with the Amarna dynasty, which he would have understandably wished not only to downplay, but omit altogether.

Whether Horemheb is referring to himself as the one next in line to the throne of Ay, Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* or perhaps even Tutankhamun (by simply ignoring Ay's reign), the mention of the non-royal titles before his crowning suggests that the Turin inscription relates his accession to the throne (in a palace). The many similarities with reliefs representing episodes of the Opet festival, on the other hand, argue for a temple setting. It is possible that these non-royal titles in this case were included to present an ideal image of royal succession, with the new king immediately taking the place of his predecessor on the throne during a public demonstration of divine approval, regardless of the fact that Horemheb had acceded to the throne already. The inclusion of non-royal titles would have furthermore served to emphasise his non-royal origins, therefore setting himself at a distance from the Amarna dynasty.

That his *nomen*, Horemheb, is written in a cartouche could be interpreted as supporting this hypothesis, but it must be borne in mind that this inscription was certainly carved after the events described in it—by which time Horemheb was definitely king, which would therefore make the writing of his name without the cartouche, even if it were referring to Horemheb before he had achieved royal status, unthinkable. Whether he was already king or not, what the mention of the non-royal titles does heavily suggest is that this Opet festival took place very early in the reign of Horemheb, or was perhaps even the first Horemheb witnessed as king, since his accession.

This, I believe, is precisely what makes this Opet festival so special that Horemheb had it recorded: it was not any other Opet festival, and neither was it Horemheb's coronation ceremony *per se*, but the first time that he participated in it, and perhaps even the first time that he appeared in public, participating in a festival or ceremony of this magnitude, thus lending further legitimacy to his reign: his appearance

[965] Murnane, "Kingship", 189. Horemheb's wish to distance himself from them is also apparent in his subjecting of Ay, Nakhtmin and Ankhsenamun to *damnatio memoriae* (Kawai, "Ay Versus Horemheb", 288).

ceremony. A scene caption, also on the north face of the 8th Pylon, seems to support this view. It records the speech of Amun in the (west wing) scene of his barque in procession:[966] *smn(=ỉ) n=ṯ sʿḥ=tn [sic] nsw.t nsw.t-bỉty Mɜʿ.t-kɜ-Rʿ m rnp*[*.t*] *t*[*p.t*] *n s*[*mn.t*] *ḫʿ=ṯ…* [*bs.n=ỉ*] *ḥm=ṯ r pr-wr* [*nṯr.w nṯr.wt m ḥʿ*]*ʿw.t psḏ.t ʿɜ.t m ršw.t* [*sḏm*]*=sn ỉr.t.n ḥm=ỉ* "(I) establish for you your [sic][967] dignity of king, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Maat-ka-Ra, *in the fir[st] ye[ar] of the es[tablishing] of your crown*... [I introduced] your Person (in)to the *pr-wr*, [the gods and the goddesses rejoi]cing and the Great Ennead joyful, when they [heard] that which my Person did."[968] The position of this scene on the north-south axis of Karnak temple, as argued, indicates that the depicted procession (and therefore speech of Amun) took place on the occasion of the Opet festival. If this assumption is correct, then what we have here is another reference to the participation of a king (Hatshepsut) in the Opet festival in the first year of their reign. Ramses II similarly participated in the Opet festival in the first year of his own (sole) reign:[969] a passage in the Great Dedicatory Inscription says that *wʿ m nn hrw ḫpr m ḥɜ.t-sp 1 ɜbd 3 ɜḫ.t sw 23* […] *ỉw* [*ḥm=f*] *ḥr-sɜ sḫn.t ỉmn r ỉp.t* "On one of these days, it happened, in Year 1, Month 3 of Akhet, Day 23, the coming back of [his Person?] after taking Amun south to Opet."[970] It is probably Luxor Temple that is meant by "Opet" here, for *sḫn.t* is the infinitive causative form of *ḫn.t*, which means to sail upstream, i.e. southward,[971] and therefore from Karnak to Luxor. Based on the date given in the text, it is clear that this taking of (the image of) Amun to Luxor Temple occurred on the occasion of the Opet festival.[972]

These events recorded by Hatshepsut and Ramses II, along with the analysis of the coronation inscription of Horemheb all support the theory that the participation of at least certain rulers in the Opet festival *of their first year* was of paramount

---

[966] *PM* II, 174 (519) I, 1.

[967] The second person feminine *dependent* pronoun is used here, when it should obviously be the suffix pronoun instead.

[968] *Urk.* IV, 281,4–11.

[969] It seems certain that a coregency did occur between Sety I and Ramses II (Murnane, *Coregencies*, 57–87; cf. Murnane, "Kingship", 207).

[970] *PM* VI, 3 (34–7); *KRI* II, 325,5–6 (l. 30). Cf. Kitchen's Notes & Comments volume, in which he gives a timeline of the events based on this inscription (*Ramesside Inscriptions* II, *Translated and Annotated*, 192).

[971] *Wb*. III, 309.

[972] I am thankful to Dr. Masashi Fukaya for pointing this out to me.

importance,[973] and suggest that Horemheb's Turin text does not, in fact, relate his coronation ceremony. Rather, what is described is his first public appearance in his capacity of Pharaoh, and therefore appearance ceremony, with the Opet festival having purposefully chosen as the ceremonial setting; Ramses II may have followed suit with his own participation in the Opet festival in the first year of his reign. If the event related in the Turin inscription is indeed Horemheb's appearance ceremony on the occasion of the Opet festival, then he would have been crowned, as practice dictated; this crowning, however, was probably not his first, given that this would have presumably already taken place at his accession.

This conclusion is retained throughout the following analysis as well as in the final remarks on the Turin inscription, but it does not fully explain the events of the text.

2. Accession and pr-nsw.t as a palace

Despite the similarities with reliefs carved in both Karnak and Luxor temples, the conclusion that Horemheb's inscription is an account of his appearance ceremony, and that the described crowning took place in Luxor Temple has several problems. Firstly, there is the fact that the term *pr-nsw.t* is known only to refer to palaces.

Secondly, in the pictorial evidence covered above, it was seen that the "culmination" scenes of the meeting between the king and Amun were all preceded by *bs-nsw.t* scenes. In the Turin inscription however, the entrance into the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr* is not described as such, while the *bs-nsw.t* in Karnak which took place earlier in the text is mentioned twice with that term (ll. 13–14). Neither can it be said that the procession was in Luxor all along, and therefore that the *bs-nsw.t* in question took place in Luxor, given that Karnak being the setting is clear: "Horus then proceeded amid rejoicing to Thebes, the city of the Lord of Eternity, his son in his embrace, to Karnak, in order to induct him into the presence of Amun" (l. 13).[974] Admittedly, however, that an induction is mentioned as having taken place in Karnak, while a similar action took place in Luxor which is not described is as such, does not in itself exclude the fact that the crowning in Luxor was indeed preceded by an "induction" of Horemheb into the temple. Therefore, while Horemheb's entrance into the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr* in Luxor is

[973] This notion was first proposed by Helck ("Zwei thebanische Urkunden", 86). Waitkus provides a list of rulers attested to have attended the Opet festival early in their reigns (*Kult und Funktion* I, 254–5).

[974] *Urk.* IV, 2116,15–17.

not expressly designated with the term *bs-nsw.t*, which could suggest that the structure he entered was not a temple, this is an argument based on a lack of evidence rather than the presence thereof.

Aside from these arguments which argue directly against the notion that the crowning of Horemheb took place in Luxor Temple, in the same manner as recorded in reliefs carved there and in Karnak, there is also the fact that the accession and crowning of Hatshepsut took place in a palace, providing a precedent for the possibility that Horemheb was similarly crowned in one. In the Turin inscription, Horemheb is referred to with non-royal titles before entering the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr* (l. 15), thus suggesting that he was not yet a king before being crowned there. This would mean that his crowning would have consisted of his accession, inside a palace, precisely like Hatshepsut.

This interpretation is not without its own problems, however. If Horemheb was indeed not yet king before entering the *pr-nsw.t* and *pr-wr* inside the palace adjoining Luxor Temple where he would accede to the throne, this would call into question the purpose of his being inducted into the presence of Amun in Karnak. It was seen in the pictorial evidence that *bs-nsw.t* scenes preceded the meeting of a king with Amun, while Horemheb would not have been one even after his induction due to the non-royal titles with which he is described. The explanation could be that a *bs-nsw.t* does not therefore by itself designate seizure of royal power but, as argued above in the discussion on the location of the *bs-nsw.t* in Karnak, simply refers to the meeting of the king with the god, having more of the sense of being ushered into the presence of the main godhead, as opposed to literally being "inducted" into the royal office. It was also argued that the king in the Karnak *bs-nsw.t* was not Horemheb, but Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*.

In contrast, as argued above, the references to Horemheb with non-royal titles need not entail that he was in actuality not yet Pharaoh, for this could have simply been a literary device to underline the fact that a commoner, with divine support, could rise to the very apex of society. However, while this fits very well with the overarching theme in the Turin inscription which, before the "coronation" section, relates his rise in the social hierarchy, this would still be a reference to a king with non-royal titles. That Horemheb's *nomen* is written inside a cartouche despite the fact that he was not yet

king speaks against the possibility that non-royal titles were used to describe someone who was already king.

This leads to the strongest argument against the notion that the crowning of Horemheb consisted of his accession: the very setting of the Opet festival. It would certainly have been a tremendous coincidence for this to have taken place not only at any point during this festival, and perhaps even on the very day of an apparently important event of making offerings to Amun, for this would imply, based on the standard definition of "accession," namely, the rise to the throne at the death of one's predecessor, that Ay had passed away just the day before. Before as a result resorting to the interpretation that the events related in the Turin inscription consist not of the accession of Horemheb, but of his "coronation ceremony," that is, his first festal appearance in public as king, by default, an alternative explanation is possible. The key factor here is the standard definition of the term "accession." What if Ay had indeed passed away, but the throne was not immediately transferred to Horemheb? The following is a purely hypothetical interpretation based on the evidence presented in this chapter: Ay passed away, but Horemheb, unwilling to seize royal office without obtaining divine blessing, waited until the grand occasion of the Opet festival, which would have presumably been coming up soon. He could have therefore engineered the whole festival occasion, in the same manner as Hatshepsut, for the aim of the momentous crowning he was to undergo in the palace, but not the one which may have been in Karnak, but the one adjoining Luxor Temple, given that he had to adapt to the standard procedure of the Opet festival.[975] This avoids ascribing the otherwise unattested meaning of *pr-nsw.t* as "temple."

This interpretation explains the need for the presence of Horus of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t* who was presented as the preceding king, the father of Horemheb, whom he succeeded. This would also explain the references to Horemheb with non-royal titles. The event consisting of his accession, this would furthermore also explain the composition of the royal titulary, which kings would have received on the occasion of their accession.

This raises questions regarding the reckoning of Horemheb's regnal years: it has been proposed that the range between IV *pr.t* 28 and I *šmw* 13 includes the date on which the switch to the following regnal year took place, thus excluding the possibility

[975] Cf. Gardiner, who argued that the "coronation ceremony" of Horemheb had to be fitted into the programme of the Opet festival ("Coronation", 24).

of an accession on the occasion of the Opet festival, but this is not certain.[976] It is known that as early as the reign of Ramses II, the regnal years of Akhenaten, Smenkhkare, Tutankhamun, and Ay were ascribed to Horemheb, and the addition of their regnal years seems to fit well with the remainder of the evidence.[977] As it stands, it is currently unknown from which date Horemheb counted his own regnal years, though the date of Amenhotep III's death has been proposed.[978]

Thus far, the underlying premise has been that an accession would have taken place inside a palace, while a crowning during a festival occasion would have taken place inside a temple. It certainly seems that this would have been the standard for most rulers, but (1) if it is true that Horemheb waited until the Opet festival since Ay's passing to seize the throne, since (2) he had to have adapted to its expected programme, and given (3) the striking similarities with scenes depicting episodes from this festival, then it could be argued that Horemheb was crowned and acceded to the throne not inside a palace, but Luxor Temple. Given that the accession seems to have taken place in palaces however, even in special cases like Hatshepsut, and that *pr-nsw.t* is known to refer only to palaces, the preferred view in this thesis is that Horemheb's accession, too, took place in a palace.

III. Conclusions

Like Hatshepsut therefore, Horemheb's accession seems to have coincided with his "coronation ceremony." His case is even more exceptional however, since this is not an instance of his being promoted to coregent, unless the period between the death of Ay and the Opet festival is seen as a coregency—which, in a manner of speaking, it was. The passages from the text discussed in this chapter indicate that the events related consist of Horemheb's accession given that they consist of the occasion on which he officially became Pharaoh. These same events could be also described as his "coronation ceremony." This description is an accurate one only insofar as the occasion is a pre-planned public and legitimising event in a temple and festival setting, and

[976] Hornung, "New Kingdom", 209.

[977] *Loc. cit.*; Dodson, *Amarna Sunset*, 128–32.

[978] Booth, *Horemheb*, 125. No reference is provided. If true however, and excluding a coregency (the existence of which is in doubt according to recent scholarship), that Akhenaten acceded to the throne between I *pr.t* 1 and I *pr.t* 8 (Hornung, "New Kingdom", 204–6), and therefore that Amenhotep III died around this date, would suggest that the change in regnal years for Horemheb would have taken place at around this time.

which took place soon after the accession. Even though Horemheb was indeed crowned on this occasion, the crowning technically took place not as a part of the Opet festival, but as a part of the accession, inside the palace structure that was the *pr-nsw.t*. It must be assumed that Horemheb's kingship was confirmed, and that he was crowned, soon after his first crowning and transformation into Pharaoh inside the *pr-nsw.t*, as a part of the standard procedure of the Opet festival.

In short, the term "coronation ceremony" is once more found to be an inaccurate one, given that Horemheb was fully Pharaoh, and equipped with the regalia of his office, before the "coronation ceremony," and therefore in contrast with the regular meaning of the term, as understood in European tradition. Rather, it was the first, public, religious legitimising event of Horemheb's reign, on which occasion he appeared and acted as king for all to see. It was an "appearance ceremony."

Having examined the evidence, and covered the arguments for and against, the events related in the "coronation" section of Horemheb's Turin inscription as relating (1) his accession, (2) "coronation" (in the sense of his first appearance on a festival occasion, in public, receiving the god's blessing), its having taken place inside (3) a palace (that adjoining Karnak or Luxor) or (4) a temple (Karnak or Luxor), what was first established was that the crowning certainly did not take place in Karnak, thus eliminating the temple or its attached palace. The evidence is unfortunately too ambiguous to further narrow things down with any degree of certainty. Both interpretations of accession in a palace and appearance ceremony in a festival setting are very tempting, but have wide-ranging implications. Based on the analysis just presented however, that the arguments supporting a highly exceptional event on which occasion accession and appearance ceremony were made to coincide are stronger. With his participation in the Opet festival soon after his accession, Horemheb seems to have set the trend, or rather the ideal, for the coming Ramesside dynasty. This, however, would require an in-depth and independent study.

CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

Over the course of this thesis, three primary coronation inscriptions dating to the 18th Dynasty were analysed in order to ascertain whether there existed a coronation ceremony in Egypt's Dynastic Period. To this end, a number of sources were examined, both textual and pictorial. These were shown to pose challenges, however.

The textual sources have not survived intact, and exhibit lacunae in key parts. Furthermore, the texts are ambiguous in their portrayal of the events they relate: the *Texte de la jeunesse*, for example, abruptly moves from a relatively clear narrative set in real locations, to describing how Thutmose transformed into a falcon, was elevated to a different plane, and saw the god Ra in his daily journey through the sky. Horemheb's Turin inscription, on the other hand, is ambiguous by providing the reader with precious few details, making it difficult to follow the sequence of unfolding events, and where exactly they are taking place. It must be noted, however, that while these omitted details are important for the modern researcher for this purpose, they were not so for the ancient reader. The setting for Amun's *bi3y.t* for Thutmose in the *Jeunesse* is stated to have been the *wadjyt*, with no further elaboration: there was no need. What mattered was that this was taking place in a well-known location ahead of the god's private apartments which alluded to the god Horus coming of age, putting an end to a childhood of hiding in thickets, and "appearing" on the throne of his father as rightful heir. So it is with the Turin inscription: the exact location of the induction in Karnak is immaterial, as is that of his crowning. It is the fact itself of a *bs-nsw.t* and the bestowal of the crowns' having taken place in a *pr-wr* which are of substance.

Pictorial sources, the secondary focus of this thesis, are problematic as well. One of the difficulties was shown to lie in the fact that scene captions do not necessarily name the festival they are depicting. In the Hypostyle Hall, for example, some scenes specifically refer to the Valley Festival, others to the Opet, while another series depicts a variation of the coronation sequence without mentioning the festival occasion.[979] It is then unclear whether this depicts a part of one or more of the depicted festivals, or if it is a separate event which is being recorded. If so, it is unclear whether

[979] Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 148–50.

this depicts the ideal of daily temple ritual, with the king being inducted into the god's presence to act as the officiating "priest." It has also been argued that coronation sequences depict the constituent rituals of the coronation ceremony in the Dynastic Period.[980] This conclusion does not necessarily follow, however.

While very interesting matches were found between the narrative of the Turin inscription and the pictorial evidence in both Karnak and Luxor Temples, they ultimately proved inconclusive due to the ambiguity exhibited by both sets of sources. This is not to say that such an endeavour would be futile: depictions of rituals and festivals shed great light on the texts examined in this thesis. Their ritual and structural contexts must be borne in mind along with the fact that the pictorial evidence is a different medium, with its pertaining advantages and disadvantages, designed for a purpose possibly distinct from a coronation inscription's. A study conducting an extensive analysis of coronation sequences and how the rituals they depict relate to their structural, ritual, and perhaps festival contexts, while outside of the scope of this thesis, is deserving of its own study.

I. Problems with previous research

Three of them were noted in the introductory chapter: (1) the terminology is not as practical as possible, with "coronation" being term which could refer to both the act of crowning, as well as the ceremony on which occasion this would have taken place, (2) the use of different kinds of sources, textual and pictorial, and from various reigns, regardless of time period, to reconstruct the ancient Egyptian coronation ceremony, and (3) the premise that there was such an event which could be called a coronation ceremony, and the ensuing labelling of events which seemingly fit this description as such.

1. The terminology

To address these issues, this thesis set forth a more precise terminology: the term "crowning" is used to refer to the act itself of placing the crowns on a king's head; this is regardless of circumstance, whether during accession, coronation ceremony, or on the occasion of another festival such as the Opet. The term "coronation ceremony" without quotation marks was used to refer to the standard definition of this event, that

[980] E.g.: Leclant, "Colonnade", 113 ff., esp. 123 f.; "Suckling", 137–8; "Purification", 48.

is, a grand event early in a reign which would have required time for preparation, organised for the specific purpose of crowning the new king. The same term, when needed, was placed between quotation marks to refer to an event, whether described in a textual or pictorial source, the nature of which is uncertain: accession, *séance oraculaire*, Opet or another festival, coronation ceremony, or a possible Egyptian equivalent thereto.

2. The use of different kinds of sources across Egyptian history

Textual and pictorial sources from various reigns, across dynasties, have been used in previous research to shed light on the alleged coronation ceremony in the Dynastic Period.[981] The problem with the use of sources from different reigns is evident: it is based on the assumption that the coronation ceremony, if it existed, changed little over time. This is not necessarily the case, however. It was seen, for example, that Horemheb's Turin inscription does not shed light on the events of another text from the 18th Dynasty, Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*;[982] on the other hand, it was also argued that Ramses II of the 19th Dynasty held his appearance ceremony on the occasion of the Opet festival, possibly following a trend set by Horemheb.[983] Many sources used to support the existence of parallels to the events related in coronation inscriptions were shown to have been pictorial, and stemming from reigns of kings who did not leave behind such texts, as with coronation sequences from Sety I/Ramses II's Hypostyle Hall and Philip Arrhidaeus' barque shrine in Karnak, the latter of whom certainly could not have undergone an Egyptian coronation or equivalent ceremony. The challenges accompanying the use of scenes from temple walls to correlate them with coronation inscriptions, summarised above, were noted throughout the thesis.

For this reason, it is fortunate that the three main texts from the Dynastic Period described as coronation inscriptions date to the 18th Dynasty, thus minimising large chronological gaps between each account. It was ultimately found that the events related in Hatshepsut's and Horemheb's texts were highly exceptional, and the simple label of "coronation ceremony" does not adequately describe them. Given that these are considered the most detailed accounts of coronation ceremonies from the Dynastic

[981] E.g.: Moret, *Caractère*, 75 f.; Barta, "Rituale", 6–13.

[982] Chapter 3, 55–8.

[983] Chapter 5, 257, 263–4.

Period, and that pictorial sources are not necessarily accurate depictions, then the existence itself of such a ceremony must be called into question.

3. The premise that there did exist a coronation ceremony

This thesis began with an examination of the best known coronation ceremony from ancient Egyptian history: that of Ptolemy V Epiphanes. It was seen that this event, related on the Rosetta Stone, meets the criteria of a coronation ceremony: it was held early in the reign of Epiphanes, after he had already ascended to the throne, and he was crowned with Egyptian crowns, apparently for the first time. This has coloured the examination of earlier inscriptions which seem to relate a king's coming to power.

