

A Naos of Nekhthorheb from Bubastis

Religious Iconography and Temple
Building in the 30th Dynasty

Neal Spencer

with a contribution by
Daniela Rosenow

Publishers

The British Museum
Great Russell Street
London WC1B 3DG

Editor

Isobel Church

Series Editor

Josephine Turquet

Distributors

The British Museum Press
46 Bloomsbury Street
London WC1B 3QQ

*A Naos of Nekhthornheb from Bubastis:
Religious Iconography and Temple Building in the 30th Dynasty*
Neal Spencer
with a contribution by Daniela Rosenow

Front cover: British Museum EA 1078, detail: hippopotamus (see Pl. 23)

ISBN-13 978-086-159-156-5

ISBN-10 086159-156-9

ISSN 0142 4815

© The Trustees of the British Museum 2006

Note: the British Museum Occasional Papers series is now entitled British Museum Research Publications. The OP series runs from 1 to 150, and the RP series, keeping the same ISSN and ISBN preliminary numbers, begins at number 151.

For a complete catalogue of the full range of OPs and RPs see the series website: [www/thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/researchpublications](http://www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/researchpublications)

or write to:

Oxbow Books, Park End Place

Oxford OX1 1HN, UK

Tel: (+44) (0) 1865 241249

e mail oxbow@oxbowbooks.com

website www.oxbowbooks.com

or

The David Brown Book Co

PO Box 511, Oakville

CT 06779, USA

Tel: (+1) 860 945 9329; Toll free 1 800 791 9354

e mail david.brown.bk.co@snet.net

Printed and bound in the UK by 4-Print

Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
-------------------------	-----------

Introduction	v
---------------------	----------

The Naos	1
1 Architectural Reconstruction	1
2 Decoration	5
3 Compendia of Divinity: Naoi Depicting Rows of Divine images	19
4 The Role of the Naos	31

The Naos in Context	39
5 The City and Temples of Bubastis	39
6 The Nekhthorheb Temple	43
<i>by Daniela Rosenow</i>	
7 Temple Building in the 30th Dynasty: A Consideration of Broad Themes	47

Appendices	53
1 Yet Another 30th Dynasty Naos from Bubastis ...	53
2 Checklist of Blocks from the Naos	56
3 Towards a Distribution List for the Egypt Exploration Fund Excavations at Bubastis	57
4 30th Dynasty Temple Naoi	64

Bibliography	67
---------------------	-----------

Index of Museum Objects	74
--------------------------------	-----------

Figures	75
----------------	-----------

Plates	93
---------------	-----------

Colour Plates	123
----------------------	------------

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Vivian Davies, Keeper of the Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan, for permission to publish this monograph about the monument. In the same department, Claire Thorne prepared the extensive artwork, and Darrel Day, Evan York, Tony Brandon, Anthony Fellows and Bob Goodey enabled the unwieldy fragments to be moved for study and photography. In the Department of Photography, Sandra Marshall photographed the British Museum fragments, with further assistance from Jim Rossiter and Claudio Mari during digital processing. Andrew Middleton, in the Museum's Department of Conservation, Documentation and Scientific Research, provided invaluable advice on both granite quarries, and the comparative material from the Klemm Collection. Thanks are also due to the editors, Josephine Turquet and Isobel Church, who saw the publication through to press.

In the Cairo Museum, the previous director Mahmoud el-Damaty, and current director Wafaa el-Sadeek, and their staff Mai Trad, Sabah Abdel Razek and Mahmoud Ibrahim, facilitated my examination of the two fragments of the naos currently in the Egyptian Museum. Further thanks are due to Christian Tietze for permission to use material from his excavations in the

Bubastis temple area, which forms the basis of the chapter by Daniela Rosenow. Discussions with Daniela, about naoi at Bubastis but also the temple in general, proved very fruitful. Conversations with H el ene Virenque, who is preparing a doctoral thesis on the Saft el-Henna naos, were also enlightening.

Patricia Spencer facilitated access to the archives of the Egypt Exploration Society, who also granted permission for the reproduction of a facsimile and archive image from the original excavations. Robert Bianchi kindly provided me with information regarding the fragment now in a private collection in Switzerland, while Emma Sully at Christies (London) and James Ede deserve thanks for assistance in tracking down blocks published in auction catalogues, and for providing permission to publish images of these objects. Finally, I would like to thank Jeffrey Spencer and Kate Spence for reading and commenting on a draft of the text.