Initially, the problem was that the distinction between accession and coronation ceremony was not being made. Thereafter, disagreement arose among scholars regarding which texts should be seen as accounts of a king's accession or coronation ceremony. While Epiphanes, however, did undergo a coronation ceremony, it is highly unlikely that any Macedonian king before him had undergone such a ceremony. It was noted that he was crowned at a time when serious troubles began shaking the Ptolemaic kings' grip on Egypt. Redford pointed out that the earlier kings, from the Dynastic Period, who have left behind accounts of coronation ceremonies were rulers who, like Epiphanes, needed to legitimise their rules.

Given the importance of the inscriptions of Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and Horemheb for the study of the coronation ceremony, they are among the primary examples used to support its existence in the Dynastic Period. The main question addressed by this thesis, whether there existed a coronation ceremony in the Dynastic Period, therefore naturally revolved around the analysis and interpretation of these three texts.

II. Results

It was argued that the *Texte de la jeunesse* can be interpreted as an account of a *séance oraculaire* which Thutmose III underwent before his accession, or alternatively as an account of his promotion to status of coregent; the view that this is an account of his accession to sole rule or a coronation ceremony was refuted. The sudden shift from the real-world setting mentioning festival procession and place names, to the mythological plane describing Thutmose being crowned by Ra in the sky, is striking. While it could

admittedly be seen as an embellished description of what actually happened, the preferred view in this thesis is that this is a description of Thutmose's religious experience of understanding what his divine selection entailed. It is therefore concluded that the *Jeunesse* does not provide an account of a coronation or appearance ceremony, and neither does the beginning of his 7th Pylon inscription, this certainly consisting of a *séance oraculaire*.

Horemheb's case is difficult to interpret: the safer conclusion would be that the Opet in his texts was his first public participation as king in a religious festival, and in this sense his appearance ceremony. The preferred conclusion, however, was that his actual accession took place on the occasion of the Opet festival since he is referred to with non-royal titles, and that he did become king during the events described. Since his regnal years were later counted from the death of Amenhotep III, it was proposed that Horemheb's accession—unlikely coincidences notwithstanding—did not immediately follow Ay's passing, and that he could have waited for the Opet festival to officially accede to the throne.

Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*, the most detailed, is indeed an account of the occasion on which she became king: a God's Wife at the start, she underwent an enthronement followed by a crowning, and became Pharaoh. Coregencies are special cases of royal succession wherein accession and appearance ceremony intersect: (1) the *Historical Inscription* describing the beginning of Hatshepsut's coregency with Thutmose III, and thus also the official start of her reign, therefore relates her accession (but not at her predecessor's death); (2) these same events, being pre-planned and of a public (hence legitimising) nature, involving the new ruler's first public "appearance" as king following the accession, can therefore also be described as Hatshepsut's appearance ceremony. It is noteworthy that the climax is not when Hatshepsut first sat on the throne (enthronement, *intronisation*, *Thronbesteigung*), and neither is it when she first wore the crowns (coronation, *couronnement*, *Krönung*); it is her *ḥʿw-nsw.t* at the hands of Amun, which seems to have been the cumulative result of these rituals: "Then these courtiers… their faces seized surprise; their limbs joined with fatigue when they saw the appearance of the enduring king which the Lord-of-All himself made" (*H* 19, # 48 + 164,7–10).

The analysis of these inscriptions therefore does not support the existence of a coronation ceremony in Egypt's Dynastic Period. Admittedly, however, it must be borne in mind that only three (four with the inclusion of Thutmose III's 7th Pylon inscription) were examined in this thesis, and furthermore all from one specific time period. This evidence therefore supports some of the arguments put forth by Redford, in so far as there was no standard coronation ceremony in the Dynastic Period that every ruler would have attempted to undergo.[984] As Redford argued, little preparation would have been needed to invest the new king in the palace with the regalia of the office of Pharaoh very soon after the death of the predecessor.[985] Bommas' views on the *Investiturritual* support this notion: "Da die sethischen Kräfte allnächtlich wirken, wurde dieses Ritual allmorgendlich durchgeführt … Die Kronen, die der König als Zeichen des göttlichen Königtums trägt, waren äusseres Kennzeichen eines erfolgreich durchgeführten Rituals."[986] If such rituals were repeated on a daily basis, there is no reason to assume that this was not the case for kings at such an important event as their accession to sole rule, especially to put an end to the ideological and very real period of chaos following the death of a king.

That is not to say that Barta's ideas should be discredited altogether: there probably existed ritual papyri preserving rituals which could have been consulted for the accession of the king, these influenced by, and borrowed from, those of other thematically related events such as the *Investiturritual* itself and the *Sed* and Opet festivals. As for appearance ceremonies, the evidence examined in this thesis has determined that they could have been celebrated on the occasions of some festivals, as with Horemheb and the Opet festival. This does not, however, exclude the existence of a standard ceremony (distinct from a coronation) which may have commonly been organised at some point early in a king's reign, but after the accession to the throne to celebrate or commemorate this fact or, as Redford termed it, "an elaborate rite dramatizing the myth of the kingship."[987] It is not impossible for coronation sequences to have been very abstract representations of all of the above, which could thus appropriately find their place alongside relief representations of such events. According

[984] Redford, *History*, 18 f.

[985] *Ibid.*, 22.

[986] Bommas, *Investiturritual*, 89.

[987] Redford, *History*, 22.

to Kemp, noting the ritual of the raising of the *Djed*-pillar on the occasion of Amenhotep III's *Sed*-festival: "This interchangeability of ritual and associated ideas made it relatively easy to invent new combinations by stirring the pot of tradition."[988] What the evidence does not seem to support, as argued by Redford, is the fact that a coronation ceremony as such existed, and that it would have been celebrated by every ruler: "The initial (formal) coronation of the king may have followed some little time after the accession, but there is no reason to assume that this was a general rule, or that the coronation could not take place on the day of the new king's reign."[989] One of the aims of this thesis was to set out a clear terminology, and here too, Redford's statement can be made less ambiguous by simply replacing "coronation" with "crowning," given that it is specifically the action of crowning which is meant.

Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and Horemheb were all rulers with exceptional personalities in circumstances just as exceptional, and all three had to legitimise their rules. Redford saw Hatshepsut and Horemheb as exceptions to the rule who celebrated coronation ceremonies to this end.[990] It was seen in this thesis, however, that it was not a coronation ceremony, but an appearance ceremony which would have ideally been celebrated by most kings, participating in festivals in their first year, acting as Pharaoh, equipped with all their royal regalia, their legitimacy confirmed by the god both in the privacy of his sanctuary, as well as by the people in public areas in and outside the temple. The coronation inscriptions of Hatshepsut and Horemheb are not accounts of their coronation ceremonies, but of the accession of each coinciding with their appearance ceremonies. The aim, either way, remains the same: legitimisation. In this vein, it is interesting to note that Thutmose III, who had the least to prove, was also the one who emphasised his transformation into king the least, focusing instead on relatively brief accounts of divine selection. While it can be suspected that Thutmose III (assuming that his texts are not accounts of *séances oraculaires*), Hatshepsut, and Horemheb in the 18th Dynasty celebrated particularly grand and significant appearance ceremonies compared to a new king whose place on the throne was more secure, what truly sets these kings apart were not the ceremonies themselves, but the fact they wished to record them.

---

[988] Kemp, *Anatomy*, 216.

[989] Redford, *History*, 27.

[990] *Ibid.*, 21–2.

III. Future Research

The scope of this thesis is undoubtedly quite narrow, and there is much more room for further study. A simple extension of this thesis would be an in-depth analysis and comparison of the Thutmose I palimpsest text in Deir el-Bahari with the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the *Historical Inscription*, as well as the study of accounts of kings' coming to power from other periods. In a different direction, one could study the textual and pictorial evidence for festivals exhibiting similarities with "coronation" inscriptions. Finally, an interdisciplinary study of systems of succession in various cultures would prove most interesting and elucidating.

Appendix A

Part 1: Facsimiles of the Chapelle Rouge blocks bearing the *Historical Inscription*

Block numbers are presented in the order in which they appear in the facsimiles. E.g. # 222 + 35 below reflects the order in which the text is to be read. Given that the text is in retrograde, columns are read left to right. This is also the case for the facsimiles of the blocks on the north side: given the fact that the text here is to be read from right to left, counter to the direction of the English language, the facsimiles' captions presented in this appendix do not match the order in which the text is to be read. E.g. 109 + 72 is listed as 72 + 109, given the simple fact that # 72 is to the left of # 109.

It has not been possible to fit sequences longer than two blocks at a time together in this appendix. The overall sequences are listed in the relevant facsimile captions in these cases, in the order of the reading of the text.

SOUTH SIDE

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Processions d'Amon dans Karnak: # 222 + 35

From sequence: # 222 + 35 + 184 + 295: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 31–2 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Processions d'Amon dans Karnak (*cont.*): # 35 + 184
From sequence: # 222 + 35 + 184 + 295: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 31–2 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Processions d'Amon dans Karnak (*cont.*): # 184 + 295
From sequence: # 222 + 35 + 184 + 295: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 31–2 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Processions d'Amon dans Karnak: # 166 + 22
From sequence # 166 + 22 + 142: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 33 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Processions d'Amon dans Karnak: # 22 + 142
From sequence # 166 + 22 + 142: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 33 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Proclamation de la déesse-uraeus. L'épouse divine devient roi: # 44 + 143

Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 34

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fin de la declaration d'une divinité. Établissement du protocole d'Hatshepsout: # 48 + 164

Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 35

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Débuts d'une proclamation d'Amon?: # 280 + 286

Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 36

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Instructions d'Amon à Hatshepsout: # 285 + 24

Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 37

Appendix A Part 1: Text of the Historical Inscription

NORTH SIDE

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Dernières processions oraculaires et cérémonies d'action de graces dans Karnak: # 72 + 109

Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 42

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: serment et protestations de véracité: # 19 + 161

From sequence # 161 + 19 + 63: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 41 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: serment et protestations de véracité: # 63 + 19
From sequence # 161 + 19 + 63: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 41 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: rappel de différentes processions oraculaires: # 287
Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 40

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: ses relations avec les dieux: # 21
Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 40

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: récit des processions oraculaires d'une déesse: # 54
Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 40

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: son triomphe surnaturel # 147

Discours d'Hatshepsout: les bienfaits de son règne # 194

From sequence # 194 + 147 + 37: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 39 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: sa puissance incontestée # 37

Discours d'Hatshepsout: son triomphe surnaturel # 147

From sequence # 194 + 147 + 37: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 39 (*excerpt*)

[The facsimile originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The facsimile was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Discours d'Hatshepsout: apologie poétique: # 146

Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 38

Appendix A

Part 2: Translation of the *Historical Inscription*

The running translation of this text presented here, as with those of the relevant passages in the third chapter of this thesis, is based on the Chapelle Rouge inscription. When applicable, passages from the more fragmentary Karnak version are used to fill in any gaps. Unlike the *Texte de la jeunesse* and the Horemheb inscription, the entirety of Hatshepsut's is translated here for, while they include the "coronation ceremonies" of their respective kings, it is not the exclusive subject of these texts.

The translation is done by the author of this thesis, but it must be noted that influence from existing translations of this text is inevitable. The oldest translation, in French, is Lacau's, while Gillen and Müller have more recently provided translations in English and German, respectively.[991]

Specific column numbers are referred to in-text. The abbreviations used are the same as in the main chapter: block numbers from the Chapelle Rouge are referred to directly, preceded by a number sign, followed by the column number (e.g. # 287,3). Consecutive blocks are linked with plus signs (e.g. # 222 + 35 + 184 + 295). Passages from the Deir el-Bahari version are referred to by the abbreviation "*DeB*," followed by the column number (e.g. *DeB* 18). As in the main chapter, the columns on a given block are numbered based on the direction in which they are read; this numbering is resumed on sequential blocks, and is reset after a missing block. The section titles used here are largely the same as those by Lacau and Chevrier, picked up by Gillen (in translation), as well as by Burgos and Larché.[992] These publications, when cited at the head of a new section, are abbreviated: Burgos and Larché's plate volume, the publication primarily relied on in this thesis, and therefore the first one to be mentioned, is shortened to *BL* [page number]; this is followed by the reference to Helck's transcription of the text, which is referred to as *H* [page number];[993] Lacau and Chevrier's publication as *LC* [page number and section number]; and Gillen's translation as *G* [page number]. Notes

[991] Lacau and Chevrier, C*hapelle*, 92–153; Gillen, "Historical Inscription," 15–28. Müller's aim being simply to provide a running translation of this text, with no grammatical commentary (the few existing comments clarify certain passages for a non-specialist audience), his work is not referenced over the course of the translation presented here ("Krönungsinschrift," 201–11).

[992] Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I (plates) and II (analysis and discussion).

[993] Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 7–33.

on passages already covered in the main chapter are not repeated here unless necessary for the comprehension of the text.

As in the third chapter, it is Burgos and Larché's sequence, presented in the most recent publication of the Chapelle Rouge, that is followed.[994]

Translation

I. The south wall

1. The beginning of the festival (H 7, DeB 1–5; LC 96–7, § 161; G 16)

(*DeB* 1) […] his disk […],

(2) […] rebellion through […]

(3) [… the succes]s which he had previously granted him.

[Then] the Person of the Lord-to-the-[Limit …]

(4) […] his [b]arque. The illuminating for him[995] among the livin[g]

(5) […] he having […][996], she did that which he desired,

(6) while his Person [charge]d (?) him (lit. "[place]d [upon] him") (with) sending/writing to […]

2. Amun is out on a festival procession, not performing an expected bi3y.t at the Station; the procession continues, Hatshepsut joins the procession, receiving Amun's blessing (BL 31–2; H 7–10; # 222 + 35 + 184 + 295; LC 97–104, § 162–3; G 16–17)

[After these things,] (# 222,1) his Person (Amun) proceeded, [performing won]de[rs], his Ennead in his following,

without (2), however, performing his *bi3y.t*-sign at the *Station of the Lord* of the King.

The entire land (lit. "the land to its limit") (3) received silence,

"One does not know" said the royal nobles,

The elders (4) of the palace were bowed-of-face,

Those who were in his (Amun's) following (said): "Why?"

The wise-of-heart (5) became foolish (lit. "empty-headed"),

Their hearts trembling beneath his wonder (or *bi3y.t*-sign?).

---

[994] Plates volume: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 31–42. See: Chapter 3, 117.

[995] Or "That which he illuminated".

[996] A verb would have preceded the *n=f*, of which only the papyrus scroll (Y 1 in Gardiner's sign-list) survives.

His Person reached the *Head of the River* (6)[997], performing a very great *bỉɜy.t*-sign at the double gates of (7) the *ʿḥ-nsw.t*

which are on the side of the *Way of the Offering Tables*.

After these things, the face was turned (# 35,8), going northward,

one not knowing what he would do,

without […] (9) near/under [above ?] an obstacle in the form of this god.

Th[en the Person of (10) the Lord-to-the-Limit], his face [turn]ed to the East, performing a very great *bỉɜy.t*-sign

(11) at the western double gates of the palace-of-the-court (called) *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him*

which are on (12) the bank of the *Head of the River*.

Then the Mistress of the Two Lands came to it (the court) from the interior of the *ḏsrw* of her palace,

(13) and she gave praise at the approach of the Lord of the Gods.

(14)[998] After these things, she (Hatshepsut) placed herself on her belly in the presence of his (Amun's) Person, (# 184,15) saying:

"How much greater is this more than the (customary) conduct of your Person!

It is (you), my father, (16) who plans all which is,

What is it that you wish to happen?

I shall truly act (17) in accordance with that which you have commanded."

The Person of this god then performed very great *bỉɜy.t*-signs, (18) doubly numerous and doubly great.

After these things, he placed her in front of him,

and advanced her (# 184,19) to the *Great House of Maat*.

She received the insignia of her servant(ship) and her equipment of (20) God's Wife

which are inside his temple.

The Person of the Lord-to-the-Limit then mul(21)tiplied *bỉɜy.t*-signs for her

[at] the side of her mother who created her beauty, Hathor, the Chief of Thebes,

(22) the Lady of the sky and Lady of the Two Banks,

the foremost-of-place in the *wadjyt*,

[997] This column number was not indicated by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 8).

[998] Col. 14 is marked as the first of # 184 by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 9) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription", 16), when it is the last of # 35; see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 31.

who nursed her with [her] body

(# 295,23)[999] […] who filled her body/flesh,

(24) […] with life and power,

(25) […] Great Na[me]

(26) […] *bi3y.t*-signs,

[in] this divine booth (28) [of the enduring king, who seized/conquered]

[…] [the King of Upper and Lower Egypt,] *Aakheperkara*,

[…] who made (?) (29) […] the [beautiful] monument [for] the Person of this god.

3. *Speech of Amun where he reveals his intentions to make Hatshepsut king; the procession continues, and Hatshepsut is installed on the throne (H 10; DeB 12–15; LC 105, § 164–5 and BL 33; H 11–15; # 166 + 22 + 142; LC 106–13, § 164, 166–7; G 18–19)*

"(*DeB* 12) […]

(13) this, your […] which I opened/separated (?)[for] you […]

(14) […] I will [subdu]e for you this land upon […].

I […] for you […]

(15) […] [sta]re,

the great of might, free from impatience regarding […]

[…] (# 166,1) who speaks against his enemies,

whose knife is the servant of fire,

(2) the heat [of which] takes effect (lit. "happens")

when he places it (the fire)

so that the lands of the malcontents may burn,

(3) He is great, the foreign lands burning like braziers (lit. "being like that which makes fire"),

whose success is as the sight of (4) [fir]e,

who is powerful-of-might to the height of the sky,

whose strength is against that which faces/confronts me.

(5) (I) will cause that you [re]st on my thrones,

I will seize for you the crook and the flail,

[999] The first column of # 295, column 23, is mistakenly numbered 22 in Helck's publication (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 10). This affected the remainder of the columns on this series of consecutive blocks (# 295,23–29), the correct numbering of which is provided here.

I will mould you, (6) whom (I) [desired] to make,

so that you may make offerings in the presence of the one who created you,

so that you may cause the shrines (7) of the gods to flourish,

so that you may protect this land and its affairs,

so that the dread of you may apprehend (8) he who acts in crime

and those who plan (9) rebellion to the times

when you will seize strength as the lord of might.

Then (10) this land will be in your grasp,

humanity under your supervision.

(# 22,11) The *rekhyt*, they will give you praise,

you will establish laws,

you will overpower (12) chaos,

you will cut off the arm of the state of civil war,

you will govern (13) the living, and they will observe according to your instructions."

The nobles who were (14) in his following, their faces received surprise.

After these things, there was a proceeding (15) outside.

Then her Person was in front of her father,

passing by while moving about (16) amidst the *rekhyt*.

Awe, it seized the sky and the earth,

Every face turned (17) to its fellow,

they not thinking about their own bodies at all,

(18) having become dumbfounded (lit. "their hearts not existing"),

no man knowing his (own) bod[y].

After (# 142,19) these (things), they collected themselves (lit. "their heart(s) assembled")

since the god revealed (lit. "illuminated") that which he had [hi]dden,

when his Person (20) reached the noble chapel and the great gates of the Lord of the Two Lands,

that is, the place of the royal following to the temple of (21) [Amu]n.

His Person entered into the palace of *I-Will-Not-Be-Far-From-Him* of the estate of Amun,

(22) He extended his arms (in protection) over his egg,

for he had planned that she seize (23) the Two Banks.

He advanced her to the platform of the unique lord

and pacified her as the ruler (24) of jo[y],

so that he may establish her place on the Great Seat,

and he caused that she occupy the throne-dais, (25) having been rear[ed] as Horus, the Lord of the Two Lands, in the presence of the entire land.

Then the Person of this god […][1000]

4. *The procession continues, followed by a speech by the Uraeus-goddess, and Hatshepsut wears the royal crowns (H 15; DeB 24; LC 113, § 168 and BL 34; H 16–17; # 44 + 143; LC 114–19; § 169–70; G 19)*

(*DeB* 24) Then the Person of th[is] god stood at the door of […] two hours.

[…]

"[…] (# 44,1) that which yo[u] desired.

You will entrust me to the one whom you bore, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *Maatkara*,

(2) (she being) in festivity, having joined with the one who bore her,

you will make her dignity, you will create the dread of her in (3) your name of the creator of eternity,

I shall appear on her head,

I shall grow on [her] fore[head],

(4) I will unite with her like I adorn my father,

My jubilation for her is great as (5) *One-who-is-on-the-head*,

I will fell for her the tribesmen of Nubia, (I) curling up in the middle of her brow,

[I will trample for her] (6) the Bedouin of Asia, swaying about, having appeared on her forehead,

I will [subdue] (7) for her the full encompassment of the Great Black,

I will do [for her] that which I ([desire]) and that which her father Amun desires,

I will place the respect of [her in] (9) all lands,

the terror of her throughout all foreign lands,

I will place her *bɜw*-power,

I will est[ablish] (# 143,10) her might,

I will subdue for her the encompassment of the sun-disk,

I will accomplish (lit. "tie," "join") for her (11) the jubilation(-rites) in the southern sky,

[1000] Four blocks, equivalent to *DeB* 22–7 and a part of 28, are missing after # 142, before the Karnak version resumes with # 44. The Deir el-Bahari version is badly eroded, but for a part of col. 24, presented in the next section.

I will cause rejoicing for her (12) <in> the northern sky,
I will play music for her with my sistra,
I will moor her as (13) the mooring-post of all humankind,
I will judge for her the indestructible stars,
(14) I will inspect for her the unwearying stars,
I will take (lit. "rest") my place in her titulary,
(15) I will assign to her eternity under her supervision."
And then she said: "Welcome, welcome!" (16) with the *nyny*-greeting,
her arms bearing that which is desired.
The paraphernalia of God's Wife was removed
so that she might don (17) and [w]e[a]r the [re]galia of Ra,
the Upper and Lower Egyptian crowns being united with her head.
She was pa[ci]fied as (18) [… 3 missing blocks].

5. *Speech of a deity, the ḫʿw-nsw.t, and the formulation of the titulary (BL 35; H 18–19; # 48 + 164; LC 119–23, § 171–2; G 19–20)*

"[…] (# 48,1) your forms in/with his beauty.
Those who are in the sky have revealed (lit. "opened") for <you> (2) the secret,
Those who are in the underworld were guiding you.
Arise/appear with the forms (3) of his sun-disk,
the crowns of his Ennead having been united with you,
(4) the gods are in your following,
you rising as the image of Ra,
(5) seize for yourself the sitting (on) the Great Seat which is in the front of the estate of your father,
(6) be exalted from the one who made you,
rejoice through the one who will cause you to appear!"
(7) Then these courtiers, their hearts were seized with forgetful(8)ness,
their faces frozen in an expression of (lit. "seized/held") surprise,
their limbs joined (# 164,9) with fatigue,
when they saw the appearance of the enduring king which the Lord-of-All himself (10) made,
and they placed themselves on their bodies.
After these (11) things, they recovered (lit. "their hearts were found"),

the Person of the Lord-of-All then (12) installed the titulary of her Person

as the efficient king in the midst (13) of Egypt,

she who seizes the flat lands, the one who establishes their tributes.

His Person spoke, installing (14) the titulary, repeating *Sed*-festivals for her:

"The Living Horus: the Powerful-of-kas, (15) [She-of-the-Two-Ladies: the Flourishing-of-years, the Golden Horus: the Divine-of-appearances, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt:] [*Maatka*]*ra*, [the Daughter of] Ra: [Hatshepsut-joined-with-]Amu[n]."[1001]

6. *Speech of Amun: the divine demands and instructions (H 20–2; DeB 46–7 and # 285 + 24; LC 124–9, § 173–5; G 20)*

"(*DeB* 46) […] [ter]ror of you throughout […] (47) […]

(# 285,1) Your Person advances it.

You will exist for (me)[1002] in order to create offices,

fill the storehouse,

provisi(2)on the offering-tables,

guide the *waab*-priests to their duties,

make laws effective,

establish (3) instructions/regulations,

enlarge offering tables,

increase portions,

add to (lit. "place to the excess of") that which has (4) previously been,

widen the places of my treasury

which contains and holds the riches of the Two Banks,

undertake projects (lit. "make works")

(5) without neglecting[1003] sandstone or granite,

complete my temple

and renew statues for it in (6) fine, white, new limestone,

improve the future for (me) with (7) your works,[1004]

[1001] The two eroded blocks 280 + 286 hardly bearing any legible signs, not included here for this reason, would have directly followed # 48 + 164 (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 153; photograph and facsimile: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 36; for more information, see: chapter 3, 91 no. 392).

[1002] *wn.k(ɜ)=ṯ n(=ỉ)*; see: Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 127 (§ 175,b).

[1003] See: Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 128 (§ 175,e).

[1004] *smnḫ n(=ỉ) m-ḫt m kɜ.wt=ṯ*: Translated as "Then you will exist for me in order to … improve the future with Your works" ("Historical Inscription," 20). He followed the suggestion by Lacau of "Tu seras pour moi (destinée) à … embellir l'avenir par ce travail" (*Chapelle*, 127 (§ 175) and 128 (§ 175,i)) who,

exceed[1005] the kings of Lower Egypt

like the desire of my Person in making that which I had formerly commanded be done for (8) me.

Will I indeed ruin your laws?

Will I indeed (9) cause that the writings of the future be destroyed?

Will I indeed disturb the regulations which you have ordered?

(10) Will I indeed cause that you be far from my seat?

Equip the monuments (11) in the temples,

Establish the god (according) to his regulations,

every one therein pre(12)cise regarding his possessions,

Improve his loaf-offering according to him.

It is the joy of the god, (13) the rendering effective of his laws.

As for the one who mutilates him, my heart is sharp in thinking of him.

(# 24,14) [Embel]lish the mansions o[f] the gods[1006] more than that which the ancestors (lit. "those who were before") had commanded.[1007]

---

referring to the *Wörterbuch* (*Wb.* III, 346 D), saw *n-m-ḫt* "(the) future" as a noun. According to this dictionary, as well as that of Hannig (*Wörterbuch* II, 1954), however, *m-ḫt* is the noun, the preceding *n* merely being the dative preposition "für die Zukunft." Given that this does not fit the context, I therefore suggest that the *n* is the preposition of an unwritten first person singular *=i̯*, with *m-ḫt* still seen in its substantive sense of "future."

[1005] *šni̯*: written with the biliteral *šn* ("loop of cord with the end downwards:" V 7), the uniliterals *n* (N 35) and *i̯* (M 17), and the "moisture falling from the sky" hieroglyph (N 4) as its determinative. This was translated as "surpasser (?)" by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 127 (§ 175)), but with no further explanation (this presumably simply being context); this suggestion was picked up by Gillen ("Historical Inscription," 20) as well, who translates "to exceed." There is no entry in any dictionary for this word which fits the context, however: *šny.t* "Unwetter, Sturm, Hagelwetter, Hagelschauer; Gewölk" (*Wb.* IV, 502–3; *Wörterbuch* II, 2472) and the verb *šni̯* "(Aufruhr) niederschlagen (wie ein Hagelwetter?)" (*Wb.* IV, 503). Other meanings of *šni̯* as a verb, all with different determinatives, include "rund sein; umkreisen, umgeben," "streiten," "(be)zwingen," "leiden (an)," "beschwören," and "fragen" (Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 2467–71), none of which fits the context either. Hannig lists the "niederschlagen" sense of *šni̯* found in the *Wörterbuch* mentioned above in his *Handwörterbuch*, where it is also defined as "übertreffen (*Vorgänger*)" (*Handwörterbuch*, 827), this presumably stemming from Lacau's translation of the *Historical Inscription* (there is no such definition in either volume of his main dictionaries, but this word is tentatively suggested as a translation for "übertreffen" on p. 1336 of his *Handwörterbuch Deutsch–Ägyptisch*). I suggest seeing the *šni̯* in the *Historical Inscription* as a miswriting, presumably on phonetic grounds, of *sni̯* which, among others, means "übertreffen (was Andere gemacht haben)" (parentheses supplied by author; *Wb.* III, 455 B,III; Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 2232–3,3), which vindicates Lacau's initial suspicion.

[1006] The text that survives from col. 51 of the Deir el-Bahari version ends here, while the equivalent of col. 52 would have introduced the north wall, had its pertaining block survived (Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 21–2).

[1007] [*smn*]*ḥ ḥw.t nw*[*.t*] *nṯr.w r nw šꜣ.n t*[*p*]*y.w-ʿ*. Helck restored the small lacuna next to the genitive *nw* with a stroke (Z 1) rather than a feminine *.t* to match *ḥw.t* (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 22). In disagreement with Lacau, who translated "Améliore les temples des dieux par rapport à ce que les

(15) Indeed, I declare:

I will open this land,

I will charge you with (16) leadership before/ahead of me.[1008]

Indeed, the king, he is a dam (17) of stone:

he will confront (lit. "turn against") flooding,

collecting (18) water which he will pull <to>[1009] the river mouth entirely.

The one who protects his fathers […]"

II. The north wall

7. *Speech by a group of deities, Hatshepsut's appointment at the Station, and the performance of an offering (H 22–3; DeB 52–8; LC 129, § 176–8 and BL 42; # 109 + 72; H 23–5; LC 129–33, § 176–8; G 21)*

(*DeB* 52) […] the Person [of] this [god]. They say:

"We laud[1010] you:

How [great] is your name on the heart!

How [good] is the kin[g] […]

(53) […]

(54) […] those who are in your disk.

We will illuminate for her that which will happen […]

(55) […]

We will [cause] that her plans seize the Two Banks,

we will cause [her] *bꜣw*-power […]

(56) […]

She will seize your (Amun's) inheritance,

---

ancêtres avaient instauré" (*Chapelle*, 127 (§ 175)), Gillen suggests: "Improve the mansions of the gods more than the equivalent of those who had been before (i.e. the ancestors)" ("Historical Inscription," 20, 26 no. 26). The latter took *šꜣ* as *šꜣ.w* "Gewicht, Kapazität; Wert, Äquivalent" (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 801; *Wörterbuch* I, 1280; "Äquivalent" not in the second volume), but this translation does not seem to account for the *nw* before *šꜣ.w*, and neither is the way it is written in this text attested. Lacau's interpretation, on the other hand, accounts for both the writing of *šꜣ* "bestimmen, anordnen" (*Wb.* IV, 402), as well as the demonstrative pronoun *nw* preceding a masculine relative form (Gardiner, *Grammar*, 417, § 511,3), where otherwise a feminine *.t* would have been expected to refer to an unmentioned antecedent (Allen, *Egyptian*, 364, § 22.15).

[1008] Or, "I will appoint/charge you, so that you may lead before/ahead of me."

[1009] Restoration suggested by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 126 (§ 174,γ)); absent in Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 22) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription," 20).

[1010] This is the figurative sense of the verb *wšꜣ*, "ausschütten," meaning "äußern, spenden" (*Wb.* I, 369; Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 219).

she will rule under your [might] as […]

(57) […]

(58) […]

the ruler of the Two Banks, truly,

the protector […]"

[…] (# 109,1) with one accord.

Then they were on their bellies, kissing the earth exceedingly.

(2) After these things, there was a procession to his temple.

He placed this king (3) in front of him,

his Ennead in his following,

those who are in the sky (4) very joyful,

the entire land in acclamation, reci[ting] (5) praises at his approach.

The living *ba* of the Person of Ra, his *serekh* was es[tab]lished (6) on this land

which he created in order to bind [all which] i[s]

(7)[1011] in order to perfect the Two Banks under [h]is [gu]idance.

The Two Lands were inundated with the [elec]trum of [his] ra[ys],

(# 72,8) when he arose like the sun-disk.

He then appointed her Person (9) at the *Station of the Lord* of the king,

multiplying *bi3y.t*-signs for her,

placing the fear of her (10) in the front.

After these things, this god proceeded, and rested on his seat (11) [o]f electrum,

the Ennead of Karnak jubilating at the approach (12) of her Person.

One then did the censing and presenting of offerings (13) to Amun-in-Karnak,

to the Ennead which was in his following,

and to the gods and goddesses (14) who are in his estate.

Praises were invoked in the Great Name of the lord of [h]is [esta]te.

8. *Hatshepsut's speech: oath and claims to veracity (BL 41; H 26–9, # 161 + 19*[1012] *+ 63; LC 136–40, § 180–1; G 21–2)*

"(# 161,1) As Amun, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, lives for me and loves me, my nose is rejuvenated (2) with life and power,

[1011] Not marked by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 24).

[1012] This block number is incorrectly numbered 119 on the relevant page in the plate volume (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 188).

the laws which I have commanded for the future are effective,
(3) I seize the strength which he has given me,
my kingship is great throughout the Two Banks,
(4) I wear the White Crown,
I am united with the Red Crown,
my father is indeed joined with (my) beauty,
enduring (5) are my monuments in Karnak,
my life is stable on the Support of Horus.
(6) It is my father, the lord of the gods, who established his daughter (the Uraeus-goddess) as she who is on my head,

having introduced (7) me to rulership over the Two Banks, while his Person was performing *bỉɜy.t*-signs,
having appointed me as the lord of the (8) the *rekhyt* in the presence of the entire land,
having advanced me to one who is inside the palace in (# 19,9) the presence of the entire Ennead,
having caused me to appear with his own two hands, (10)[1013] I having been brought up as Horus the strong-of-arm,
having caused that (I) sit on (11) the Support of Horus in the presence of the entirety of the royal nobles.

I say, (12) however:
I will illuminate the future,
I will be neglected

without uniting with his *bɜw*-power,

(13) (it) is greater than the concealing of this event

without a boasting with falsehood being therein.

(14) (It) has not been heard since the (primeval) time of this land and (15) the [ti]me of the rising/emergence from Nun,
the like has not happened for (# 63,16) the kings of Upper and Lower Egypt at the beginning under the first generation[1014],

[1013] Not marked by Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 26).

[1014] For translation of *ḥɜ.t-ʿ ḥr ḥ.t tp.t*, see: Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 162.

one did not hear[1015] (17) (such) kindness of words at the time of men and gods,

(this) has not (18) happened since the time of humanity,

(this) has not been heard since the time of god,

(19) there is no[thing] in the [ann]als[1016] of the ancestors,

and indeed nothing in the [activity] of the mouth,[1017]

(20) [ap]art[1018] from me, the beloved of the one who created her.

He has acted for (me) since the nest of Kh[e]mmis[1019].

[1015] The *m* at the start of col. 7 is used instead of the more common *n* to introduce the object of *sḏm* (*Wb*. IV, 384,III; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 259).

[1016] As with many parts of # 63, this passage is eroded. In the publications by both Lacau and Chevrier (C*hapelle*, 137 (§ 180)) and Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 27), this word is *gnw.t*, a suggestion which the surviving determinative, the harpoon-head of bone (T 19), repeated three times to indicate plurality, supports. The drawn facsimile of the photograph of # 63 in the publication by Burgos and Larché (*Chapelle* I, 41) has differing signs, however: below *n*[*n*] *m* they have the uniliteral stool *p* (Q 3) above the uniliteral water *n* (N 35) which is above two signs, what appears to be the uniliteral *g* (jar ring-stand/red earthenware pot: W 11) and a more legible *nw*-bowl (W 24), side-by-side. The closest possible reading based on these signs I was able to find is the word *png* "teilen, verteilen, aufteilen" (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 278); even though this word is written with the knife determinative (T 30), it could conceivably be written with the harpoon-head (T 19). This reading does not seem to fit the context, however, and neither does it take the *nw*-bowl into account. Furthermore, given the poor state of preservation of this passage, it is difficult to distinguish between the similarly-shaped uniliterals *g* and *p*, *g* and the biliteral *nw*, and *t* and *nw*, for which reason, regardless of Burgos and Larché's suggestions, I here follow those of Lacau/Chevrier and Helck.

[1017] According to Lacau (C*hapelle*, 140, (§ 181,w)), with whom Gillen agrees ("Historical Inscription," 26 no. 40), the overall passage refers to oral tradition, which is being contrasted with written records (*gnw.t*). The lacuna is short, and traces of the eroded signs are visible (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 41 # 63; Lacau, C*hapelle*, 137 (§ 180)). These signs seem to have consisted of (1) a horizontal one above (2) a vertical one next to which are two more legible signs (3) the uniliteral *t* (X 1) above (4) the two diagonal strokes for *y* (Z 4). Below all these signs, at the end of the column, is the uniliteral mouth *r* (D 21). In the publications by Burgos/Larché and Lacau/Chevrier, the horizontal sign is the uniliteral door-bolt *s* (O 34). Lacau did not provide suggestions for what was between the potential *s* and the *ty*, while Burgos and Larché have the uniliteral *b* (D 58). I was unable to identify any potential readings based on these signs, but Helck's suggestions (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 27) do result in a reading which fits the context: he saw the horizontal sign as the uniliteral arm ꜥ (D 36), and the vertical as the seat *s.t* (Q 1), and agreed with the remainder of the signs. This would result in the reading *s.t-*ꜥ "Tätigkeit" (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 649) had ꜥ been written after *s.t*, but reasons of space could account for this arrangement of signs. The resulting translation would, in contrast to written records (the *gnw.t* "annals"), oral tradition (the *s.t-*ꜥ *r* "the activity of the mouth"). It might relevant to mention, however, that Lacau/Chevrier and Helck have the uniliteral *r* accompanied by a stroke (Z 1) while, based on the photograph published by Burgos and Larché, there is no room for it (*Chapelle* I, 41 # 63).

[1018] *wpw-ḥr*: "ausser" (*Wb*. I, 301,15–16). The ox-horns hieroglyph with the phonetic value of *wp* (F 13) is missing, but confirmed through the Deir el-Bahari version (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 28; this is not marked as a lacuna by Lacau, however: *Chapelle*, 137 (§ 180)).

[1019] Enough of the determinative of *sš* "nest" (a duckling in a nest: G 48) has survived for there to be no doubt as to the reading of the word, but this is not marked as such by either Lacau (C*hapelle*, 137 (§ 180)) nor Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 28). They both also added a genitive *n* before "Khemmis" which has not survived on the original monument, marked as a lacuna by Lacau, but not by Helck. It is possible for there to have been room for the *n*, but the translation would remain unchanged in either case. Only a portion of the bee (L 2) has survived, not marked by either Lacau or Helck, but enough that

(21) Take care not to say: 'That which is does not exist'

I testify as […][1020] the one who crosses (22) the sky,

who takes care of the land,

who judges like[1021] one who is not inclined to one side,

who installs Maat (23)[1022] [for] that in which I rejoice,

such that she (Maat) is in the front of his barque.

I know his (Amun's) deeds,

(24) I am [w]ise with his *bꜣw*-power,

(my) heart is pleased in accordance with his justice.

(25) [A]ll[1023] these (things) have truly[1024] happened,

without (any) words of lying."

9. *Hatshepsut's speech: recollection of different oracular processions (BL 40; H 25, # 287; LC 133–5, § 179 a–b; G 22)*

"[…] (# 287,1) very great [*bỉꜣy.t*-signs] in the presence of this good god,

predicting for me the kingship of the Two Lands,

(2) Upper and Lower Egypt being under the fear of me,

giving to me all the foreign lands,

illuminating (3) the victories of My Person.

Regnal year 2, month 2 of *Peret*, day 29, third day of the festival of Amun,

corresponding to (4) these offerings of Sekhmet on the second day

---

there can be no doubt about the reading. For photograph of this block, see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 41 # 63.

[1020] This is marked as a lacuna, with no suggestions, by both Lacau (C*hapelle*, 137 (§ 180)) and Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 28). The more recent study of this monument by Burgos and Larché, however, revealed traces of some signs: the flowering reed with the phonetic value *i* (M 17), a circular sign, presumably the placenta with the phonetic value of *ḥ* (Aa 1), and what appears to be a part of an arm-hieroglyph (D 37–45), though it is impossible to tell which one based on the remaining traces (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 41 # 63). I was unable to find a word which matches this group of signs however, and so have no suggestion to make.

[1021] This word, *mỉ*, is written in a non-retrograde manner, for which reason it is marked with "sic" by both Lacau (C*hapelle*, 137 (§ 180)) and Helck (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 28).

[1022] This is incorrectly marked as col. 22 by Helck (*loc. cit.*), but this did not affect his numbering of the remainder of the columns on this block.

[1023] *r*-[*ꜣ*]*w=w* "all" (lit. "to their length"): no traces of the sign(s) preceding the uniliteral *w* (G 43) have survived (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 41 # 63), but Lacau's suggestion of the biliteral *ꜣw* (F 40) fits the context perfectly (*Chapelle*, 137 (§ 180)).

[1024] *r wn-mꜣʿ*: Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 195. As remarked by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 138 (§ 180,β)), there should have been a second uniliteral *r* (D 21), the reason probably being that the one in the text is "shared" by *ḫpr* (acting as a phonetic complement) and the expression *r wn-mꜣʿ*.

was the predicting to (me) of the Two Lands in the (fore)court of South[ern] (5) Ope[t].

His Person (Amun) performed *bi3y.t*-signs in the presence of this good god

(at) the appearance of (my) father (6) in his beautiful festival, Amun, chief of the gods.

He conducted My Person (7) [to the sta]tion of the beneficent king,

and he multiplied *bi3y.t*-signs on my account in the presence of the en[tire] land."

10. Hatshepsut's speech: her relationship with the gods (H 29; DeB 73–80; LC 141, § 182 and BL 40; # 21 LC 145–6, § 185 a–b; G 22–3)

"[…] (# 21,1) therein.

I am enriched with favours,

[Res]pect of me inundates the Two Lands.

(2)[1025] He has transferred to me the inheritance of Geb and the effective office of Khepri,

he has given (3)[1026] (me) life and power,

I was satisfied in the company of the Ennead,

I made things for the gods,

(4) and (I) took their hands (lit. "arms"), they flourishing.

How much they rejoice at this, at my approach!

(5) <T>hey accomplish[1027] the jubilation(-rites) for my Person,

they speak, reciting (6) praises, in order to charge me with that which will happen (i.e. the future)[1028]:

"Welcome, welcome, enduring king!"

[1025] Helck saw 161 + 19 + 63 + 21 as one sequence, and numbered the columns accordingly (apart from the first column of # 21, which is marked as col. 1 instead of 26 (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 29). In accordance with Burgos and Larché, according to whose reconstruction neither block that would have been adjacent to # 21 has survived (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 40), the column numbers presented here are reset, and run through only this block.