Finally, this book is dedicated to my parents, John and Nollaig, who supported me in pursuing a career in the bizarre world of Egyptology.

Introduction

The focus of Edouard Naville's excavations at the site of Bubastis between 1887 and 1889 was the main temple area, where significant structures of Osorkon II and Nekhthorheb were revealed, alongside a considerable amount of earlier material. Amongst these remains were fragments from a monumental naos of Nekhthorheb. The shrine's discovery is not detailed in the published excavation account, but Naville's correspondence indicates fragments came to light during clearance of the western parts of the temple area during the 1888 season (Letter of Naville to Poole, 15 April 1888 [EES Archive Vf]; excerpts cited in Chapter 5). Published in line drawings (Naville 1891: pls. 47–8), the architectural form of this shrine, and the exquisite quality of its sunk relief carving, have been unknown to most Egyptologists for the past century. One proposed reconstruction (Van Siclen 1994) is mostly untenable, as it contains errors, partly caused by a lack of access to the surviving pieces. It is only in recent years that the British Museum fragments have been stored together, in an accessible area. Van Siclen's reconstruction has been echoed in subsequent publications (e.g. Arnold 1999: 129).

This study presents a new reconstruction of the naos, based on the surviving fragments. It is of course possible that new blocks may come to light in the ongoing excavations at Bubastis. The accompanying detailed photographs of the relief work provide an important source for sculptural style and religious iconography towards the end of the 30th dynasty (further colour images were published in Spencer 2005). Consideration is then given to the development of this style of shrine decoration, and possible interpretations of its purpose(s). Thereafter, the original context of the shrine, within the temple complex at Bubastis, is considered. The final chapter outlines how building work at Bubastis was related to the 30th dynasty temple-construction programme throughout Egypt.

Naos have yet to be studied comprehensively, and few are published *in extenso*, with consideration of architecture, decoration and original context. This volume does not aim to offer an exhaustive study of naos *per se*, but rather to present one exquisitely decorated example, and to highlight their central role in Late Period temple building, particularly those shrines with the type of decoration found upon this naos from Bubastis.

1. Architectural Reconstruction

Note

Throughout, the terms left and right refer to the view of someone standing in front of the entrance to the naos, as the monument would have been viewed by the ancient priests. The fragments of this naos are referred to by their museum accession numbers; a checklist with bibliography and plate/figure references for this study can be found in Appendix 2. For quick reference, the position of surviving blocks in the reconstruction is indicated in **Figure 5**.

The architectural form of this naos can be reconstructed from the surviving fragments in London and Cairo, though some details remain open to interpretation (**Pl.6**). It is feasible that some of these issues will be clarified by the excavation of further fragments (see Rosenow, Chapter 6).¹ Naville's line drawings, though of commendable accuracy for the scale and speed at which they were reproduced (1891: pls.47–8), offer no architectural information on this imposing monument.

EA 1079 clearly formed part of the back of the naos, as it preserves three decorated vertical faces and a significant portion of a pitched roof (**Pl.4, Colour Pl.2**). The horizontal element which forms an edge to the roof has not been finished, as the upper surface has only been roughly cut back and is not polished smooth, as is the case with the roof surface (EA 1080). This unpolished surface would not have been visible to those entering the sanctuary. The pitched form of this roof is partly paralleled on another shrine from Bubastis and on a naos from Tuna el-Gebel (Roeder 1914: CG 70013, 70014), but pyramidal (Roeder 1914: CG 70011, 70013, 70015, 70022), flat or arched (Roeder 1914: CG 70020) roofs are more common. The Tuna el-Gebel shrine is very different from the Bubastis naos, as it lacks a cavetto cornice, uraeus frieze, and bears no exterior wall decoration. In the quarries of the Wadi Hammamat, a series of naoi are depicted with either pyramidal or pitched roofs (Coyat and Montet 1912: pl.8); many of the surrounding inscriptions date to the 30th dynasty. The method of representation does not allow one to ascertain which form was intended. The proportions of the depicted naoi are more in line with shrines such as that of Nekhtnebef from Mendes (Roeder 1914: CG 70022) than the Bubastis naos discussed here. A pitched roof is found upon an anepigraphic small granite naos now in Marseille, but without the frieze of uraei (Capart 1902: pl.28). The cavetto cornice upon the Bubastis naos was embellished with the cartouches of Nekhtorheb, below which ran a horizontal torus moulding (**Pl.14, Colour Pl.2**). No fragments of the cornice from the rear of the naos have yet come to light, but I favour a reconstruction with cornice on the rear wall also, as found on many Late Period naoi (e.g. Roeder 1914: CG 70008, 70022). The back right corner indicates that a torus moulding originally framed the walls, preserved only as a slight change in the preserved surface plane of the stone, to the right of the falcon and to the left of the shrine containing the baboon (adjoining faces of EA 1078, **Pl.17**). Evidence for a torus moulding at the front corners is preserved as a damaged trace