[1026] The new column begins with *n(=i)*, which is not clear in Helck's publication (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 29; see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 40).

[1027] See: Lacau and Chevrier, C*hapelle*, 118 (§ 170,p).

[1028] Lacau, whose translation was picked up by Gillen, translated *r dì.t m ḥr* "pour attirer l'attention (sur)" (lit. "to place in the face (of someone)"), followed by a relative form, *ḫpr.t=sn*, with *ḫpr* "au sens factitif" (C*hapelle*, 146 (§ 185 b,j); Gillen, "Historical Inscription," 22–3): "leur création". This, however, does not account for the first person singular suffix *=i* after *ḥr*. I translate *r dì.t m ḥr=i* "in order to charge me with," and see the remainder of the sentence as a *sḏm.ty=fy* form: *ḫpr.ty=sn* "those (things) which will happen" (i.e. the future).

[…]

(*DeB* 73) […] of the appearance of my father […]

(77) indeed, my affairs in/as […]

(78) […] with rejoicing at my approach […]

(79) […] the chiefs (lit. "great ones") of all foreign lands, the banks […]

upon/concerning you […]

(80) […] [of?] [one word] the Mistress of the sanctuary (*pr-wr* "Great House"), the one who is on [my] brow[1029], […]"

11. Hatshepsut's speech: an account of the oracular procession of a goddess (BL 40; H 30; # 54; LC 141–3, § 183 a–b; G 23)

(# 54,1) appearance(s?)/crowns,

She (the Uraeus-goddess) then seized my Person,

and it was caused that I sit (2) upon the Support of the Double Crown of Horus.

The Mistress of the Two Lands (the Uraeus-goddess) then performed very great *bỉʒy.t*-signs, (3) doubly numerous and doubly great concerning my Person

while I was on the Great Seat,

establishing my years (4) as the Flourishing-of-Years,

and carving my annals of (lit. "in") the *Sed*-festival.

(5) This goddess then proceeded to her horizon of electrum,

having transferred to me the seizing of the crowns,

(6) the Two Banks of Horus under my supervision,

having given to (me) that which the Great Black encloses/surrounds,

all those in its encompassment (7) being under the terror of me,

I having seized it like the strength of his youth,

(8) her flames being against my enemies.

I having been inundated (with blessings?) thanks to her, li[ke] (9) […]

I having [verb] to/for the *bʒw*-power of my Person,

I having grasped my Uraeus (which?) settl[(10)ed][1030] […]

[1029] The possibility of the restoration of "my" is not mentioned by Lacau, who translated "qui est au-dessus du front" (C*hapelle*, 141 (§ 182)), while Gillen translates "the chief at the top" ("Historical Inscription," 23; for *ḥry-tp* "one who is upon (the head)" in the sense of "one having authority over," or "chief," or "Oberhaupt," see: *Wb*. I, 140; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 175).

[1030] Only the phonetic element of this word, *ḫnn*, has survived. The determinative and grammatical markers which would have followed would have been present on the following block. I here follow

12. Hatshepsut's speech: the achievements of her reign (BL 39; H 31–2; # 194; LC 143–5, § 184 a–b; G 23)[1031]

(# 194,1; 8*) My falcon is on top of the *serekh*,

(I) have seized his inheritance [upon] his throne,

he having [revea]led (lit. "illuminated") (2; 9*) that which I had done since the beginning.

(I) have reached adulthood (lit. "counted my body")[1032] as effective king,

(I) have seized (3; 10*) that of which he placed me in charge,

All lands are contained in my grasp,

(4; 11*) (as well as) the Nine Bows, without any loss therein,[1033]

My *bɜw*-power has reached the edges of the Two Lands,

(I) have seized (5; 12*) the might of the Disturber/Rowdy One[1034],

my power having spread throughout the valleys,

(I) have made the hearts of the *rekhyt* be well-disposed[1035],

(6; 13*) (I) have commanded the carrying out of contentment (*shry.t*) in the midst of the nomes,

All cities are at (7; 14*) peace.

(I) have obeyed the plans of the one who created me,

My crews …

Lacau's translation of "posé" (C*hapelle*, 142 (§ 183 b)) which presumably would have been a stative form of the verb *ḫnỉ* in the sense of "sich niederlassen," "to rest" (*Wb*. III, 287; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 192).

[1031] Gillen gives the order # 147 + 194 + 37 but, like Burgos and Larché, sees # 146 as separate ("Historical Inscription," 23–4). Helck ordered these blocks as # 37 + 194 + 147, and placed # 146 at the end of this sequence (*Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 31–3). The column numbers provided here are based on Burgos and Larché's publication, Helck's are marked with asterisks.

[1032] See: Lacau and Chevrier, C*hapelle*, 144 (§ 184 b,c).

[1033] Transliteration: *nn nhw ỉr=w* (lit. "loss to them not existing"). Lacau's translation "sans que rien n'y manque" seems accurate (*Chapelle*, 144 (§ 184 b)), the sense probably being conveyed here being that all lands, including Egypt's enemies, are all completely ("without any loss therein") under Hatshepsut's control ("grasp").

[1034] An epithet, especially of Seth (*Wb*. IV, 566,6–7; Leitz, *Lexikon* VII, 159 s. v. "*Šd-ḫrw*: 'Der Störenfried'" A,b,6; Te Velde, *Seth*, 82, no. 1 and 147 no. 4). This is acknowledged by Gillen who, however, translates "I have seized the power of mischief" ("Historical Inscription," 23 no. 59 in p. 27).

[1035] An alternative translation not mentioned by Lacau or Gillen is possible, where the verb is a passive *sḏm.w=f* form "The hearts of the *rekhyt* have been made well-disposed toward me" (*sỉmɜ*(*.w*) *n*(*=ỉ*) *ỉb.w rḫy.t*).

13. Hatshepsut's speech: her extraordinary triumph (H 32, # 147; LC 147–8, § 186 a–b; G 23)

(My crews,) (# 147,8; 15*) they are that which his disk encircles,

(I) have pulled together those who were ignorant of Egypt,

(9; 16*) and those whom a royal messenger had not reached.

(I) have descended from the sky,

I am wise/skill[e]d (10; 17*) with his *bɜw*-power,

I am aware/knowledgeable of the affairs and that of which he placed me in charge,

(11; 18*) (I) have seized this land with modesty (lit. "with bowed head")[1036],

(I) was exalted/uplifted as a royal child (*ỉnpw*),

(12; 19*) My power, it makes the brow of the land (i.e. the south) tremble,

The North of the land is under my treadings,[1037]

(13; 20*) These things are not lesser (than) since the time of the ancestors,[1038]

The like of these events has not occurred (14; 21*) previously.[1039]

I am king due to the command of him from whom I came forth,[1040]

(I) have seen the forms of …

14. Hatshepsut's speech: her uncontested power (BL 39; H 31; # 37; LC 148–9, § 187 a–b; G 23–4)

(# 37,15; 1*) […][1041], I being rejuvenated with *nḥḥ*-eternity,

there being none who defy (16; 2*) [me in] the Two Portions,[1042]

[1036] *wɜḥ-tp*: Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 600.

[1037] Lacau translated "(Mais) ma puissance, elle fait trembler l'extrême Sud et l'extrême Nord est sous mes foulées" (*Chapelle*, 147 (§ 186 b)). Gillen translates the second sentence more loosely "My power, it causes the top of the land to tremble, the north of the land to be under my treadings" ("Historical Inscription," 23).

[1038] Lacau has: "Cela n'est pas moindre (que ce qui fut) du temps des ancêtres" (*Chapelle*, 147 (§ 186 b)), and Gillen: "There has been no decrease since the time of the ancestors" ("Historical Inscription," 23).

[1039] Lacau has: "il ne s'est (même) rien produit de pareil auparavant" (*Chapelle*, 147 (§ 186 b)), while Gillen has: "the like of these creations has not previously been" ("Historical Inscription," 23).

[1040] *wḏ.t=f* could also alternatively be read as *wḏ(.t) ỉt(=ỉ)*, resulting in the translation proposed by Gillen: "I am king due to the command of (my) father, from whom I came forth" ("Historical Inscription," 23).

[1041] The top right corner of this block is missing, affecting the tops of its first three columns; see: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 39 # 37.

[1042] This translation is based on Helck's restoration *nn ksm* [*wỉ m*] *psš.ty*, which Gillen also follows ("Historical Inscription," 23). Lacau saw *nn ksm* as part of what precedes it, but did not propose any restorations: *snḫḫ.kwỉ m nḥḥ nn ksm* [...] *psš.ty* "Je suis rajeunie par là, éternellement, sans contestation. J'ai […] les deux parts des Deux Seigneurs" (*Chapelle*, 149 (§ 187 b)). I here suggest an

(I) have placed the two streets and two ways of the sky and the earth below me,

(17; 3*) [The lands of the nor]therners[1043], their gods are surely[1044] my protection,

their arms (18; 4*) bearing life and power,

I have appeared thanks to it[1045] with joy (lit. "length of heart"),

I am at peace thanks to it,

(19; 5*) there being no enmity of me,

Life and dominion have united with me,[1046]

The Upper and Lower Egyptian crowns have been allocated to (me),

(20; 6*) The Double Crown, it has been established on my head,

I relied/depended (21; 7*) on the Great-of-Magic,

I am firm/established on my seat as King of the Two Lands and the Two Banks.

[…]

15. Hatshepsut's speech: a poetic praise of her characteristics (BL 38; H 32–3; # 146; LC 149–53, § 188 a–b; G 24)

[…] (# 146,1; 22*)[1047] births[1048],

---

alternative restoration: *nn ksm*[*.tw(=ỉ) m*] *psš.ty* "None shall defy [(me)] (lit. "[(I)] will not [be] defi[ed]") in the Two Portions."

[1043] As noted by Lacau, the first sign of the third column of this block appears to have been the lasso with the phonetic value of *wꜣ* (V 4), or the whip with the phonetic value of *mḥ* (V 22–3) (*Chapelle*, 149 (§ 187 a,α)). The recent publication by Burgos and Larché clearly shows that it is only the more vertical part of these signs which has survived, and a comparison with fully preserved instances of these same signs in the same text confirms the validity of both of his suggestions: the *wꜣ*-hieroglyph in the preceding column of text (second column from the right of # 37: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 39), and the *mḥ*-hieroglyph in # 147 (fifth column from the right: *loc. cit.*; at least one other, incompatible, version of this sign is also used in this text as attested near the top of the third column from the left of # 143: *ibid*., 34). I furthermore also make the suggestion that the uniliteral *ḏ* "cobra in repose" (I 10) is an equally likely candidate. As also noted by Lacau, it is clear that the missing word(s) would have referred to hostile foreigners due to the throwing-stick (T 14–15) and man with blood streaming from his head (A 14) hieroglyphs (*Chapelle*, 149 (§ 187 b,c)).

[1044] The enclitic particle *ms* (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 117) has the papyrus-roll determinative (Y 1–2) instead of the more usual man with hand to mouth (A 2) (Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 149 (§ 187 b,d)).

[1045] Gillen translates *ḥr=s* as "upon it" ("Historical Inscription," 24).

[1046] I here follow Lacau's translation (*Chapelle*, 149 (§ 187 b)). Gillen proposes the equally possible *ḫnm.n(=ỉ) wỉ ꜥnḫ wꜣs* "(I) have joined myself with life and dominion" ("Historical Inscription," 24; parentheses around "I" added by me).

[1047] Helck saw # 146 as the last in the sequence he ordered as 37 + 194 + 147, for which reason his column numbering for this block resumes that of the sequence (cols. 22–35, marked with asterisks). Burgos and Larché see # 146 as unattached to any of the surviving blocks (*Chapelle* I, 38), for which reason the column numbers I present here are reset.

[1048] This word, *msw.t*, can alternatively be translated as "shape" or "figure," or "creations" as well. Lacau translated "[Je suis renouvelée (?)] de naissances" (*Chapelle*, 150 (§ 188 b)), and Gillen "that which is created" ("Historical Inscription," 24).

I am a king who establishes laws,

who judges matters,

who pu(2; 23*)nishes the one who forgets[1049] his actions;

I am a wild bull, pointy-of-horns[1050],

(3; 24*) who came[1051] from the sky after it saw its image[1052];

I am a falcon, who flies over the lands,

(4; 25*) who lands[1053], dividing[1054] its borders;

I am a swift-footed jackal[1055] travelling the land (5; 26*) in the matter (lit. "fashion/manner")[1056] of an instant;

I am glorious-of-heart, who glorifies his father,

who adheres to (6; 27*) the matters for his justification;[1057]

I am the unique one, who rests in Maat, enriching it, (7; 28*) and depending on its affairs;

I am the Glorious Eye[1058], which is on top of[1059] his father,

---

[1049] Following Lacau (*Chapelle*, 150–1 (§ 188 b,c)) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription," 24), the verb *wnỉ* which, among other meanings, has the sense of "(das Gesagte) nicht beachten," or "vernachlässigen" (*Wb*. I, 313,18–14,1), has here been translated as "to forget".

[1050] For parallels to *spd ꜥ.wy*, see: Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b,e).

[1051] Lacau (*Chapelle*, 150 (§ 188 b)) and Gillen ("Historical Inscription," 24) saw this as an imperfective active participle.

[1052] Lacau translated *sšm* as "disposition" (*Chapelle*, 150 (§ 188 b)).

[1053] For the expression *sꜣḥ tꜣ* "to reach land," see: *Wb*. IV, 20,7–15; Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 210.

[1054] The element *wp* in the expression *wp tꜣš.w*, "die Grenze scheiden" (*Wb*. V, 235,10–12) was translated with the verb "fixer" by Lacau (*Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b)), a translation which Gillen followed ("Historical Inscription," 24).

[1055] *wḏ nmt.wt*: Lacau pointed to two similar expressions indicating speed. In *The Tale of Sinuhe*, the titular character is described as *pḏ nmt.wt* "far-striding" (column B 56 from P. Berlin 3022 and line R 81 of P. Ramesseum A (P. Berlin 10499), incorrectly marked as B 81 by Lacau: *Chapelle*, 152 (§ 188 b,h); translation by Parkinson: *Sinuhe*, 30). As the remainder of this passage from the *Historical Inscription* demonstrates, the jackal was seen as a fast-moving animal, and Lacau referred to a very similar passage from a stela in Abu Simbel in which Ramesses II is described as a *sꜣb ḫꜣḫ nmt.wt* (Černý, *Abou-Simbel*, C 20, 3,15–16) "chacal au pas rapide" (*Chapelle*, 152 (§ 188 b,i)). He translated *sꜣb wḏ nmt.wt* as "un chacal au pas rapide" (*Chapelle*, 151, § 188 b), literally as "qui jette ses pas en avant" (*ibid*., 152, § 188 b,h). Gillen's translation as "a jackal who lays down steps" ("Historical Inscription," 24) is too literal, for which reason I prefer "swift-footed."

[1056] For sense of *sḫr* as "Art," "Weise:" *Wb*. IV, 259,C.

[1057] *mḏd sp n smꜣꜥ.n=f*: I here directly follow Gillen's translation, who also points out that *smꜣꜥ.n=f* is a nominalised *sḏm.n=f* ("Historical Inscription," 24, no. 68 in p. 28).

[1058] The word *ꜣḫ.t*, written with the *ꜣḫ*-hieroglyph (G 25) and the painted eye determinative (D 6) refers to the eye of the sun god, the Uraeus (*Chapelle*, 152, § 188 b,l).

[1059] This passage merely says *ỉnk ꜣḫ.t tp(y).t ỉt(=f)*; *tp(y).t* is here taken as a *nisbe*-adjective of the preposition *tp*. Lacau translated "Je suis l'OEil Glorieux, qui est sur (le front de) son père" (*Chapelle*, 151

who coils (around) his head with (8; 29*) victories;

I am a furious (crocodile)[1060], which captures with strength;

indeed, one which captures (9; 30*) without one escaping from it;[1061]

I am a formidable (crocodile), which covets opportunity,[1062]

(10; 31*) which crosses a canal/lake which one does not cross;

I am truly a hidden (crocodile)[1063], (11; 32*) a *dpy*-crocodile[1064], which seeks[1065] (?) the shade which conceals (it)[1066] in the place of shelter;[1067]

(§ 188 b)), and Gillen "I am the brilliant eye, who is upon (the front of) his father" ("Historical Inscription," 24). While a noun such as *wp.t* "brow" or *ḥ3.t* "forehead" might have indeed been expected in this context, as with *DeB* 80 above (*nb.t p.t nb.t pr-wr ḥr*(*y.t*)*-tp wp.t*[*=i*] "the Mistress of the sanctuary, the one who is on [my] brow": Helck, *Hist.-biog. neue Texte (6,2)*, 29), it is not required.

[1060] Hatshepsut henceforth describes herself with four characteristics with crocodile determinatives (*3dw*, *šny*, *k3pw*, and *dpy*). These seem to have been narrowly applicable to this animal, a sense which is supported by context (see: Lacau and Chevrier, *Chapelle*, 152 (§ 188 b,m)).

[1061] Gillen sees the verb *it̲i* as the infinitive *it̲.t*, and not a participle: "indeed (whose) seizing is that from whom one cannot be saved" ("Historical Inscription," 24), but given that the restoration of "whose" (requiring the addition of a suffix pronoun: *it̲.t*<*=f*>) is not essential, I here largely follow Lacau's translation of *it̲ gr.t iwty nḫm.tw m-ᶜ=f* as "qui capture, assurément, sans qu'on puisse se préserver de lui" (*Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b)).

[1062] Transliteration: *ink šny ᶜwn sp*. On the translation of *šny*, see: Lacau, *Chapelle*, 152 (§ 188 b,o). *ᶜwn*: "be covetous," "despoil" (someone) (Faulkner, *Dictionary*, 40); "gierig sein (*ḫr* auf);" "betrügen (*ḫr*/*m* um Habe);" "plündern (Land)" (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 133). Gillen translates "I am a (formidable) crocodile, who plunders possessions" ("Historical Inscription," 24). Lacau suggested "Je suis un crocodile-redoutable, qui trouve des occasions de pillages" (*Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b)), but "de pillages" is implied by one of the meanings of *ᶜwn* as "plündern," but according to the definition provided by Hannig and in the *Wörterbuch* (*Wb*. I, 172), this sense is used for plundering lands, and not possessions. For this reason, while I agree with his understanding of *sp* as "chance," "occasion," or "opportunity" (with reference to the behaviour of crocodiles lying in wait for their prey), I here opted to translate *ᶜwn* as "to covet."

[1063] *k3pw* (*Wb*. V, 105,5) is etymologically related to the verb *k3p* "sich verstecken, verbergen" (*Wb*. V, 104).

[1064] As noted by Lacau, the meaning of *dpy* (*Wb*. V, 447,13) is unclear. He translated it as "sournois" (*Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b)), while Gillen suggests "concealed." Hannig merely has this word as a *Bezeichnung* for a crocodile (*Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch–Deutsch*, 977).

[1065] *ᶜḫ̲*: Lacau stated that this word is partially illegible (*Chapelle*, 153 (§ 188 b,r)), but this is not the case (Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* I, 38), but his remark that the circumference of the circular sign which appears to be the uniliteral hieroglyph with the phonetic value of *ḫ̲* (Aa 1) is small is accurate (*Chapelle*, 153, § 188 a,α). Regardless of the precise reading, however, the meaning "chercher" proposed by Lacau, picked up by Gillen ("Historical Inscription," 24 and 28 no. 70), fits the context, for which reason I here follow his suggestion.

[1066] There is no pronoun in the original text, but I have added it here to make my interpretation of this passage clearer.

[1067] Transliteration: *ink is k3pw dpy ᶜḫ̲ šwy.t sdg m ibw*. Gillen sees *sdg* as a passive participle, generating a sense that is unclear ("I am truly a (hidden) crocodile, a (concealed) crocodile, who searches for the shade which is hidden in the location of refuge:" "Historical Inscription," 24). Lacau, on the other hand, saw *sdg* as an active, but also reflexive, participle: "Je suis un crocodile-dissimulé, un crocodile sournois (?), qui cherche (?) l'ombre, qui se cache dans l'enclos protecteur" (*Chapelle*, 151 (§

I am the sun-disk, (12; 33*) which creates forms[1068],

binds the land, and actualises its success;

I am one who distinguishes the one from whom he came forth,[1069]

(13; 34*) knowing that that which he desired was happening,[1070]

I creating for him [works] (14; 35*) according to the regulations,

so that[1071] their ends may exist forever, free from […]

188 b)). I here suggest that it is the *šwy.t* which is the agent doing the concealing, hiding from view predators lying in wait. This does not affect Lacau's general discussion on this passage, however (*ibid.*, 153 (§ 188 b,s)).

[1068] Lacau translated "qui a créé les êtres" instead (*Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b)).

[1069] Gillen translates "I am one who judges that which he has brought forth therein" ("Historical Inscription," 24). *prỉ*, however, is an intransitive verb, for which reason I here follow Lacau's translation of "Je suis quelqu'un qui distingue celui de qui il est issu" (*Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b)).

[1070] My translation differs from Lacau's and Gillen's, both of whom considered *mr.t.n=f* a relative form acting as the object of *rḫ.kwỉ*: "je sais ce qu'il (mon créateur) aime voir se réaliser" (*Chapelle*, 151 (§ 188 b)) and "I … knew what he loved to create" ("Historical Inscription," 24). This, however, disregards the fact that *ntt* introduces a new clause (Gardiner, *Grammar*, § 187).