upon CG 70016 (not easily visible in Roeder's publication). Torus mouldings are common on monolithic shrines (e.g. Roeder 1914: CG 70013, 70014, 70019)

The front of the naos was provided with more ornate architectural elements: this was the principal view of the shrine visible to those entering the sanctuary in which the monument was installed. A row of high-relief uraei crowned with sun-discs form a frieze in front of the pitched roof (**Pls.7, 9**). Friezes of uraei commonly top the front of naoi with flat roofs (e.g. Roeder 1914: CG 9287) or curved roofs (Louvre D29, Piankoff 1933: pl.1), but are much less common on those with pyramidal or pitched roofs (an example of the latter is a naos of Ptolemy I from Mit Ghamr, Habachi 1955: 457–9, figs.9–11). The base of the Bubastis naos is partially preserved (Roeder 1914: CG 70016; **Pl.21**). It has been suggested that this block is from another shrine (Habachi 1957: 81), but this is extremely unlikely. Firstly, it was discovered by Naville in the same area as the other parts. Secondly, its scale fits the emplacement proposed here perfectly. Finally, the style of carving and high degree of polish, and the unfinished décor (see Chapter 2), further indicate it was part of the great naos.²

The threshold fragment indicates several important aspects of the original monument (**Pls.2, 21**). Firstly, it reveals that the base of the shrine, i.e. the portion below the level of the cavity, was 4cm wider than the upper parts, forming a socle (not unusual in Late Period naoi, cf. Roeder 1914: CG 70008, 70013, 70019, 70022 and the Edfu naos, Fazzini *et al.* 1988: 44, fig.14). The sides of the socle had been finished to a high polish similar to that on the decorated surfaces. Secondly, CG 70016 indicates that the doorway was 98cm wide, if one assumes the decoration was symmetrical. The interior cavity was actually 104cm wide, as the side walls narrowed towards the front of the shrine to create the doorjambs (**Fig.3**). Additionally, the full height of the interior cavity did not extend to the front of the shrine: the underside of EA 1080 preserves the remains of a lintel of at least 2cm in depth (**Fig.4**; see Roeder 1914: pl.48d for a private Middle Kingdom example with such a lintel; it is not a typical feature of royal naoi of the Late Period, see Roeder 1914). A groove inside the doorjamb on CG 70016 indicates that the original doors, presumably of wood, opened inwards (**Fig.3**; Roeder 1914: pl. 55d). Monolithic shrines could also be provided with door-leaves which opened outwards (e.g. Leiden IM 107; Boeser 1915: 1, pls.1–5). Such doors were apparently sealed after the enactment of rituals (e.g. Alliot 1949: 77).

Reconstruction of the height of the naos is based on the back corner of the right side, which is largely preserved in EA 1078 and 1079 (**Pls.3-4**). From the projected top of the roof, at the rear, to the bottom of the upper ledge of the cornice, measures 71cm; the cavetto cornice itself amounts to a further 29cm. The dedicatory inscription is 15cm in height, with four registers of divine images below it, each 43cm high. Parts of all four registers are preserved on EA 1078 (**Pls.15–16**). Directly beneath the lower

register was a decorative band of symbols (EA 1005: **Fig.10**, **Pl.19**), 15cm high, with at least a further 8cm of height below. This area in the preserved fragment is polished smooth but bears no decoration. It seems likely that this decorative frieze ran above the socle, itself 42cm in height, as known from CG 70016. No evidence of the socle is preserved on EA 1005, thus there was at least 8cm between the top of the socle and the bottom of the decorative frieze (**Pl.3**). It is possible that the socle was destined to be decorated, and is unfinished, but it is more probable that it was simply highly polished (CG 70021 features an undecorated area beneath the lower dedicatory texts; Roeder 1914). Adding these measurements gives a total height of 3.52m for the naos. A height of 3.95m could be proposed if allowance was made for a fifth register of divinities, but the resulting proportions look somewhat less typical of Late Period architecture.³ The height of the polished band beneath the symbol frieze may also have been somewhat larger. Nonetheless, these dimensions are in keeping with the larger naoi found in contemporary sanctuaries: the Edfu naos was 4.17m height, while the central monolithic shrine at Elephantine reached 4.4m (see Appendix 4). Much larger shrines are known from descriptions: Herodotus claimed that a naos at Sais measured 10m x 7m in plan (Arnold 1999: 85). A medieval description of a naos at Memphis suggests an even more monumental structure (Stricker 1939). The scale of these two monuments demands that we are cautious in describing them as monolithic. Van Siclen's suggestion that the Bubastis naos was formed from several blocks of stone (1994: 32) is no longer necessary to account for the preserved surfaces and architecture. The undersides of EA 1079 and 1080 are polished where the ceiling of the naos cavity was located, and broken areas indicate where the walls extended but are now broken away. There is no reason to doubt that the naos was originally formed from a single piece of stone.

The width at the front is 154.4cm at the base (extrapolated from the symmetry of CG 70016), or 146cm at the lintel level (EA 1080). The 8.4cm difference in width between the top and bottom of the naos is due to the battered walls. In this reconstruction, the naos is also wider at the rear than the front (**Fig.3**): the width of the rear wall below the lintel level is 160cm (from EA 1079). How does one account for this difference of up to 14cm between front and rear widths at a similar level? Naoi have rarely been published *in extenso*, detailed measurements of this nature being rarely noted (see Roeder 1914). However, the red granite naos from Elephantine, preserved almost intact, is 10cm wider at the rear than at the front, and the difference is even greater upon the grey granite naos from the same site (Niederberger 1999: 87, figs.51, 53). The Koptos naos of Nekhtnebef features vertical torus mouldings at the rear of either side of the exterior wall, with a difference in positioning of over 10cm (Roeder 1914: pl.49c). Thus the difference in width with the large Bubastis naos should not be seen as problematic.

The key difficulty in reconstructing the Bubastis naos remains the nature of the interior. Van Siclen (1994) proposed an ingenious reconstruction, but examination of the fragments of the shrine reveals this is largely untenable. Using Naville's line drawings, he proposed the emplacement of several fragments. However, his interior right wall (Van Siclen 1994: fig.7) features two large reliefs, one above the other. In fact, these are adjacent faces of the same block (EA 1079; **Colour Pl.2**). In addition, the

third decorated face of the same block (EA 1079) is presented as a separate fragment, placed on Van Siclen's left interior wall (1994: fig.6). Furthermore, EA 1080 clearly shows that the shrine had a pitched roof (**Pl.7**), not the flat roof proposed by Van Siclen. Finally, EA 1106 is architecturally incompatible with this naos (see Appendix 1). Nonetheless, his premise of a rear internal chamber or niche smaller than the main cavity is applicable to the great naos, though there is no preserved evidence of interior decoration. The interior layout of the naos is clarified by EA 1078, as this is a significant part of the back corner of the right side of the naos, with parts of four registers of scenes preserved on two adjoining external faces (**Pl.17**). To reconstruct the architectural form of the shrine, it is the undecorated faces of this block that warrant attention (**Pl.18**). One surface, to the left of the wider preserved face, is just a broken edge, some 40cm thick. This indicates the thickness of the right wall of the naos (matched by that observed upon EA 1080), towards the rear of the shrine. In contrast, the thickness of the other side wall near the front is only 21cm at the base (CG 70016) and 17cm at the ceiling level (EA 1080). These measurements exclude the thickening of the walls to create the doorjamb. Differences between the wall thickness at the top and bottom provide the key to reconstructing the amount of batter on the outside walls of the naos (**Pl.6**, **Fig. 5**). Naoi often feature a pronounced batter to the side walls, echoing formal temple architecture. Monolithic naoi of the Late Period typically represent a distillation of contemporary temple architecture.