[1071] Lacau (*Chapelle*, 153 (§ 188 b,x)) suggested that the unattested *m-wrt* is a conjunction identical in meaning to *m mrw.t* "so that" (*Wb*. II, 103,10).

Appendix B

History of discussion of block 287 of the *Historical Inscription*

Before the publication of the *Historical Inscription*, Schott mistakenly saw the passages preserved on this block (Appendix A Part 1)[1072] as relating Hatshepsut's coronation (*Krönung*); in fact, he saw Hatshepsut's speech on block 287 and the remainder of the *Historical Inscription* as two different texts, the main one set in Karnak, and block 287 set in Luxor Temple, this second consisting of a "Wiederholung" of her initial coronation in Karnak.[1073]

Redford pointed out that two texts give the dates of Hatshepsut's coronation, 2 *pr.t* 29 from block 287, and 1 *ꜣḫ.t* 1 from the Middle Colonnade texts and reliefs. He saw the former as a more historical account, but also argued that one would not be "justified in writing off the Deir el-Bahari account as pure fabrication. It is highly likely that an actual occurrence lies behind it, perhaps a formal presentation by Thutmose I of his daughter to the court, or even a proclamation that Hatshepsut was the 'heiress.'"[1074] Given that it was still unpublished, Redford argued that the events related in the *Historical Inscription* took place on the same date as those described in block 287.[1075]

Yoyotte, with Lacau's collaboration, was better able to examine the various blocks of the *Historical Inscription*, and was the first to note, thanks to the shift from third to first person, that the account in block 287 is a part of the overall *Historical Inscription*, and that it consists of a speech by Hatshepsut, in contrast to the first half of the text which refers to Hatshepsut in the third person, and which relates her actual coronation.[1076] He also concluded, the view Murnane took up, that in block 287 on the other hand, what Hatshepsut "évoquait à cet endroit n'était pas sa promotion sacrale à la dignité de pharaon, mais, selon toute apparence, les oracles qui, en l'an II d'un certain roi et une fois auparavant, avaient fait pressentir cette promotion en présence de ce souverain régnant."[1077] This is consistent with the widely accepted belief that

---

[1072] *Supra*, 284.

[1073] Schott, *Krönungstag*, 212–13.

[1074] Redford, *History*, 54–5.

[1075] *Ibid.*, 54.

[1076] Yoyotte, "Date supposée", 85 ff.

[1077] *Ibid.*, 88 (and 89); Murnane, *Coregencies*, 33. It must be noted, however, due to the fact that the *Historical Inscription* was still around nine years away from being first published by Lacau and Chevrier in 1977 (*Chapelle*), some aspects of Yoyotte's views of the text were imperfect. For example, despite

Hatshepsut became Pharaoh in the seventh regnal year of Thutmose III, or at least closer to then than to the second regnal year. Yoyotte presented three possibilities for the identity of the *nṯr pn nfr* on block 287. (1) He stated that since Hatshepsut does not shy away from depicting and naming Thutmose III elsewhere in the Chapelle Rouge, then there is no reason to assume that the "this good god" refers to him, there certainly not being any other data to confirm or reject this identification. (2) Thutmose II was thought the least likely, for Yoyotte accurately stated that Hatshepsut, after becoming king, did not rely on him to legitimise her rule.[1078] (3) She did so with her father, Thutmose I. This being reminiscent of her Middle Colonnade coronation inscriptions and reliefs, Yoyotte made the interesting argument that the events of block 287 consist of a "contrepartie 'historisante' et vérifiable des souvenirs réels ou fictifs qui prennent une forme rituelle et mythographique dans la *Naissance du roi divin* et dans la *Légende de la jeunesse*."[1079]

Meyer disagreed, proposing a return to seeing the second regnal year of Thutmose III as the one in which the accession of Hatshepsut took place.[1080] She rejected his suggestion that the Middle Colonnade sources and block 287 relate the same event (but in two distinct ways) due to the fact that the former is clearly fictional, as well as due to the fact that each text (despite even the fact that the Middle Colonnade date of New Year's Day is a fictitious one) provides a different date for the events they describe.[1081] She also argued, just as Schott had, through an interpretation of the Horemheb text with which I disagree, that the events of block 287 also relate the "Wiederholung" of the coronation in Karnak related in the remainder of the *Historical Inscription*, which also features the future king being selected by Amun: "… dürfte wohl die Interpretation des Datums des Blockes 287 durch Schott als eine

awareness of the retrograde nature of the text, he stated that the narrative sections relating Hatshepsut's coronation, referring to her in the third person, were on the north face of the Chapelle Rouge, and the of the south ("Date supposée", 85–6), while it is now known that these sections are mostly on the south face, the start of the north, and on block 54 (in the middle of the north face). It was therefore also believed that block 287 was originally located on the south, rather than north, face (*ibid.*, 87).

[1078] Cf. Dorman, "Early Reign", 54–5.

[1079] Yoyotte, "Date supposée", 91.

[1080] Meyer, *Senenmut*, 21–7.

[1081] *Ibid.*, 23; Cannuyer disagrees as well ("Brelan", 111 no. 65). It must be added, however, that Yoyotte had himself admitted this, adding that "il est bon de convenir que les relations poétiques devaient recouper dans une certaine mesure des événements réels" ("Date supposée", 90); cf. Redford, *History*, 55.

Wiederholung der Krönung in Luxor ziemlich wahrscheinlich sein."[1082] She interpreted all of the events related in Horemheb's Turin text as having taken place in Karnak: the journey to, and rituals in, Luxor are simply not mentioned, but only implied in the statement toward the end of the text that Amun returned to Karnak after the Opet festival concluded (ll. 21–2). Meyer therefore concluded that "anläßlich des Auszuges des Amun nach Luxor dort eine Wiederholung bzw. Verkündigung der Krönung durch den Gott in aller Öffentlichkeit stattgefunden hat."[1083] In contrast, as presented in the fifth chapter of this thesis, a part of the events of the Turin inscription occurred in Karnak, but the most important, such as the crowning in the *pr-wr*, did in either Luxor Temple or its adjacent palace. Meyer argued that Thutmose III is referred to most often on the Chapelle Rouge as *nṯr nfr*, while the title of *nsw.t-bity* is reserved for Hatshepsut, which Dorman refuted by pointing out that in the Middle Colonnade of Deir el-Bahari, Thutmose III "is often referred to as *nsw-bity*, but Thutmosis I as *nṯr nfr* as well."[1084]

Dorman reads the Turin inscription in a similar manner to Meyer, in that what took place in Luxor is not mentioned. He interpreted it differently, however, arguing that Horemheb was crowned in the palace adjacent to Karnak Temple (rather than the temple itself), whereas I argue in the fifth chapter that Luxor Temple's palace is the likelier possibility. Regardless, this refutes the notion of the celebration of more than one event featuring the crowning of the king as part of the royal succession, whether accession or coronation ceremony. This, along with the detailed examination of pictorial and textual, and dated and undated, evidence from the early reign of Thutmose III, has Dorman conclude: "as Yoyotte has suggested, the year 2 date on block 287 is not a demonstrable reference to a coronation, but is most likely a prediction of Hatshepsut's future accession that was made during an oracular procession in the reign of one of her predecessors, while her accession took place at a later date."[1085]

Cannuyer proposes a return to Schott's view that Hatshepsut acceded to the throne in the second regnal year of Thutmose III.[1086] His main argument is based on

[1082] Meyer, *Senenmut*, 24.

[1083] *Ibid.*, 23–4.

[1084] *Ibid.*, 27.

[1085] Dorman, *Monuments*, 28 (discussion of evidence: 18–45); cf. "Early Reign", 55–6.

[1086] Cannuyer, "Brelan", 109 f.

understanding the verb *sr* as "to announce, to proclaim," this partially resting on his interpretation of Thutmose III's 7th Pylon inscription, where "the rulership of the two lands" are said to have been *sr* to Thutmose and, after a short gap, his accession is said to have taken place.[1087] Block 287 featuring several characteristics in common with Thutmose's 7th Pylon inscription, such as the festal appearance of Amun, *sr*, and the presence of the reigning king, Cannuyer applies this definition of *sr* to Hatshepsut's text as well.[1088] Accepting for now the translation of "to announce" at the expense of "to foretell," as well as his interpretation that the *sr* of the 7th Pylon inscription would have taken place quite soon before his accession, Cannuyer's arguments for seeing the date provided in block 287 as that of Hatshepsut's accession bear a flaw: (1) block 287 contains parts of two similar oracular events, the latter part of one, and the start (or perhaps all of) another; (2) the first, the date for which would have been on the preceding block, like the second with the date of regnal year 2, 2 *pr.t* 29, features the presence of a *nṯr pn nfr*, the performance of *bỉʒy.t*-signs – as well as a *sr*: "… very great [*bỉʒy.t*-signs] in the presence of this good god, predicting for me the kingship of the Two Lands" (# 287,1). There is no more reason to assume that this second event necessarily consisted of Hatshepsut's accession, for the same could be said for the first. This, however, is not necessarily inconsistent with Cannuyer's own views for, in agreeing with Schott's interpretations, he believes that there was more than one "coronation" event, the ones after the first consisting of *Wiederholungen* (though he does not say so explicitly). By this logic, however, both consisting of "accessions" and/or "coronations" there is no reason to assume the second one to be describing "un avènement effectif survenu le 29/26 du II Peret d'un an II."[1089] If anything, since this first would have presumably taken place on an earlier date (being written before the account of the events 2 *pr.t* 29), it should be argued that it is this event (or perhaps another one which would have preceded it) which consisted of Hatshepsut's original accession to the throne. Furthermore, Cannuyer also failed to consider the following factor: while his interpretation of the 7th Pylon inscription—by itself—is consistent with (or at least does not exclude) the fact that Thutmose III may have actually become king soon after, or even at, the oracular event, the fact of the matter is that this text

[1087] *Ibid.*, 108–9; *Urk.* IV, 180.

[1088] Cannuyer, "Brelan", 112–15.

[1089] *Ibid.*, 113.

consists of a *sr* + accession while the second oracular event of block 287 contains no reference—aside from *sr* by itself—to an "accession" (*ḫʿi-nsw.t*) proper; but the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription* does. In support of Cannuyer's interpretation, it may have been possible to argue, had only the start of the second oracular event been preserved (the block following 287 also being missing), that its remainder may also have eventually mentioned Hatshepsut's accession, but this would be overlooking the fact that the end of the first oracular event of block 287 is preserved, which does not feature any mention of an actual rise to the throne, via *ḫʿi-nsw.t* or otherwise.

Vandersleyen, accepting his interpretation of *sr*, agrees with Cannuyer that block 287 relates more than the mere promise of kingship and, like Yoyotte, cites Thutmose I's role in Hatshepsut's Deir el-Bahari coronation inscription in support of his being the *nṯr pn nfr*.[1090]

Warburton, in a review article of a lexicographical study of the verb *sr* by Cannuyer, definitively rejects his views. The latter argued for a single origin for the word, originating from a spatial meaning "to spread," which expanded to "to announce, to proclaim," but not "to foretell," while Warburton persuasively argues for two different words, one with the spatial meaning (*sri*), but the other having the sense of "to announce" or "to foretell" (*sr*).[1091] More recently, in another review of Cannuyer's book, McDonald argues in favour of the translation of *sr* as "to predict" or "to foretell."[1092] It is with this definition in mind that this verb is translated in this thesis, this being among the primary reasons for interpreting the events of block 287 as *séances oraculaires*.

[1090] Vandersleyen, *L'Égypte*, 250–1.

[1091] Warburton, *Darkness*, 287 ff., esp. 301–6; *contra* Cannuyer, *Girafe*; cf. Cannuyer, "Brelan", 108–9, 112–13. I kindly thank my supervisor, Prof. Mark Smith, for directing me to this reference. Meyer's views that Hatshepsut, in her coronation in Karnak which is recorded in the main narrative of the *Historical Inscription*, related to those present an event which would have taken place not too long ago in Luxor which consisted of her first coronation ceremony, therefore does not work, for her interpretation hinges on translating *sr* as "to announce (an actual event)" (*Senenmut*, 25), for only in this light it would be possible for the coronation in Karnak to have been a *second* coronation – a repetition of the one which had taken place in Luxor.

[1092] McDonald, *Review: girafe*, 232. This review was kindly pointed out to me by its author after her keynote speech entitled "Travelling Ideas in the Written World of Ancient Egypt" for the 16th Current Research in Egyptology conference which was held in Oxford.

Appendix C

Part 1: Hieroglyphic transcription of the *Texte de la jeunesse*

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Thutmose describes his young age
(Cols. 1–2; *Urk.* IV, 156,13–157,6)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Thutmose describes his young age (cont.)
(Cols. 2–3; *Urk.* IV, 157,7–12)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The god emerges from the inner areas of his temple
(Cols. 3–5; *Urk.* IV, 157,13–158,2)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The great food-offering
(Col. 5; *Urk.* IV, 158, 3–6)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Amun mysteriously seeks out Thutmose, and finds him
(Col. 6; *Urk.* IV, 158,7–12)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Thutmose's reaction to Amun stopping for him, and the god's own reaction thereto
(Col. 7; *Urk.* IV, 158,13–17)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Claims to veracity and the hidden will of the gods
(Col. 8; *Urk.* IV, 159,3–9)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The doors of the 5th Pylon are opened for Thutmose, who passes through (Cols. 9–10; *Urk.* IV, 159,10–17)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The bestowal of status of king to, and crowning of Thutmose, and the establishment of his titulary (Cols. 10–12; *Urk.* IV, 160,1–12)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The bestowal of status of king to, and crowning of Thutmose, and the establishment of his titulary (Cols. 12–14; *Urk.* IV, 160,12–161,12)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The dominion of the new king; acknowledgement by Thutmose of his dependence on Amun
(Cols. 15–16; *Urk.* IV, 161,13–162,8)

Appendix C

Part 2: Translation of the *Texte de la jeunesse*

The *Texte de la jeunesse* is inscribed on the south face of the southern wall of the Hatshepsut central suite of rooms in Karnak.[1093] Like Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription*, it is written in retrograde columns, with the hieroglyphs facing north, toward the sanctuary of Amun in Karnak. Also facing north, before the beginning of the text, is a figure of an enthroned Thutmose III.[1094] The inscription is unfortunately very fragmentary, with roughly the top halves of the entirety of the preserved columns, apart from cols. 34–47, being missing. The text can be divided into roughly two sections. The first part (cols. 1–16) has been variously described by Egyptologists as relating the coronation, or perhaps accession, of Thutmose III. The second largely consists of a speech by Thutmose III in which he details the monuments and endowments he made for Karnak temple (cols. 16–49, esp. 25 f.). Given its lack of direct pertinence to the accession and coronation of Thutmose III, this part of the text is not covered in this thesis.

The inscription was first mentioned in 1875 by Mariette, who also provided transcriptions of the text in two plates but, like Brugsch (1877) and de Rougé (1879), he read the text backwards because of the retrograde writing.[1095] A more accurate transcription was provided later by Brugsch (1891), who corrected the order in which the text is to be read.[1096] The first most reliable publication of the text was undertaken by Breasted, who provided a transcription, translation, and detailed commentary.[1097]

The *Texte de la jeunesse* is largely believed to have been carved some time before the 23rd regnal year of Thutmose III.[1098] The most recent transcription of the *Texte de la jeunesse*, provided in the first part of this appendix, is the one in the *Urkunden*. Given that it was not possible to access the original monument, it forms the

[1093] *PM* II, 106 (328), plans XI–XII (1); Mariette, *Karnak (Planches)*, pls. 14–16.

[1094] Mariette, *Karnak*, pl. 14 a (left).

[1095] *Ibid.*, 51–2 (pls. 14–16); Brugsch, *Geschichte*, 359–65; de Rougé, *Inscriptions*, 1065–74.

[1096] Brugsch, *Thesaurus*, 1281–90.

[1097] Breasted, *Chapter*, 5 ff.

[1098] Laboury, *Statuaire*, 32–4, 546–51; Carlotti and Gabolde, "Ouadjyt", 289, no. 92; cf. Laboury, "Portrait", 270, nos. 90 and 92 in 286.

basis of the transliteration and translation undertaken in this thesis.[1099] The only full translations of the text, both into German, are Sethe's own[1100] and Hofmann's, who provided a transliteration as well.[1101]

The notes on the transliteration and translation of the text presented here pertain only to passages not included in the main chapter.

Translation

1. *Beginning of the text; statements of legitimacy (Cols. 1–3; Urk.* IV, *156,13–157,12)*

(1) [Regnal year 42:
There occurred an audience[1102] of the king himself] […]
[Summoning of the friends] […]
[Royal command to the friends of the king …][1103]
"He is my fa[ther],
I am his son.
He commanded to (me) that (I) be on his throne
    while I (still) was one-who-is-in-his-nest.
He engendered me with intimacy[1104].
(2) […]
[There is no false]hood,
There is no misstatement therein.
    Since my Person was a royal child,

[1099] *Urk.* IV, 155–76.

[1100] *Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 1–4)*, 155–75 (pp. 75–83).

[1101] Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 209–27.

[1102] Lit. "a sitting" and, as translated by Hofmann "Thronsitzung" (*ibid.*, 209 f.).

[1103] *Urk.* IV, 156, 13-14; Hofmann, *Königsnovelle*, 209 f. These are Sethe's restorations. The date is possible, as is the remainder of his restorations, which consists of a well-attested introduction to royal texts: the king holds an audience, summoning various court officials to express his plans, projects, or desires, usually as a result of a manifestation of the will of a god (*ibid.*, 324–33; Hermann, *Königsnovelle*, 9 f., esp. 13–14). A text by Senusret I (*PM* II, 107 (330); Mariette, *Karnak*, pl. 14 a (right); Habachi, *Devotion*, 353–5) and Hatshepsut's *Punt Inscription* (*PM* II, 347 (15); *DeB* III, pls. 85–6; *Urk. IV*, 349–55), for example, have similar introductions. The accompanying scenes of these two inscriptions, furthermore, are nearly identical to that of Thutmose III's. Given that his and Senusret I's texts are carved on the same wall, it is not unlikely that Thutmose did this as an act of devotion (Habachi, *Devotion*, 350–1, 359).

[1104] *m mt.t n.t ỉb*: lit. "with exactness of heart," translated as "Innigkeit" by Sethe (*Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 1–4)*, 157 on p. 76); cf. *Wb*. II, 175,6: "*mtr ỉb* (u. ä.) aufrichtigen Herzens;" and Hannig, *Wörterbuch* II, 1155: "aus vollem Herzen, in Innigkeit."

when I was a young child in his temple,

my induction into (the rank of) *ḥm-nṯr*-priest had not (yet) happ[ened].

(3) [… the tem]ple[1105] of my Person.

I was a *Pillar-of-his-Mother* in form and shape,

like the Child Horus in *Akhbit*.

2. *The god emerges from the inner areas of his temple (Cols. 3–5; Urk.* IV*, 157,13–158,2)*

I was standing in the northern *wadjyt*-colonnade,

(4) […] the splendours of his horizon.

He made festive the sky and the earth with his beauty,

he accepted the great sign/wonder,

while his rays were in the eyes of humankind

like the rise of Horus-of-the-Horizon,

and the *rekhyt*, they gave him (5) [praise].

3. *The great food-offering (Col. 5; Urk.* IV*, 158,3–6)*

(5) […] his temple.

Then his Person was performing a censing(-ritual) on the fire,

presenting him with great food-offerings consisting of long- and short-horned cattle, and foreign wild animals.

4. *Amun mysteriously seeks out Thutmose, and finds him (Col. 6; Urk.* IV*, 158,7–12)*

(6) […]

[…] moving about in both wings (lit. "its two sides") of the *wadjyt*,

the heart was without grasping what-was-forthcoming (from) his actions (lit. "those (things) which he was doing")

while seeking My Person everywhere.

(I), however, knew myself

when he made a (ritual-)stop.

5. *Thutmose's reaction to Amun stopping for him, and the god's own reaction thereto (Col. 7; Urk.* IV*, 158,13–159,2)*

(7) […]

[1105] The "temple" of one's head: *Wb.* II, 24; Faulkner, 102.

[I placed myself on the belly in front of him,]

[I prostrated on] the floor,

I bowed (lit. "bent myself") in his presence,

He placed me in front of his Person,

(And) I was stationed at the *Station [of] the Lord*.

He then performed a *bi3y.t*-sign for me.

6. *Claims to veracity and the hidden will of the gods (Col. 8; Urk.* IV*, 159,3–9)*

(8) […]

[There is no] lying,

They were withheld from the faces of humanity,

the secrets being in the hearts of the gods.

These knowing his/its (?) […]

There is none who knows it,

There is none who opens it.

7. *The doors of the 5th Pylon are opened for Thutmose, who passes through (Cols. 9–10; Urk.* IV*, 159,10–17)*

(9) […]

[He opened for] me the doo[rs] of the sky,

He opened for me the doorways of [it]s horizon,

I f[le]w up to the sky as a divine falcon,

so that (I) may see his [intro]duction which is in the sky,

so that I may adore his Person.

(10) […] every […]

I saw the forms of He-of-the-Horizon on his mysterious paths in the sky.

8. *The crowning of Thutmose (Cols. 10–12; Urk.* IV*, 160,1–10)*

Ra himself established me,

I was dignified with [his] crown[s] which are [o]n his head,

his Uraeus affixed to (11) [my forehead],

[…]

[I] was [equipped] with all of his manifestations,

I was satisfied with the wisdom of the gods

like Horus when he 'counted his body' at the temple of my father Amun-Ra,

I was [pro]vided (lit. "accomplished") with the dignities of a god in (12) […]

[…]

[He established] my crowns.

9. The establishment of the titulary (Cols. 12–14; Urk. IV*, 160,11–161,12)*

I installed the titulary itself (?),

He established my falcon on the *serekh* (palace-façade),

He strengthened me as a strong bull,

He caused that I appear within Thebes,

(13) [in this my name of Horus, the Strong-Bull-who-appeared-in-Thebes.

He caused that I raise the Two Ladies,

He made my kingship endure like (that of) Ra in the sky,

in] this my [name] of the Two Ladies, the Enduring-King-like-Ra-in-the-sky.

He fashioned me like a falcon of gold,

He gave me his power and his might,

I am splendid with these his crowns,

in this (my) name (14) [of the Horus-of-Gold, the Powerful-of-Might-splendid-of-crowns.

He caused that I appear as *nsw.t-bity*, Upper and Lower Egypt[1106],

He established my forms like (those of) Ra.

in this my name of] the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *Menkheperra*.

I am his son, who came forth from him,

fair-of-birth[1107], like the Foremost-of-Hesret,

He united all my forms,

in this my name of the Son of Ra, Thutmose-*smɜ-ḫpr*,

living forever and ever.

10. The dominion of the new king; acknowledgement by Thutmose of his dependence on Amun (Cols. 15–16; Urk. IV*, 161,13–162,8)*

(15) […] my […][1108]

[1106] Transliteration of Sethe's restoration: *di.n=f ḥr=i m nsw.t-bity šmʿ.w mḥ.w* (*Urk.* IV, 161,6). This is likely an error on his part, for it is unclear how *šmʿ.w mḥ.w* relates to what precedes it. The adding of the word *nsw.t*, for example, would have resolved this issue. That Sethe's own translation does not take *šmʿ.w mḥ.w* into account lends support to the notion that the restoration is likely to be incorrect: "[Er liess mich erschienen als König von Ober- und Unterägypten]" (*Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 1–4)*, 161 on p. 77).

[1107] *tw.t msw.t*: *Wb*. V, 258,16.

[1108] Sethe has an *m* and a *t* and, followed, by a short gap, the falcon on a standard, probably acting as the first person singular suffix pronoun *=i* (*Urk.* IV, 161,13).

He caused that all foreign lands [come][1109], bowing to the *bꜣw*-power of my Person,
the terror of me being in the hearts of the Nine Bows,
all lands being under [my] sandals.
He placed strength (or "victory") in my arms
in order to widen (16) [the borders of Egypt]
[…]
[My father Amun did] th[es]e (things),
so great is the [lov]e (?) of me on his [beha]lf.
He is joyful for me more than any king who had been in this land
since it was created (lit. "released").
I am his son whom his Person loves,
that which he desires is that which is done.

[1109] Sethe restored this as *ỉw.t*, which is the prospective form of the verb *ỉy.t* (Hoch, *Grammar*, 87, § 71).

Appendix D

Part 1: Hieroglyphic Transcription of Horemheb's Turin Inscription

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Beginning of the procession in Karnak
(ll. 12–13; *Urk.* IV, 2116,9–2117,1)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The encounter of Horemheb and Horus with Amun
(ll. 13–14; *Urk.* IV, 2117,2–6)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Amun joins the festival and leads Horemheb to the pr-nsw.t and pr-wr
(ll. 14–16; *Urk.* IV, 2117,7–13)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The crowning moment of the festival
(l. 16; *Urk.* IV, 2117,14–15)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The Ennead celebrates and gives a speech
(ll. 16–18; *Urk.* IV, 2117,16–2118,10)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

The making of the titulary
(l. 19; *Urk.* IV, 2118,11–15)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Exit from the pr-nsw.t and public confirmation of kingship
(ll. 19–21; *Urk.* IV, 2118,16–2119,7)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

End of festivities
(ll. 21–2; *Urk.* IV, 2119,8–9)

[The excerpt from the Urkunden originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The excerpt was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Sailing northward, setting the land in order
(ll. 21–2; *Urk*. IV, 2119,10–2120,17)

[The reproduction of this inscription published by Gardiner originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The reproduction was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Reproduction of the text on the back of the statue of Horemheb and Mutnedjmet Turin Cat. 1379 (Gardiner, “Coronation”, pl. 2)

Appendix D

Part 2: Translation of Horemheb's Turin Inscription

This inscription is carved on the back of a group statue, currently in the Turin museum, which depicts Horemheb and his Great Wife Mutnedjmet.[1110] Another, very fragmentary, version has also been discovered on a quartzite stela in Memphis.[1111] While not an exact copy, it contains some identical passages. These are pointed out in the translation below. As for the state of preservation of the Turin inscription itself, the beginning of lines 1–18 is missing, with as much as a fourth of some of these lines being missing. The text is otherwise largely intact, the exception being the far ends of the first four lines.[1112] The section of the text with the account of Horemheb becoming Pharaoh begins in line 12, before which it describes his rise to power under previous kings. It is the former which concerns us, a translation of which is presented here.

Gardiner's publication of the text (1953) was, and remains, the first full publication, with commentary and discussion, and also included a comparison with the Memphite version of the text. The most recent transcription and translation are by Helck in the *Urkunden*; this is the case for the Memphite version as well.

Given that I was unable to examine the inscription itself, these two most recent publications are the ones relied on for the translation presented here. The few differences between the two transcriptions are noted over the course of the translation. Both are reproduced in the first part of this appendix. As with the running translations of the *Historical Inscription* and the *Texte de la jeunesse* presented in Appendices A and C Part 2, notes on passages already covered in the main chapter are not repeated here unless necessary.

A brief note on the differences between the Turin and Memphite versions of the text: the beginning of the Memphite is broken off, the first surviving line being its fifth, and corresponding to line 15 of Turin.[1113] The rest of line 5 of the Memphite version is missing, but when it picks up again in line 6, it matches the Turin text once more (l.

[1110] Turin Cat. 1379. *PM* VIII, 58–9 (800-642-650); *Urk.* IV, 2113,7–2120,17; Gardiner, "Coronation", 13–31.

[1111] *PM* III, 832; *Urk.* IV, 2121,5–2124,8; Gardiner, "Coronation", 28–31; Mariette, *Memphis* I, pl. VI.

[1112] See Gardiner, "Coronation", pl. II.

[1113] Memphite text: *Urk.* IV, 2121,18–20; Turin: *Urk.* IV, 2117,10–12. Cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", 29.

17),[1114] based on which Helck restores the lacuna with the corresponding part from Turin.[1115] Gardiner, on the other hand, while he also saw the Memphite lacuna as corresponding to the same part from Turin, did not restore it as such, arguing that this lacuna is too small to accommodate the entirety of the corresponding section from the Turin text.[1116] The rest of Memphite line 6 is missing, but it would have had the same content as Turin line 17 for, when the text resumes in line 7, the two texts match.[1117] The Memphite diverges from the Turin from this point, however. After a few passages where they do not match, the two texts share two events, related identically, but in reverse order. As pointed out in the Hatshepsut chapter, these are (1) the making of the titulary, and (2) the exit from the *pr-nsw.t* and Amun embracing Horemheb.[1118] This order is followed in the Turin text, while in the Memphite, the exit and embrace come before the making of the king's *rn-wr*.[1119] After this point, three more fragmentary lines of text are preserved which do not correspond to any passages from the Turin inscription, at which point the text breaks away completely.[1120] The Turin version, in contrast, gives more details as to the celebrations taking place, following which it mentions the end of the festival.[1121] There follows an account of what took place afterwards, of Horemheb travelling northwards, bestowing various benefactions onto temples as he went.[1122]

[1114] Memphite text: *Urk.* IV, 2122,7–10; Turin: *Urk.* IV, 2117,18–2118,3. Cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", 29. It might be important to note that the word for "crown" is spelled differently in the two texts here: both are written with the *ḥ*ᶜ-hieroglyph (N 28) followed by its phonetic complement, the forearm (D 36), but in the Turin text these are followed by *w* (Z 7, hieratic equivalent of the quail chick, G 43) and then determined with the Blue Crown (S 7), while in the Memphite version only plural strokes are added (Z 2).

[1115] Memphite text: *Urk.* IV, 2122,1–7; Turin: *Urk.* IV, 2117,13–18. Cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", 29.

[1116] Gardiner, "Coronation", 29 no. 6.

[1117] Memphite text ll. 6–7: *Urk.* IV, 2122,10–19; Turin l. 17–18: *Urk.* IV, 2118,3–9. Cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", 30.

[1118] Memphite ll. 7–8: 2123, 1–10; Turin ll. 19–20: *Urk.* IV, 2118,11–18.

[1119] Interestingly, Gardiner does not seem to be aware of this either.

[1120] Ptah Stela ll. 9–*x*: *Urk.* IV, 2123,11–2124,8. This part of the Memphite stela mentions monuments which Horemheb built for Ptah, as well as how he had them decorated.

[1121] Turin ll. 20–22: *Urk.* IV 2119,1–9.

[1122] Turin ll. 22–26: *Urk.* IV, 2119,10–2120,17.

Translation

1. *Beginning of the procession in Karnak (ll. 12–13; Urk.* IV*, 2116,9–2117,1)*

(12) [After many days] had passed by on these things,

the eldest son of Horus was the highest of the *pʿt*-people of this entire land.

Now, this noble god Horus, lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*, his heart wished (to) establish his son upon his throne of eternity.

[Subject] commanded (13) […] Amun.

Horus then proceeded amid rejoicing to Thebes, the city of the Lord of Eternity,

his son in his embrace, to Karnak,

in order to induct him into the presence of Amun,

in order to transfer to him his office of king

and in order to make his lifetime.

2. *The encounter of Horemheb and Horus with Amun (ll. 13–14; Urk.* IV*, 2117,2–6)*

Now, (14) [Amun, the lord of the thrones of the Two Lands, had gone forth in jo]yousness in his beautiful festival, the foremost of Southern Opet (i.e. Luxor).

He then saw the Person of this god, Horus, Lord of *Ḥw.t-nsw.t*,

his son with him in the royal induction in order to give him his office and his throne.

3. *Amun joins the festival and leads Horemheb to the pr-nsw.t and pr-wr, where he is crowned (ll. 14–16; Urk.* IV*, 2117,7–15)*

Now, Amun-Ra had joined in the celebration.

He saw […] (l. 15) the day of making his offerings,

then went up to this elder, the hereditary noble (*iry-pʿt*), the one who has authority over the Two Lands (*ḥry tp tɜ.wy*), Horemheb,

and then proceeded to the *pr-nsw.t* and placed him before himself at the *pr-wr* of his noble daughter Weret-(l. 16)[Hekau],

[h]er [arms] in the *nyny*-gesture.

She embraced his beauty,

and she established herself on his forehead.

4. *The Ennead celebrates, and gives a speech (ll. 16–18; Urk.* IV*, 2117,16–2118,10)*

The Ennead, lords of the *pr-nsr* were in acclamation at his appearance,

Nekhbet, Wadjyt, Neith, Isis, Nephtys, Horus, Seth, the entire Ennead, the foremost of the *s.t-wr.t*

(17) They raised praises to the heights of the sky,

rejoicing at the contentment of Amun.

"Behold, Amun has come, his son in front of him, to the *ḥ*

in order to establish his crown on his head,

in order to prolong his entire lifetime.

We have assembled so that we may establish for him

(18) and (so that we may) [al]locate to him the insignia of Ra,

so that we may pay honour to Amun on account of him.

You have brought to us our protector.

Give him the *Sed*-festivals of Ra and the years of Horus as king,

it is he who shall do what contents your heart inside Karnak, and likewise Heliopolis and Memphis,

it is he who <shall> enrich them."

5. *The making of the titulary (l. 19; Urk.* IV*, 2118,11–15)*

(19) The great-name of this good god was [m]ade, his titulary like (that of) the Person of Ra, consisting of

Horus 'Strong-bull-ready-of-plans'

Two Ladies 'Great-of-wonders-in-Karnak'

Golden Horus 'Pleased-with-Maat-the-one-who-brings-the-Two-Lands-into-being'

King of Upper and Lower Egypt, *Djeserkheperura-setep-en-Ra*

The Son of Ra 'Horemheb-the-beloved-of-Amun,' given life.

6. *Exit from the pr-nsw.t and public confirmation of kingship (ll. 19–21; Urk.* IV*, 2118,16–2119,7)*

Going forth out (20) of the *pr-nsw.t* by the Person of this noble god, Amun, the king of the gods,

his son in front of him.

He embraced his beauty, he (Horemheb) having arisen with the *khepresh*-crown,

in order to transfer to him the circuit of the Aten,

the Nine Bows under his two legs,

the sky in festivity, the earth joyful,

the Enneads of the Beloved Land, their heart pleased.

(21) Now, the land, the bank, and all the people were joyful:

They cheered to the heavens,

great and small, they began (lit. "seized") shouting,

the entire land rejoicing.

7. *End of festivities and sailing northward, organising the country (ll. 21–6; Urk.* IV, *2119,8–2120,17)*

Afterwards, this foremost festival of Southern Opet (Luxor) came to an end,

and Amun, the king of the gods, came in peace to (22) Thebes.

Travelling by his Person in sailing northward with the statue of Horakhty:

Now, he (then began to) set this land in order:

He organised it to (the way it was) (at) the time of Ra,

he renewed the temples from the marshes of the Delta to Nubia,

he fashioned all (23) their images,

(they) numbering more than before,[1123]

exceeding in beauty through that which he did for them.

Ra rejoices when he sees them,

they having been found ruined[1124] at a previous time.

He elevated their temple(s),

and created their images[1125] in all their exact shapes (lit. *ḏ.t* "bodies")[1126]

[1123] The translation I give is more akin to Breasted's translation "⌜in number⌝ more than before" (*Records* III, 18, § 31). Grammatically, it is closer to Gardiner's "distinguished more than before" ("Coronation", 15, n. 3d on p. 20), with *ṯnw*(.*w*) being a stative. Helck translated "unterschieden von früher" (*Urk.* IV *(Übersetzung 17–22)*, 2119 on p. 406).

[1124] *gm*(.*w*) *wš* (stative); see: *Wb*. V, 167,26.

[1125] Breasted: "He fashioned 100 images" (*Records* III, 18, § 31). The confusion stems from an uncertainty whether the symbol in question is the hieratic abbreviation of *w* (Z 7), or the coil of rope (V 1) indicating the number 100 (see: Gardiner, "Coronation", 20 n. 3f). Given that it was not possible for me to examine the original monument, I cannot confirm which of the two is correct, but the latter seems to be the less likely possibility.

[1126] Gardiner translated this "(each) in (its) own exact person" ("Coronation", 15) and literally tentatively as "in all accurate bodies" (*ibid.*, 20 n. 3g). I here follow the sense of *ḏ.t* as "shape" (*Gestalt*: *Wb*. V, 505 D), this perhaps referring to the dimensions and proportions in which divine images were supposed to be carved. Cf. Helck's translation of "in jeder richtigen äußeren Gestalt" (*Übersetzung (17–22)*, 2120 on p. 406).

from every precious (lit. "noble") costly stone.

(24) He sought the precincts (*bky.t*)[1127] of the gods

which were as ruins (*iꜣw.t*; lit. "mounds") in this land,

(re-)founded them like they were since the beginning of primeval times,

and he dedicated regular/constant[1128] daily offerings for them.

Every vessel for their temple(s) (25) was gilded with gold and silver,

he equipped them (the temples) with *waab*-priests and lector-priests

from the pick of the army (*mnfꜣ.t*)[1129],

and he assigned[1130] them land and cattle, equipped with all occupations/services/cultic activity[1131],

so that they may rise early in the morning in order to pay honour to Ra at dawn every day:

"May you prolong for us the kingship of your son, who makes your heart content, *Djeserkheperura-setep-en-Ra*,

so that you may give him millions of *Sed*-festivals,

so that you may place his victories over all lands,

like Horus, the Son of Isis,

like (when) he pacified your heart in Heliopolis,

and your Ennead joined you[1132]."

[1127] Hannig: "Temenos, Tempelbezirk, Tempelfreiheit" (*Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch—Deutsch*, 263); *Wb*. I, 430 (s. v. *bꜣkꜣ.t*). The translation of "precinct" was apparently first suggested by Breasted (*Records* III, 18, § 31; cf. Gardiner, "Coronation", n. 3h on p. 20).

[1128] *m ỉmny.t*: "dauernd, täglich" (*Wb*. I, 83,8).

[1129] *Wb*. II, 80; here written *mnfy.t*.

[1130] *nḫb n*: "jemandem ein Landstück zuweisen" (*Wb*. II, 307,12).

[1131] *ḥn.t*: "Geschäft," "Kulthandlung" (*Wb*. III, 102).

[1132] Helck: "(… in Heliopolis) zusammen mit (?) deiner Neunheit" (*Übersetzung (17–22)*, 2120 on p. 407); Breasted: "(… in Heliopolis,) united with thy divine ennead" (*Records* III, 19, § 32).

Bibliography

The names of periodicals and publication series on this list appear as acronyms; these abbreviations are in accordance with those presented in the *Liste der abgekürzt zitierten Zeitschriften und Reihen* and *Liste der abgekürzt zitierten Monographien* of the *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*'s seventh volume (1992).

Abdel-Raziq, M. 1986, *Das Sanktuar Amenophis'* III. *im Luxor-Tempel*. Studies in Egyptian Culture 3. Tokyo: Waseda University.

Aldred, C. 1971, "Egypt: the Amarna Period and the End of the Eighteenth Dynasty" in *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume* II, *part 2. The Middle East and the Aegean Region, c. 1380–1000 B.C.*, eds. I.E.S. Edwards, C.J. Gadd, N.G.L. Hammond & E. Sollberger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 49–97.

Allen, J.P. 2000, *Middle Egyptian: an Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, 3rd edn. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Andrews, C. 1981, *The Rosetta Stone*. London: British Museum.

Arnold, D. 1962, *Wandrelief und Raumfunktion in ägyptischen Tempeln des Neuen Reiches*. MÄS 2. Berlin: Bruno Hessling.

Arnold, D. 1997, "Royal Cult Complexes of the Old and Middle Kingdoms" in *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, ed. B.E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 31–85.

Arrian & Brunt, P.A. 1976, *Arrian*. Loeb Classical Library 236. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Assmann, J. 1989, "Death and Initiation in the Funerary Religion of Ancient Egypt" in *Religion and Philosophy in Ancient Egypt*, ed. W.K. Simpson. New Haven: Yale Egyptological Seminar, 135–59.

Baines, J. 1987, "Practical Religion and Piety." *JEA* 73, 79–98.

Baines, J. & Malek, J. 2000, *Cultural Atlas of Ancient Egypt*. New York: Checkmark Books.

Balanda, S.Z. 2003, *Society and Government in Ancient Egypt to the End of the New Kingdom*: Stanbal Publications.

Barguet, P. 1962, *Le temple d'Amon-Rê à Karnak: Essai d'exégèse*, 2006^{e} edn. RAPH 21. Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'IFAO.

Barguet, P. 1967, "Karnak: Métropole religieuse de l'Égypte." *Archeologia* 15, 58–65.

Barta, W. 1980, "Thronbesteigung und Krönungsfeier als unterschiedliche Zeugnisse königlicher Herrschaftsübernahme." *SAK* 8, 33–53.

Barta, W. 1985, "Bemerkungen zur Existenz der Rituale für Geburt und Krönung." *ZÄS* 112, 1–13.

Bell, L. 1985, "Aspects of the Cult of the Deified Tutankhamun" in *Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar I*, ed. P. Posener-Kriéger. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 31–59.

Bell, L. 1985, "Luxor Temple and the Cult of the Royal *Ka*." *JNES* 44, 251–94.

Bell, L. 1997, "The New Kingdom 'Divine' Temple: The Example of Luxor" in *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, ed. B.E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 127–84.

Bergman, J. 1968, *Ich bin Isis: Studien zum memphittischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isisaretalogien*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 3. Uppsala: [Uppsala University].

Beylage, P. 2002, *Aufbau der königlichen Stelentexte vom Beginn der 18. Dynastie bis zur Amarnazeit.* 2 vols. ÄAT 54. Münster: Münster Universität.

Birch, S. 1874, "Inscription of Haremhebi on a Statue at Turin." *TSBA* 3, 486–95.

Blackman, A.M. 1945, "The King's Grace Before Meat." *JEA* 31, 57–73.

Blackman, A.M. 1998, "Purification (Egyptian)" in *Gods, Priests and Men: Studies in the Religion of Pharaonic Egypt*, ed. A.B. Lloyd. London, New York: Kegan Paul International, 3–21.

Blackman, A.M. 1998, "Sacramental Ideas and Usages in Ancient Egypt" in *Gods, Priests and Men: Studies in the Religion of Pharaonic Egypt*. London, New York: Kegan Paul International, 183–96.