The difference in the thickness of the side walls near the front, compared to that towards the rear of the shrine, provides evidence for a narrower cavity at the back of the shrine. The majority of the interior face of EA 1078 is smoothed and highly polished, but the edge nearest to the thinner decorated face is actually rough and broken (8cm thick), in a manner that clearly attests to the original presence of the wall continuing in this direction (**Pl.18**): the rear wall of the naos. This wall of the naos was thus 8cm thick, implying much of the weight of the roof was supported by the thicker side walls (17–21cm thick) near the front of the naos. The smoothed interior surface can only be that of an area meant to be seen, i.e. the right wall of the shrine cavity. The polish has not been taken up to the rear edge, possibly indicating this part of the work was never finished. The top edge of this smoothed surface actually preserves part of the rounded corner which linked the ceiling and side wall. This interpretation of EA 1078 is confirmed by examination of the underside of EA 1079. The polished imprint of the inner cavity ceiling is preserved to almost its full width (80cm), with the rounded corner between ceiling and left side wall visible. A 16cm thick band at the back of the ceiling is smoothed but not polished; it is tempting to relate this to the similar texture on the right interior side (EA 1078), but the dividing line on the ceiling seems like an intentional effect, rather than being merely unfinished. On EA 1079, behind the 16cm smoothed band is the broken footprint of an 8cm thick wall, matching the thickness observed on EA 1078. The inner cavity ceiling is 8.5cm below the level of the bottom of the star-filled *p*-sign which tops the second register on the rear face of the naos (on EA 1078, **Pl.18**); the level of the inner cavity ceiling can thus be placed on the elevation (**Fig.4**, **Pl.2**).

Only one solution for the interior layout of the naos will support this data. The main interior space was 104cm wide

(width of shrine minus the side walls of 17–21cm thick), and of undetermined depth. It may be significant that the width of the shrine cavity is 2 cubits. However, towards the rear was a narrower space 80cm in width, as given by subtracting twice the side walls' thickness of 40cm (the known width of the side walls, evident on EA 1078) from the width of the naos at the rear. Its ceiling was 35cm lower than that of the front cavity (Fig.4). The floor level may have been higher in this interior space, but no parts of the cavity floor at the rear of the naos are preserved. The interior was highly polished throughout, except the band towards the back of the cavity's ceiling, but apparently undecorated. The external depth of the naos was at least 184cm, on the basis of the sum of the dimensions of EA 1079 and 1080 (Fig.4, Pl.5). The proportions of monolithic naoi of the Late Period exhibit significant variations, so that an exact depth cannot be proposed. The 160cm width of the naos at the rear corresponds to about 3 cubits; it is possible that a round number of cubits was intended for the depth, though the reconstructed height is some way under 7 cubits. It is interesting that the unfinished naoi of this period found at Rod el-Gamra fall into two groups, of 2 and 3 cubits in height (Harrell 2002: 240). A survey of the larger naoi of this period suggests that a round number of cubits was not always sought (see Appendix 4).

Preserved naoi with such an interior arrangement are rare. The red granite naos at Elephantine featured an inner recess, achieved through a raised floor level, but no change in width or ceiling level (Niederberger 1999: 86–8, fig.51), as did the Edfu naos (Bianchi *et al.* 1988: 44, fig.14). A miniature limestone example in Cairo (Roeder 1914: CG 70045) has two interior areas, but this is a much smaller shrine. The monumental naos at Mendes features an internal 'shelf' on the back wall, but no variation in width or floor level (De Meulenaere and Mackay 1976: pls.2–5). A familiar problem is the lack of architectural drawings of surviving examples; many are published as if the naos was merely a three-dimensional setting for two-dimensional reliefs.

A cult image made of precious materials, presumably of 'Bastet the Great, Lady of Bubastis', the only deity invoked in the dedicatory text, would have been housed inside this naos. The nature of daily temple rituals is well known from the later texts and representations at Edfu (Alliott 1949), though earlier rituals may have been partly different in form, and one should allow for a degree of variation between different temples. The naos (*k3r*) of the god in the sanctuary is the focal point of most of the rituals described in the Edfu texts. Given that the door-leaves opened inwards on the Bubastis shrine (Fig.3), the wider front space cannot have been used to house statuary. The architectural form of the naos strongly suggests the inner niche was used to house the cult image. This would then limit the size of the image contained within to at most 80cm wide and 141cm in height; the latter figure may have been considerably smaller if the floor level of the inner cavity was raised. This maximum height, 141cm, is somewhat more than 2.5 cubits. The inscriptions accompanying a depiction of three shrines in the corridor surrounding the Dendera sanctuary provide evidence for the opulent nature of cult statues:

Hathor. Bronze overlaid with gold, hair in gold, throne in gold, body overlaid with gold. (Naos:) Pine (𓆎). Height: Three cubits and one palm. Width: One cubit and six palms.