Blyth, E. 2006, *Karnak: Evolution of a Temple*. London: Routledge.

Bommas, M. 2013, *Das ägyptische Investiturritual*. BAR International Series 2562. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Bonhême, M. 1978, "Les désignations de la 'titulature' royale au Nouvel Empire." *BIFAO* 78, 347–87.

Bonhême, M. 1987, *Les noms royaux dans l'Égypte de la Troisième Période Intermédiaire*. Bibliothèque d'Étude 98. Le Caire: IFAO.

Bonhême, M. & Forgeau, A. 1988, *Pharaon: les secrets du pouvoir*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Boorn, G.P.F.v.d. 1988, *The Duties of the Vizier: Civil Administration in the Early New Kingdom*. Studies in Egyptology. London & New York: Kegan Paul International.

Booth, C. 2009, *Horemheb: The Forgotten Pharaoh*. Stroud: Amberley.

Boraik, M. 2010, "Excavations of the Quays and the Embankment in Front of Karnak Temples: Preliminary Report." *Cahiers de Karnak* 13, 65–78.

Borchardt, L. 1896, "Zur Geschichte des Luqsortempels." *ZÄS* 34, 122–38.

Borchardt, L. 1905, *Zur Baugeschichte des Amontempels von Karnak*. UGAÄ 5, Heft 1. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Borchardt, L. 1935, *Die Mittel zur zeitlichen Festlegung von Punkten der ägyptischen Geschichte und ihre Anwendung*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Zeitbestimmung der ägyptischen Geschichte 2. Kairo: Selbstverlag.

Borghouts, J.F. 1987, "*ꜣḫ.w* (akhu) and *ḥkꜣ.w* (hekau): Two Basic Notions of Ancient Egyptian Magic, and the Concept of the Divine Creative Word" in *La Magia In Egitto Ai Tempi dei Faraoni: atti, convegno internazionale di studi, Milano, 29–31 ottobre 1985*. Milan: Art and Nature Books, 29–46.

Bosch-Puche, F. 2013, "The Egyptian Royal Titulary of Alexander the Great I: Horus, Two Ladies, Golden Horus, and Throne Names." *JEA* 99, 131–54.

Bosch-Puche, F. 2014, "The Egyptian Royal Titulary of Alexander the Great II: Personal Name, Empty Cartouches, Final Remarks, and Appendix." *JEA* 100, 89–109.

Breasted, J.H. 1900, *A New Chapter in the Life of Thutmose* III. UGAÄ 2, Heft 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Breasted, J.H. 1906–1907, *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest,* 5 vols. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Brugsch, H. 1877, *Geschichte Aegyptens unter den Pharaonen*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.

Brugsch, H. 1883–1891, *Thesaurus: Inscriptionum Aegyptiacarum.* 3 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.

Brugsch, H. 1886, "Der Apis-Kreis aus den Zeiten der Ptolemäer nach den hieroglyphischen und demotischen Weihinschriften des Serapeums von Memphis." *ZÄS* 24, 19–40.

Burgos, F. & Larché, F. 2006–8, *La chapelle Rouge: Le sanctuaire de barque d'Hatshepsout.* 2 vols. Paris: Culturesfrance, Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Burstein, S.M. 1991, "Pharaoh Alexander: A Scholarly Myth." *Ancient Society* 22, 139–45.

Cabrol, A. 2001, *Les voies processionnelles de Thèbes*. OLA 97. Leuven: Peeters.

Cannuyer, C. 1990, "Brelan de 'Pharaons' Ramsès XI, Thoutmosis III, et Hatshepsout" in *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim* I, ed. S. Israelit-Groll. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 98–115.

Cannuyer, C. 2010, *La girafe dans l'Égypte ancienne et le verbe sr: Étude de lexicographie et de symbolique animalière*. Acta Orientalia Belgica 4. Bruxelles: Société Belge d'Études Orientales.

Carlotti, J. 1995, "Mise au point sur les dimensions et la localisation de la chapelle d'Hatchepsout à Karnak." *Cahiers de Karnak* 10, 141–66.

Carlotti, J. 2001, *L'Akh-menou de Thoutmosis* III *à Karnak: Étude architecturale*. Paris: Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Carlotti, J. 2003, "Essai de datation de l'agrandissement à cinq barres de portage du pavois de la barque processionnelle d'Amon-Rê." *Cahiers de Karnak* 11, 235–54.

Carlotti, J. 2004, "Le siège d'intronisation d'Amon' et les 'Annales des prêtres' de Karnak." *CRIPEL* 24, 75–97.

Carlotti, J. & Gabolde, L. 2003, "Nouvelles données sur la *Ouadjyt*." *Cahiers de Karnak* 11, 255–338.

Černý, J. 1960, *Abou-Simbel: éxtérieur. Textes hiéroglyphiques*. Collection scientifique. Cairo: Centre de documentation égyptologique.

Černý, J. 1962, "Egyptian Oracles" in *A Saite Oracle Papyrus from Thebes in the Brooklyn Museum [Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3]*, ed. R.A. Parker. Brown Egyptological Studies IV. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 35–48.

Chassinat, É. 1932, *Le temple d'Edfou* VII. Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire 24. Le Caire: IFAO.

Chevrier, H. 1951, "Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak 1950–51." *ASAE* 51, 549–72.

Chevrier, H. 1952, "Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak, 1951–52." *ASAE* 52, 229–42.

Chevrier, H. 1956, "Chronologie des constructions de la salle hypostyle." *ASAE* 54, 35–38.

Crawford (Thompson), D.J. 1980, "Ptolemy, Ptah and Apis in Hellenistic Memphis" in *Studies on Ptolemaic Memphis*, eds. D.J. Crawford, J. Quaegebeur & W. Clarysse. Studia Hellenistica 24. Lovanii: s.n., 1–42.

Daressy, G. 1898, "Notes et remarques." *RecTrav* 20, 72–86.

Darnell, J. 2010, "Opet Festival" in *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology* [Online], eds. J. Dieleman and W. Wendrich, Available: http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz0025n765, 1–15.

Daumas, F. 1951, "Sur deux chants liturgiques des mammisis de Dendara." *RdE* 8, 31–46.

Davies, N.d.G. 1905, *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna* II*: The tombs of Panehesy and Meryra II*. ASE 14. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.

Davies, N.d.G. 1908, *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna* VI*: Tombs of Parennefer, Tutu, and Aÿ*. ASE 18. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.

de Rougé, E. 1879, *Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques copiées en Égypte pendant la missions scientifique de M. le vicomte Emmanuel de Rougé*. Paris: Vieweg.

Derchain, P. 1998, "Le pique-nique de l'Aulète" in *Egyptian Religion: the Last Thousand Years. Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur* II, eds. W. Clarysse, A. Schoors & H. Williams. OLA 85. Leuven: Peeters, 1155–67.

Dodson, A. 1990, "Crown Prince Djehutymose and the Royal Sons of the Eighteenth Dynasty." *JEA* 76, 87–96.

Dodson, A. 2009, *Amarna Sunset: Nefertiti, Tutankhamun, Ay, Horemheb, and the Egyptian Counter-Reformation*. Cairo, New York: American University in Cairo Press.

Donadoni, S. 1999, *Thèbes*. Paris: Arthaud.

Dorman, P.F. 1988, *The Monuments of Senenmut: Problems in Historical Methodology*. London & New York: Kegan Paul International.

Dorman, P.F. 2006, "The Early Reign of Thutmose III: an Unorthodox Mantle of Coregency" in *Thutmose* III*: A New Biography*, eds. E.H. Cline & D. O'Connor. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 39–68.

Edgerton, W.F. 1933, *The Thutmosid Succession*. SAOC 8. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edgerton, W.F. & Wilson, J.A. 1936, *Historical Records of Ramses* III*: the Texts in Medinet Habu, Volumes* I *and* II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edzard, D.O. (ed) 1976–1980, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie V: Ia-Kizzuwatna*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Epigraphic Survey, T. 1932, *Medinet Habu* II*: Later Historical Records of Ramses* III. OIP 9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Epigraphic Survey, T. 1940, *Medinet Habu* IV*: Festival Scenes of Ramses* III. OIP 51. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Epigraphic Survey, T. 1963, *Medinet Habu* VI*: The Temple Proper, Part 2: the Re Chapel, the Royal Mortuary Complex, and Adjacent Rooms with Miscellaneous*

Material from the Pylons, the Forecourts, and the First Hypostyle Hall. OIP 84. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Epigraphic Survey, T. 1964, *Medinet Habu* VII*: The Temple Proper, Part 3: The Third Hypostyle Hall and All Rooms Accessible from it with Friezes of Scenes from the Roof Terraces and Exterior Walls of the Temple*. OIP 93. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Epigraphic Survey, T. 1994, *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple* I*: the Festival Procession of Opet in the Colonnade Hall*. OIP 112. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Erichsen, W. 1954, *Demotisches Glossar*. Kopenhagen: Einar Munksgaard.

Erman, A. & Grapow, H. 1926–63, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache.* 6 vols. Leipzig, Berlin: J. C. Hinrichs, Akademie-Verlag.

Fairman, H.W. 1958, "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt" in *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*, ed. H. Hooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 74–104.

Faulkner, R.O. 1962, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Franke, D. 1988, "Zur Chronologie des Mittleren Reiches (12.-18. Dynastie), Teil 1: Die 12. Dynastie." *Or* 57, 113–38.

Frankfort, H. 1948, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society & Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frazer, J.G. 1914, *The Golden Bough: Adonis, Attis, Osiris: Studies in the History of Oriental Religion,* 3rd edn. London: Macmillan.

Gabolde, L. 1993, "La ‘cour des Fêtes’ de Thoutmosis II à Karnak." *Cahiers de Karnak* 9, 1–100.

Gabolde, L. 2005, *Monuments décorés en bas-relief aux noms de Thoutmosis* II *et Hatchepsout à Karnak.* 2 vols. Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale 123. Le Caire: IFAO.

Gabolde, L. & Zimmer, T. 1985, "Sondage effectué à l'angle sud-est du parvis du IVe Pylône." *Cahiers de Karnak* 8, 159–65.

Gardiner, A.H. 1911, *Egyptian Hieratic Texts. Series* I*: Literary Texts of the New Kingdom. Part* I*: The Papyrus Anastasi* I *and the Papyrus Koller, Together with the Parallel Texts*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Gardiner, A.H. 1911, "The Goddess Nekhbet at the Jubilee Festival of Ramesses III." *ZÄS* 48, 47–51.

Gardiner, A.H. 1915, "Notices of Recent Publications." *JEA* 2, no. 2, 121–6.

Gardiner, A.H. 1932, *Late-Egyptian Stories*. BAe 1. Bruxelles: Édition de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

Gardiner, A.H. 1945, "Regnal Years and Civil Calendar in Pharaonic Egypt." *JEA* 31, 11–28.

Gardiner, A.H. 1947, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardiner, A.H. 1952, "Thutmose III Returns Thanks to Amun." *JEA* 38, 6–23.

Gardiner, A.H. 1953, "The Coronation of King Haremhab." *JEA* 39, 14–21.

Gardiner, A.H. 1953, "The Memphite Tomb of the General Ḥaremḥab." *JEA* 39, 3–12.

Gardiner, A.H. 1957, *Egyptian Grammar: Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Griffith Institute.

Gayet, A. 1894, *Le temple de Louxor, 1er Fascicule: Constructions d'Aménophis* III*: Cour d'Aménophis, Salle hypostyle, Salle des Offertoires, Salle du Lever et Sanctuaire de Maut*. MIFAO 15. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Gee, J. 2004, "*Prophets, Initiation and the Egyptian Temple*." *JSSEA* 31, 97–107.

Gillen, T.J. 2005, "The Historical Inscription on Queen Hatshepsut's *Chapelle Rouge*." *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 16, 7–28.

Gitton, M. 1974, "Le palais de Karnak." *BIFAO* 74, 63–73.

Goebs, K. 2008, *Crowns in Egyptian Funerary Literature: Royalty, Rebirth, and Destruction*. Griffith Institute Monographs. Oxford: Griffith Institute.

Golvin, J. 1985, "La restauration antique du passage du troisième pylône." *Cahiers de Karnak* 8, 189–206.

Golvin, J. & Goyon, J. 1987, *Les bâtisseurs de Karnak*. Paris: Presses du CNRS.

Gosudarstvennyĭ Ėrmitazh (Russia) 1993, *Les transcriptions des papyrus hiératiques no. 1116 A (verso) et 1116 B (verso) de l'Emitage impérial à St.-Pétersbourg*. San Antonio: San Antonio : Van Siclen Books.

Goyon, J. 1972, *Confirmation de pouvoir royal au nouvel an: Brooklyn Museum Brooklyn Museum Papyrus 47.218.50*. Le Caire: IFAO and Brooklyn Museum.

Grimal, N. 1981, *La stèle triomphale de Pi('ankh)y au Musée du Caire: JE 48862 et 47086-47089*. MIFAO 105. Le Caire: IFAO.

Grimm, A. 1988, "Feind-Bilder und Bilderverbrennung: ein Brandopfer zur rituellen Feindvernichtung in einer Festdarstellung des 'Chaplle Rouge'." *VA* 4, no. 3, 207–13.

Habachi, L. 1985, "Devotion of Tuthmosis III to his Predecessors: A Propos of a Meeting of Sesostris I with his Courtiers" in *Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar* I, ed. P. Posener-Kriéger. Le Caire: IFAO, 349–59.

Haeny, G. 1970, *Basilikale Anlagen in der ägyptischen Baukunst des Neuen Reiches*. BeiträgeBf 9. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Haeny, G. 1997, "New Kingdom 'Mortuary Temples' and 'Mansions of Millions of Years'" in *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, ed. B.E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 86–126.

Hannig, R. 1995, *Die Sprache der Pharaonen: großes Handwörterbuch. Ägyptisch-Deutsch*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Hannig, R. 2000, *Die Sprache der Pharaonen: großes Handwörterbuch. Deutsch-Ägyptisch (2800-950 v. Chr.)*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Hannig, R. 2006, *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch* II*: Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit*. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.

Hari, R. 1964, *Horemheb et la reine Moutnedjemet ou la fin d'une dynastie*, Éditions de Belles-Lettres.

Hayes, W.C. 1957, "Varia from the Time of Hatshepsut." *MDAIK* 15, 78–90.

Hegazy, S.e. & Martinez, P. 1993, "Le 'Palais de Maât' et la 'Place Favorite d'Amon'." *Les Dossiers d'Archéologie* 187, 54–63.

Helck, W. 1954, " Die Sinai-Inschrift des Amenmose." *MIO* 2, 189–207.

Helck, W. 1955–58, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Helck, W. 1956, "Zwei thebanische Urkunden aus der Zeit Sethos' II." *ZÄS* 81, 82–7.

Helck, W. 1968, "Zur Chronologie Amenophis' I." in *Festschrift für Siegfried Schott zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20 August 1967*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 71–2.

Helck, W. 1969, "Eine Stele Sobekhoteps IV. aus Karnak." *MDAIK* 24, 194–200.

Helck, W. 1995, *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie: Nachträge*. Kleine ägyptische Texte 6,2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Helck, W., Otto, E., Westendorf, W. (eds) 1975–1992, *Lexikon der Ägyptologie.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hermann, A. 1938, *Die ägyptische Königsnovelle*. LÄS 10. Glückstadt: Augustin.

Hoch, J.E. 1996, *Middle Egyptian Grammar*. SSEA 15. Mississauga: Benben.

Hoffmeier, J.K. 1985, *Sacred in the Vocabulary of Ancient Egypt: the Term ḏsr, with Special Reference to Dynasties* I–XX. OBO 59. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg (Schweiz).

Hofmann, B. 2004, *Die Königsnovelle: 'Strukturanalyse am Einzelwerk'*. ÄUAT 62. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hölbl, G. 1994, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches: Politik, Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander dem Großen bis zur römischen Eroberung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Hornung, E. 1964, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches*. ÄA 11. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hornung, E. 1982, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: the One and the Many*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Hornung, E. 2006, "The New Kingdom" in *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, eds. E. Hornung, R. Krauss & D.A. Warburton. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1: The Near and Middle East 83. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 197–217.

Hornung, E., Krauss, R. & Warburton, D.A. 2006, "Chronological Table for the Dynastic Period" in *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1: The Near and Middle East 83. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 490–5.

Huss, W. 1994, *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester: Studien zur Geschichte des ptolemaiischen Ägypten*. Historia. Einzelschriften 85. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Huß, W. 2001, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332-30 v. Chr*. München: C. H. Beck.

Junker, H. 1940, *Die Götterlehre von Memphis (Schabaka-Inschrift)*. APAW 23. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Karkowski, J. 1992, "Notes on the Beautiful Feast of the Valley as Represented in Hatshepsut's Temple at Deir el-Bahari" in *50 Years of Polish Excavations in Egypt and the Near East: Acts of the Symposium at the Warsaw University 1986*, eds. S. Jakobielski & J. Karkowski. Warsaw: Centre d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, 155–66.

Karlshausen, C. 1995, "L'évolution de la barque processionnelle d'Amon à la 18e dynastie." *RdE* 46, 119–37.

Karlshausen, C. 2009, *L'iconographie de la barque processionnelle divine en Egypte au Nouvel Empire*. OLA 182. Leuven: Peeters.

Kawai, N. 2010, "Ay Versus Horemheb: The Political Situation in the Late Eighteenth Dynasty Revisited." *Journal of Egyptian History* 3, 261–92.

Kees, H. 1928, *Das Re-Heiligtum des Königs Ne-woser-re (Rathures)* III*: die grosse Festdarstellung*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Kees, H. 1958, "Die weiße Kapelle Sesostris' I. in Karnak und das Sedfest." *MDAIK* 16, 194–213.

Kemp, B.J. 1989, *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization*, 1st edn. London, New York: Routledge.

Kitchen, K.A. 1979, *Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical* II. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kitchen, K.A. 1987, "The Titularies of the Ramesside Kings as Expression of their Ideal Kingship." *ASAE* 71, 131–41.

Kitchen, K.A. 1999, *Ramesside Inscriptions, Translated and Annotated: Notes and Comments II: Ramesses* II*, Royal Inscriptions*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Klug, A. 1996, "Ein neues Fragment der Thronbesteigungsanzeige Thutmosis' I." in *Wege öffnen: Festschrift für Rolf Gundlach zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Schade-Busch. ÄA 35. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 124–8.

Koenen, L. 1977, *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste*. Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 56. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain.

Koenen, L. 1993, "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure" in *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, eds. A. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long & A. Stewart. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 25–115.

Königliche Museen zu Berlin 1913, *Aegyptische Inschriften aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin I: Inschriften von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Ende der Hyksoszeit*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Konrad, K. 2006, *Architektur und Theologie: pharaonische Tempelterminologie unter Berücksichtigung königsideologischer Aspekte*. Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Kruchten, J. 1986, *Le grand texte oraculaire de Djéhoutymose: intendant du domaine d'Amon sous le pontificat de Pinedjem* II. MRE 5. Bruxelles: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

Kruchten, J. 1989, *Les annales des prêtres de Karnak (*XXI-XXIII*mes Dynasties) et d'autres textes contemporains relatifs à l'initiation des prêtres d'Amon*. OLA 32. Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek.

Kruchten, J. 1991, "Le 'Maître des dieux' de Karnak" in *Religion und Philosophie im alten Ägypten: Festgabe für Philippe Derchain zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Juli 1991*, eds. U. Verhoeven & E. Graefe. OLA 39. Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, 179–87.

Kuhrt, A. 1995, *The Ancient Near East c. 3000–330 BC*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kurth, D. 2008, *Einführung ins Ptolemäische: eine Grammatik mit Zeichenliste und Übungsstücken*. Hützel: Backe.

Laboury, D. 1998, *La statuaire de Thoutmosis* III*: Essai d'interprétation d'un portrait royal dans son contexte historique*. Aegyptiaca Leodiensia 5. Liège: C.I.P.L.

Laboury, D. 2006, "Royal Portrait and Ideology: Evolution and Signification of the Statuary of Thutmose III" in *Thutmose* III*: A New Biography*, eds. E.H. Cline & D. O'Connor. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 260–91.

Lacau, P. & Chevrier, H. 1977, *Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak* I. Le Caire: Le Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte avec la collaboration de l'IFAO.

Lansing, A. & Hayes, W.C. January 1937, "The Egyptian Expedition, 1935–1936." *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 32, 5–39.

Larché, F. 2007, "Nouvelles observations sur les monuments du Moyen et du Nouvel Empire dans la zone centrale du temple d'Amon." *Cahiers de Karnak* 12, 407–592.

Larché, F. 2010, "The Chapel of Amenhotep II Embedded between the Obelisks of Thutmose I." *Cahiers de Karnak* 13, 297–326.

Laskowski, P. 2006, "Monumental Architecture and the Royal Building Program of Thutmose III" in *Thutmose* III*: A New Biography*, eds. E.H. Cline & D. O'Connor. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 183–237.

Lauffray, J. 1969, "Le secteur nord du temple jubilaire de Thoutmosis III à Karnak. État des lieux et commentaire architectural." *Kemi* 19.