Hathor, lady of Dendera. 𓆎 and 𓆏 (sceptres) in gold and precious stones. Height: Six palms. Gold. (Naos:) Granite, door-leaves in pine (𓆎).

Hathor. Length: One cubit and four palms. White crown: Two cubits. Gold. (Naos:) Gold and lapis lazuli, pine (𓆎), door-leaves in pine (𓆎). Height: One cubit and one palm. Width: Three palms. (Dendara II: 56 = Cauville 1999: 92–3).

Few examples of such statuary can be identified with certainty; the precious materials used for cult images ensuring that most did not survive melting down to reuse the raw materials. Fine statuettes in precious metals found in museum collections are often cited as rare examples of surviving cult statues (e.g. Aldred 1956; Schoske 1995: 63, fig. 67; Miho 1997: 18–20 [5]; Russmann 2001: 172–3 [82]), but the scale of the Bubastis shrine would suggest a larger statue was housed within. The biggest image depicted at Dendera, of 'Hathor lady of the *pr-wr*', is labelled as being 4 cubits high (2.1m) and made of gold (Dendara III: 85, pl.190 = Cauville 2000: 160–1). The measurements for statues and their naoi given in the inscriptions at Dendera suggest that the head-dress and/or statue base may have been detached to allow the figure to fit inside (e.g. Cauville 1987: 76–7). It is not clear if this arrangement would have been suitable for the main image housed in a monolithic shrine that was probably involved in the daily rituals. Another uncertainty is whether such images could be part of large composite groups: *P. Harris I* records Ramses III's donation, in favour of Ptah of Memphis, of a 'mysterious shrine (*k3r st3*) of Elephantine stone ... Ptah, Sekhmet and Nefertum are installed within, flanked by statues-of-the-lord destined to make offerings (for eternity) in their presence' (Grandet 1989: 287). In this case, multiple statues were being housed within a stone naos. The 'statues-of-the-lord' are presumably images of the king offering, quite possibly made of bronze and/or other precious metals, destined to ensure ritual when the king was absent (Grandet 1989: n.128). A description of a statue group of Bastet in the *Delta Cult Manual* (dated to the end of the Third Intermediate Period or the Late Period by Meeks, 1989: 297) further alludes to complex groupings:

As for Bastet who is in Bubastis, it is a woman with the face of a lioness, seated, her legs (folded) under her; she is above steps upon which the defeated ones are overthrown, a falcon protects her, and two hippopotami surround her; images of the Nile-gods are around her, seven cubits wide and two cubits long (Cauville 1997b: 99).

As noted by Cauville, such an image is depicted in one of the Osiride chapels at Dendera, with the falcon's outstretched wings protecting the kneeling god (1997c: 201 [12–14], pls.97, 126). The text identifies this figure as 'Bastet lady of Bubastis (*B3st*), foremost of southern *pr-B3st*, lady of life who is in Dendera, lady of rejoicing who is in Bubastis (*B3st*)'. A simpler form of the goddess Sekhmet in the same pose appears before Bastet in this scene, mirroring that of 'Sekhmet who is in Sais', depicted on a 26th dynasty naos, now partially preserved in Brussels (E.5818, see Chapter 4). These two forms of Sekhmet do not have any accompanying elements such as falcons, Taweret-images or offering figures. In contrast to this evidence for composite divine images, the description of a granite naos of Amun at Thebes describes only the statue of that god (Grandet 1989: 228).

The height of the Bubastis shrine's interior was 42cm above the floor level in the room in which it was housed, as clear from the threshold block (CG 70016). The statue was housed in the inner cavity, thus access for priests performing daily rituals

would have been difficult without steps, particularly if the inner niche had an even higher floor level. A detail in the decoration of the Edfu sanctuary suggests steps may have been provided, presumably of stone or wood: the king is shown before Horus of Behdet, the latter housed in a shrine (*Edfou XI*: pl.213). Three steps are indicated, at very small scale, abutting the front of the naos. Texts explaining the daily morning ritual describe the king/priest: ‘ascending the stairs. Saying: I climb the stairs, I approached the barque’ (Alliott 1949: 69).