Lauffray, J. 1979, *Karnak d'Égypte: Domaine du Divin*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Le Saout, F. 1989, "Une nouvelle fête d'Hathor à Karnak." *CRIPEL* 11, 69–71.

Leclant, J. 1953, "La colonnade éthiopienne à l'est de la grande enceinte d'Amon à Karnak." *BIFAO* 53, 113–72.

Leclant, J. 1956, "La 'Mascarade' des boeufs gras et le triomphe de l'Égypte." *MDAIK* 14, 128–45.

Leclant, J. 1960, "The Suckling of the Pharaoh as a Part of the Coronation Rites in Ancient Egypt" in *Proceedings of the* IX*th International Congress for the History of Religions: Tokyo and Kyoto 1958*. Tokyo: Maruzen, 135–45.

Leclant, J. 1968, "Les rites de purification dans le cérémonial pharaonique de couronnement" in *Proceedings of the* XI*th International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions* II*: Guilt or Pollution and Rites of Purification*. Leiden: Brill, 48–51.

Legrain, G.A. 1917, "Le logement et transport des barques sacrées et des statues des dieux dans quelques temples égyptiens." *BIFAO* 13, 1–76.

Leprohon, R.J. 2010, "Patterns of Royal Name-giving" in *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology* [Online], eds. E. Frood and W. Wendrich, Available: http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz001nx697, 1–10.

Leprohon, R.J. 2013, *The Great Name: Ancient Egyptian Royal Titulary*. Writings from the Ancient World 33. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Lepsius, K.R. 1849–1858, *Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien.* 12 vols. Berlin: Nicolaische Buchhandlung.

Letellier, B. 1979, "La cour à péristyle de Thoutmosis IV à Karnak (et la 'cour des Fêtes' de Thoutmosis II)" in *Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Saunéron 1927-1976* I*: Égypte pharaonique*, ed. J. Vercoutter. Le Caire: IFAO, 51–72.

Lichtheim, M. 2006, *Ancient Egyptian Literature. A Book of Readings* III*: the Late Period*. Berkeley, CA; London: University of California Press.

Malek, J. 1999, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* VIII*: Objects of Provenance Not Known. Part 1: Royal Statues, Private Statues (Predynastic to Dynasty* XVII*)*. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford: Griffith Institute.

Mariette, A. 1869, *Abydos: Description des fouilles exécutées sur l'emplacement de cette ville* I*: ville antique, temple de Séti*. Paris: Librairie A. Franck.

Mariette, A. 1875, *Karnak: Étude topographique et archéologique avec un appendice comprenant les principaux textes hiéroglyphiques découverts ou receuillis pendant les fouilles exécutées à Karnak*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Martin, G.T. 1989, *The Memphite Tomb of Ḥoremḥeb, commander-in-chief of Tut'ankhamūn,* I*: the reliefs, inscriptions, and commentary*. EM 55. London: EES.

McDonald, A. 2012, "Review: 'Cannuyer, La girafe dans l'Égypte ancienne et le verbe sr: Étude de lexicographie et de symbolique animalière'." *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 69 (3–4), 226–33.

McDowell, A.G. 1990, *Jurisdiction in the Workmen's Community of Deir el-Medîna*. Egyptologische Uitgaven. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Meyer, C. 1982, *Senenmut: eine prosopographische Untersuchung*. Hamburg: Verlag Borg.

Morenz, S. 1960, *Ägyptische Religion*. Die Religionen der Menschheit 8. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.

Moret, A. 1902, *Du caractère religieux de la royauté pharaonique*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Moret, A. 1930, "La légende d'Osiris à l'époque thébaine d'après l'hymne à Osiris du Louvre." *BIFAO* 30, 725–50.

Morkot, R. 1985, "Nakhtmin, the Supposed Viceroy of Ay." *Wepwawet* 1, 7–8.

Morris, E.F. 2010, "The Pharaoh and Pharaonic Office" in *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*, ed. A.B. Lloyd. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 201–17.

Müller, M. 2005, "Die Krönungsinschrift der Hatschepsut" in *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte*, eds. B. Janowski & G. Wilhelm. Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 197–211.

Müller, M. 2013, "Hatschepsut und der Umgang mit der Vergangenheit: Zur angeblichen Mittleren-Reich-Vorlage für Hatschepsuts Darstellung ihrer Erhebung zur Koregentin" in *Vergangenheit und Zukunft: Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit*, ed. S. Bickel. Aegyptiaca Helvetica 22. Basel: Schwabe, 187–202.

Murnane, W.J. 1977, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

Murnane, W.J. 1993, "La grande fête d'Opet." *Dossiers Histoire et Archéologie* 101, 22–5.

Murnane, W.J. 1995, "The Kingship of the Nineteenth Dynasty: a Study in the Resilience of an Institution" in *Ancient Egyptian Kingship*, eds. D. O'Connor & D.P. Silverman. Probleme der Ägyptologie 9. Leiden: Brill, 185–217.

Murray, M.A. 1931, *Egyptian Temples*. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd.

Naville, E. 1892, *The Festival-Hall of Osorkon* II *in the Great Temple of Bubastis*. EEF 10. London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trübner & Co.

Naville, E. 1896, *The Temple of Deir el Bahari* II*: The Ebony Shrine, Northern Half of the Middle Platform*. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund 14. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.

Naville, E. 1898, *The Temple of Deir el Bahari* III*: End of Northern Half and Southern Half of the Middle Platform*. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund 16. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.

Naville, E. 1908, *The Temple of Deir el Bahari* VI*: The Lower Terrace, Additions and Plans*
. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund 29. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.

Nelson, H.H. 1981, *The Great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak*. OIP 106. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

Nims, C.F. 1966, "The Date of the Dishonoring of Hatshepsut." *ZÄS* 93, 97–100.

Niwiński, A. 1976, "Les colonnes proto-doriques avec inscriptions du temple de Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari." *ET* 9, 81–110.

Ockinga, B. 2011, "Hatshepsut's Appointment as Crown Prince and the Egyptian Background to Isaiah 9:5" in *Egypt, Canaan and Israel: History, Imperialism, Ideology and Literature. Proceedings of a Conference at the University of Haifa, 3–7 May 2009*, eds. S. Bar, D. Kahn & J.J. Shirley. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 52. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 252–67.

O'Connor, D. 1995, "Beloved of Maat, the Horizon of Re: the Royal Palace in New Kingdom Egypt" in *Ancient Egyptian Kingship*, eds. D.P. Silverman & D. O'Connor. Probleme der Ägyptologie 9. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 263–300.

O'Connor, D. 2006, "Thutmose III: an Enigmatic Pharaoh" in *Thutmose* III*: a New Biography*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1–38.

O'Connor, D. 2009, *Abydos: Egypt's First Pharaohs and the Cult of Osiris*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Oréal, E. 2011, *Les particules en égyptien ancien: de l'ancien égyptien à l'égyptienne classique*. Bibliothèque d'Étude 152. Le Caire: IFAO.

Otto, E. 1952, *Topographie des thebanischen Gaues*. UGAÄ 16. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Parkinson, R.B. 1991, *Voices from Ancient Egypt: an Anthology of Middle Kingdom Writings*. London: British Museum Press.

Parkinson, R.B. 1997, *The Tale of Sinuhe and Other Ancient Egyptian Poems 1940–1640 BC*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pleyte, W. 1869–1876, *Papyrus de Turin.* 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Porter, B. & Moss, R.L.B. 1934, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* IV*: Lower and Middle Egypt (Delta and Cairo to Asyût)*
. Oxford: Clarendon.

Porter, B. & Moss, R.L.B. 1939, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* VI*: Upper Egypt: Chief Temples*

(Excluding Thebes): Abydos, Dendera, Esna, Edfu, Kôm Ombo, and Philae. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Porter, B. & Moss, R.L.B. 1951, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* VII*: Nubia, the Deserts, and Outside Egypt*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Porter, B. & Moss, R.L.B. 1972, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* II*: Theban Temples*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Griffith Institute.

Porter, B. & Moss, R.L.B. 1974, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* III*: Memphis. Part 1: Abû Rawâsh to Abûṣîr*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Porter, B. & Moss, R.L.B. 1981, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings* III^{2}*: Memphis. Part 2: Ṣaqqâra to Dahshûr*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quaegebeur, J. 1971, "Documents Concerning a Cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos at Memphis." *JNES* 30, 239–70.

Quirke, S. & Andrews, C. 1988, *The Rosetta Stone: Facsimile Drawing*. London: British Museum.

Randall-MacIver, D., Woolley, C.L. & Legrain, G.A. 1908, "Postscripts." *Egypt Exploration Fund Archaeological Reports* 1907–1908, 77–82.

Redford, D.B. 1966, "On the Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty." *JNES* 25, 113–24.

Redford, D.B. 1967, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*. Near and Middle East Series 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Redford, D.B. 1971, "The Earliest Years of Ramesses II, and the Building of the Ramesside Court at Luxor." *JEA* 57, 110–19.

Redford, D.B. 1973, "Studies on Akhenaten at Thebes I." *JARCE* 10, 77–94.

Refai, H. 2000, "Notes on the Function of the Great Hypostyle Hall in the Egyptian Temple: A Theban Approach" in *Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: Proceedings of the Eighth Congress of Egyptologists: Archaeology*, ed. Zahi Hawass, in collaboration with Lyla Pinch Brock. Cairo, New York: American University in Cairo Press, 393–9.

Reymond, E.A.E. 1981, *From the Records of a Priestly Family from Memphis*. ÄA 38. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Ritner, R.K. 1993, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

Römer, M. 1994, *Gottes- und Priesterherrschaft in Ägypten am Ende des Neuen Reiches: ein religiongeschichtliches Phänomen und seine sozialen Grundlagen*. ÄUAT 21. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Roth, A.M. 2005, "Models of Authority: Hatshepsut's Predecessors in Power" in *Hatshepsut: from Queen to Pharaoh*, eds. C.H. Roehrig, R. Dreyfus & C.A. Keller. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 9–15.

Schade-Busch, M. 1992, *Zur Königsideologie Amenophis'* III.*: Analyse der Phraseologie historischer Texte der Voramarnazeit*. HÄB 35. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag.

Schäfer, H. 1903–1913, "Inschriften des Mittleren Reichs" in *Aegyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin: Inschriften von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Ende der Hyksoszeit*, ed. Generalverwaltung. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 137–210.

Schott, S. 1950, *Altägyptische Festdaten*. Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz in Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag.

Schott, S. 1955, *Zum Krönungstag der Königin Hatschepsût*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schulman, A.R. 1964, "Some Observations on the Military Background of the Amarna Period." *JARCE* 3, 51–9.

Schunck, M. 1985, *Untersuchungen zum Wortstamm ḫʿ*. Bonn: R. Habelt.

Seipel, W. 1979, "Zur Chronologie der Verfehmung Hatschepsuts durch Thutmosis III." in *Acts: First International Congress of Egyptology, Cairo October 2–10, 1976*, ed. W.F. Reineke. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 581–2.

Sethe, K. 1904–1916, *Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit*. Urkunden des aegyptischen Altertums 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Sethe, K. 1905, "Die Schwägerin Amenophis IV." *ZÄS* 42, 134–5.

Sethe, K. 1914, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie: bearbeitet und übersetzt*. Urkunden des aegyptischen Altertums. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Sethe, K. 1927–1930, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*, 2nd edn. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Sethe, K. 1928, *Dramatische Texte zu altaegyptischen Mysterienspielen*. UGAÄ 10. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Sethe, K. 1932, *Das Hatschepsut-Problem: noch einmal untersucht*. APAW 4. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Seyfried, K. 2013, *Bemerkungen und Quellen zum ḥɜb nfr n jnt, dem 'Schönen Fest des Tales' in Theben*. Göttinger Miszellen Beihefte 13. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie.

Shafer, B.E. 1997, "Temples, Priests, and Rituals: an Overview" in *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, ed. B.E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1–30.

Sharkawy, A.E. 1997, *Der Amun-Tempel von Karnak: die Funktion der Großen Säulenhalle, erschlossen aus der Analyse der Dekoration ihrer Innenwände*. Wissenschaftliche Schriftenreihe Ägyptologie 1. Berlin: Verlag Dr. Köster.

Shaw, G.J. 2012, *The Pharaoh: Life at Court and on Campaign*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Shirun-Grumach, I. 1993, *Offenbarung, Orakel und Königsnovelle*. ÄAT 24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Simpson, R.S. 1996, *Demotic Grammar in the Ptolemaic Sacerdotal Decrees*. Griffith Institute Monographs. Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum.

Simpson, W.K. 1956, "The Single-Dated Monuments of Sesostris I: an Aspect of the Institution of Coregency in the Twelfth Dynasty." *JNES* 15, 214–19.

Spalinger, A. 1997, "Drama in History: Exemplars from Mid Dynasty XVIII." *SAK* 24, 269–300.

Spencer, P. 1984, *The Egyptian Temple: A Lexicographical Study*. London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Kegan Paul International.

Stadelmann, R. 1973, "Tempelpalast und Erscheinungsfenster in den Thebanischen Totentempeln." *MDAIK* 29, 221–42.

Stadelmann, R. 1979, "Totentempel und Millionenjahrhaus in Theben." *MDAIK* 35, 303–21.

Stadler, M.A. 2012, "Die Krönung der Ptolemäer zu Pharaonen." *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft, neue Folge* 36, 59–95.

Stephan, K. 2008, *Die Dekoration der "Chapelle Rouge" in Karnak: Struktur und Funktion*. Norderstedt: Books on Demand.

Stoneman, R. 1991, *The Greek Alexander Romance*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Tefnin, R. 1973, "L'an 7 de Thoutmosis III et d'Hatshepsout." *CdE* 48, 232–42.

Thompson, D.J. 2012, *Memphis Under the Ptolemies*, 2nd edn. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Thorpe, L.G.M. 1969, *Two Lives of Charlemagne*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Traunecker, C. 1972, "Les rites de l'eau à Karnak d'après les textes de la rampe de Taharqa." *BIFAO* 72, 195–236.

Troy, L. 1997, "Mut Enthroned" in *Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman Te Velde*, ed. J.v. Dijk. Groningen: Styx, 301–15.

Troy, L. 2006, "Religion and Cult During the Time of Thutmose III" in *Thutmose* III*: A New Biography*, eds. E.H. Cline & D. O'Connor. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 123–82.

Vandersleyen, C. 1992, "Inepou: un terme désignant le roi avant qu'il ne soit roi" in *The Intellectual Heritage of Egypt: Studies Presented to László Kákosy by Friends and Colleagues on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, ed. U. Luft. Studia Aegyptiaca XIV. Budapest: Chaire d'Égyptologie de l'Université de Loránd Eötvös, 563–6.

Vandersleyen, C. 1995, *L'Égypte et la vallée du Nil* II*: De la fin de l'Ancien Empire à la fin du Nouvel Empire*. Nouvelle Clio: l'Histoire et ses Problèmes. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Vercoutter, J. 1962, "Preliminary Report of the Excavations at Aksha by the Franco-Argentine Archaeological Expedition, 1961." *Kush* 10, 109–16.

Vomberg, P. 2004, *Das Erscheinungsfenster innerhalb der amarnazeitlichen Palastarchitektur: Herkunft - Entwicklung - Fortleben*. Philippika 4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Waitkus, W. 2008, *Untersuchungen zu Kult und Funktion des Luxortempels.* 2 vols. Aegyptiaca Hamburgensia 2. Gladbeck: PeWe-Verlag.

Walker, S. & Higgs, P. (eds) 2001, *Cleopatra of Egypt: from History to Myth*. London: The British Museum.

Wallet-Lebrun, C. 1994, "Contribution à l'étude de l'histoire de la construction à Karnak" in *L'égyptologie et les Champollion*, eds. M. Dewachter & A. Fouchard. Grenoble: Presses universitaires de Grenoble, 223–56.

Wallet-Lebrun, C. 2009, *Le grand livre de pierre: les textes de construction à Karnak*. Études d'égyptologie 9. Paris: AIBL-Soleb.

Warburton, D.A. 2011, "Darkness at Dawn: Methodology in Egyptological Lexicography." *Lingua Aegyptia* 19, 287–320.

Wegner, J.W. 1996, "The Nature and Chronology of the Senwosret III-Amenemhat III Regnal Succession: Some Considerations Based on New Evidence from the Mortuary Temple of Senwosret III at Abydos." *JNES* 55, 249–79.

Wicenciak, U. 2005, "Centres of the Amun Cult Between the Third and Fourth Nile Cataracts and the Coronation Journey of the Kushite Rulers." *Gdańsk Archaeological Museum African Reports* 3, 251–64.

Wiercińska, J. 2010, "The Change of Dimensions of the Bark of Amon in the Light of Recent Studies on the Temple of Tuthmosis III at Deir el-Bahari" in *8. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung: Interconnections between Temples, Warschau, 22.–25. September 2008*, eds. M. Dolińska & H. Beinlich. Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen 3,3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 221–31.

Wilkinson, R.H. 1992, *Reading Egyptian Art: a Hieroglyphic Guide to Ancient Egyptian Painting and Sculpture*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Wilson, P. 2010, "Temple Architecture and Decorative Systems" in *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*, ed. A.B. Lloyd. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 781–803.

Winlock, H.E. 1924, "A Statue of Horemheb Before His Accession." *JEA* 10, 1–5.

Wolf, W. 1931, *Das schöne Fest von Opet: die Festzugsdarstellung im grossen Säulengange des Tempels von Luksor*. Veröffentlichungen der Ernst von Sieglin Expedition in Ägypten 5. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Wreszinski, W. 1923–1942, *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte.* 7 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Yoyotte, J. 1968, "La date supposée du couronnement d'Hatshepsout." *Kêmi* 18, 85–91.

[The image originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The image was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 1: Coronation sequence of Philip Arrhidaeus (Gardiner, “Coronation”, pl. II; in turn adapted from *LD* IV,2,c). Karnak, granite sanctuary, south wall, southern (external) face, first register (*PM* II, 100 (290) I, 1–4).

[The image originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The image was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 2: Sety I being purified by Horus and Seth (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 148). Hypostyle Hall, west wall, north half, second register (*PM* II, 44 (152) II, 7).

[The image originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The image was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 3: Sety I being led into temple by Khonsu and Atum (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 149). Hypostyle Hall, west wall, north half, second register (*PM* II, 44 (152) II, 8).

[The image originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The image was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 4: Ramses II escorted by Mut and Thoth, receiving life, years, and jubilees from Amun-Ra, with Khonsu (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 150). Karnak, Hypostyle Hall, west wall, north half, second register (*PM* II, 44 (152) II, 9).

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 5: Karnak, Great Temple of Amun, between 6th Pylon and Festival Temple (*PM* II, plan XI).

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 6: Karnak, Great Temple of Amun, 2nd Pylon to 6th Pylon (*PM* II, plan X).

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 7: Karnak during the reign of Thutmose I (adapted from: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 333).

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 8: Karnak temple during the reign of Thutmose II and Hatshepsut, as it would have looked like at the time of the events of the *Historical Inscription* and the *Texte de la jeunesse* (adapted from: Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle Rouge* II, 334).

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 9: Reconstruction of the events in the Historical Inscription according to Gitton ("Palais", 65 fig. 1).

Fig. 10: Reconstruction of some of the surroundings of the temple at the time of the events of the *Historical Inscription* based on the text. Image of Karnak temple east of the 5th Pylon adapted from Burgos and Larché, *Chapelle* II, 334. The *wɜ.t-wḏḥ.w*, *tp-ỉtrw*, and *ʿḥ-nsw.t* were added by the author of this thesis.

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it contains third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, on the left]

[The plans originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because they consist of third party copyright material. The plans were sourced from the reference presented in their pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 11: According to O'Connor, the location of palace at Karnak
A: in the earlier 18th Dynasty; B: under Amenhotep III and Akhenaten
(adapted from: "Beloved of Maat", 298 fig. 7.3)

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, on the right]

Fig. 12: According to O'Connor, the relationships between Karnak Temple, its palace, and Luxor Temple, based on his interpretation of Hatshepsut's *Historical Inscription* and Horemheb's Turin inscription (adapted from: "Beloved of Maat", 299 fig. 7.4):

1a. Hatshepsut joins the procession of Amun-Re's image;

1b. Horemheb joins the procession of Amun-Re's image;

2. the procession of divine image and king to Luxor;

3. rituals within Luxor Temple;

4. departure from Luxor Temple;

5. return to Karnak palace;

6. entry into palace;

7. coronation and enthronement ceremony;

8. departure from Karnak Palace;

9. entry into Karnak Temple, and concluding rituals.

[The image originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The image was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 13: Sety I being led by Isis into the presence of Amun-Ra and Mut, while Khonsu records king's years of reign (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 137). Hypostyle Hall, west wall, north half, large scene (*PM* II, 43 (151) II, 1–3).

[The image originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The image was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 14: Ramses II escorted by Mut and Thoth, receiving life, years, and jubilees from Amun-Ra, with Khonsu (Nelson, *Hypostyle*, 7). Hypostyle Hall, west wall, south half, large scene (*PM* II, 46 (156) I–III).

[The plan originally presented here cannot be made freely available via ORA because it consists of third party copyright material. The plan was sourced from the reference presented in its pertaining caption, below]

Fig. 15: Luxor Temple. Hypostyle and Rooms I–XXIII (*PM* II, plan XXXII).