Were these monumental naoi of the Late Period fitted with internal shrines? We know from representational evidence that small shrines, set upon processional barques, could be housed within a larger shrine (e.g. Gardiner 1935: pl.11), but the proportions of Late Period monolithic naoi suggest processional barque-shrines may not have been stored inside, particularly in cases where the door-leaves opened inwards, as on the Bubastis naos. Furthermore, the dimensions given for processional barques in the Ptolemaic temple texts (e.g. *Dendara V*: 23 = Cauville 2004: 102–3) suggest these forms of shrine were not housed in monolithic naoi (see further in Appendix 1).

Fragments of many smaller shrines survive from the Late Period, usually made out of wood inlaid with glass and precious stones or overlaid with gold, silver and copper (Yoyotte 1972: pl. 19). The workmanship on surviving fragments is usually of a very high quality. Small-scale (model?) wooden shrines with finely worked gold-foil appliqué were also produced. A wooden door-leaf, provided with copper alloy bolt and bearing a depiction of a kneeling Nekhthorheb worked in gilded overlay, is now in the British Museum.⁴ Areas of precious metal decoration are known from larger shrines, including a ‘silver-gilt plaque’ decorated with a scene consisting of a pharaoh protected by a falcon with outstretched wings (Sotheby’s 1991: 25 [51]). The dimensions of the latter piece, 6cm high, indicate it was larger than the model shrine of Nekhthorheb, but it does fit better with the scale of a plaque now in Brooklyn, which also displays stylistic similarities (Bianchi *et al.* 1988: 107–8 [17]). A 34cm wooden door-leaf from the Amherst Collection (Sotheby’s 1964: no.123) may also have been gilded: it bears a depiction of pharaoh offering.

Fragments of fine glass inlays are found in museums throughout the world, many of which come from small wooden shrines (Bianchi 1983a), though similar inlays were also used on coffins of this era (Bianchi 1983b: 12–19). Unfortunately, there are few examples with known archaeological contexts.⁵ Some of these wooden shrines undoubtedly represent more modest chapels (note the range of sizes and quality of the shrines found in North Saqqara, Insley-Green 1987), possibly donated by pious individuals,⁶ or chapels forming part of sacred barque fittings.⁷ A series of depictions of up to seven shrines sitting inside each other (Karlshausen 1998: 870–3), all dating to the 1st millennium BC, underline the use of architectural layers around a god’s image, and it would be unsurprising to find shrines of precious materials housed inside the monolithic naoi that are often the only surviving element.

It is known that monumental stone shrines could be sealed with doors of bronze, or at least wood overlaid with precious metals (‘he made a naos of black granite, its door-leaves of black copper, adorned with gold, for his father Khonsu-Horus lord of joy, son of Bastet’, Rondot 1989: 251), or wooden doors similarly embellished (e.g. Roeder 1914: 55); door-pivots are visible on

many naoi (e.g. Niederberger 1999: 86–8). Traces of gilding have been found on stone naoi, such as upon the naos of Tuthmosis II re-used in the treasury at north Karnak (Jacquet-Gordon 1999: 281–3 [181]). There is significant representational evidence dating to the New Kingdom which indicates that divine images could be hidden from view by veils during processions upon sacred barques (Kitchen 1975: 623). This arrangement was undoubtedly prompted by the deity needing to be hidden from view in more public areas; while the monolithic naoi of the Late Period were not intended to be portable, there may have been further protective screens or veils, behind the doors themselves.

The naos fragments in the British Museum were compared with samples from ancient granite quarries at Aswan, now part of the Klemm Collection, housed in the Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan at the Museum. Klemm and Klemm note that granites of this type fall into two distinct groups, one with light pink inclusions, the other with a noticeably darker red colour to the inclusions (1993: 325–35). Andrew Middleton (Department of Conservation, Documentation and Scientific Research) conducted an initial visual inspection of the samples alongside the naos fragments. While the naos fragments seem to broadly fit within the darker ‘red granite’ grouping, there was significant variation on some of the fragments, particularly on the fragments of the shrine discussed in Appendix 1 (EA 1106). With such coarse-grained stone, it is not possible to associate a monument such as the Bubastis naos with any of the individual quarries identified by Klemm and Klemm. Nonetheless, it is clear that the quarried naos ‘blank’ would have been transported some 600km down the Nile from the Aswan region to Bubastis.

Notes

- 1 Some fragments discovered in the 2005 season appear to be from the roof areas, including preserved parts of the cornice, with symmetrically arranged cartouches, and the dedicatory text; the end of the uraeus frieze was carved with a high relief depiction of the rear part of a snake’s body (Rosenow, pers. comm.). A damaged area upon British Museum EA 1080 suggests that it may also have been embellished with the body of the snakes in this area.
- 2 Until fragments which link EA 1080 and CG 70016 are discovered, it does of course remain possible that CG 70016 is from a naos of almost identical dimensions, form and style.
- 3 Annotated draft drawings would have enabled sculptors to assess the proportions of a monument before work began. A papyrus bearing a draft drawing of a naos, with numerical annotations, survives from the Roman Period, Tait 2004; another architectural drawing was found at Gurob, depicting a shrine suspended within another shrine (Smith and Stewart 1974).
- 4 EA 38255, 11cm high, acquired from Rudolph Lieder in 1869 (unpublished).
- 5 Though a workshop for production of these inlays has been identified at Tebtynis, Rondot 2002: 35–6.
- 6 Monumental stone shrines could also be donated by individuals, such as the limestone naos and accompanying statue of Taweret, dedicated at Karnak by the great steward Pabasa, Roeder 1914: 106–9, pls.37, 56a.
- 7 Fine openwork faience shrines are known from the Saite era, including fragments of a shrine, or several, dating to the reign of Necho I: Munich SSKA, AS 4270–8 and 5330, with other fragments in Brussels and Cairo. I am grateful to Alfred Grimm for pointing me towards this material. The preserved fragments indicate a wall scene showing two diminutive figures of the king offering to a goddess seated upon a lotus flower, with protective winged goddesses flanking the whole scene. Miniature shrines with openwork sides are known, Sotheby’s 1928: pl. 6 [123]. Fragments of several such shrines from the Roman period, of wood with inlaid, plastered, painted or gilded decoration, were excavated at Ismant el-Kharab (Hope 1998: 829–37); the author identifies some as barque-shrines through comparison with New Kingdom reliefs.

2. Decoration

The decoration of the naos, restricted to the outer wall surfaces, was executed in sunk relief of exquisite quality, though unfinished in places.¹ The uncarved areas are finished to a high polish. There is no evidence of paint upon the naos, though finely carved hard stone was often painted (see Jenni 1998: 113–14 for a 30th dynasty example).

Front

Elevation: Pl. 2

EA 1080 (Fig. 6, Pl. 7) and CG 70016 (Pl. 21)

Fragments of the doorjambs of the naos have yet to be found, thus our knowledge of the decoration upon the front of the naos is restricted to the area above and below the cavity. The cavetto cornice is carved with a central sun-disc, from which two uraei are suspended, wearing the white and red crowns, to the left and right respectively. *Ankh*-signs hang from the bodies of the cobras, and 'lord of heaven' is carved beneath the disc. Sets of three pairs of cartouches flank the sun-disc on either side. Each cartouche sits on the *nbw*-symbol, and is topped with two feathers and a sun-disc. The cavetto cornice is divided from the door lintel by a horizontal torus-moulding. Part of the left side of the lintel is preserved, indicating that it was decorated with a winged sun-disc, identified in the adjacent caption as 'the great god, the Behdedite'. The nomen cartouche of Nekhthorheb is carved immediately below. A similar scheme must have been employed on the right doorjamb, possibly with the prenomen cartouche. The Behdedite reference is commonly carved above the doorway on Late Period shrines (e.g. Roeder 1914: CG 70013 and 70015).

All that remains of the inscription carved upon the left doorjamb is the top of a falcon wearing the double crown, presumably the beginning of Nekhthorheb's Horus name, in a serekh topped with a falcon. Doorjamb texts on naoi rarely amounted to more than elements of the royal titulary, with epithets relating to gods, often associated with a toponym (e.g. Roeder 1914: CG 70013). Some naoi, however, bear lengthier texts upon the door jambs. The Saft el-Henna naos features a hymn to Soped laid out over nine columns of inscription on each door thickness (Roeder 1914: CG 70021). Three columns of text, framed by extended *w3s*-sceptres, on the Edfu naos of Nekhthorheb give the king's full five-part titulary, and a description of the naos, including the precious materials of which it was made, and an expression of Horus' satisfaction over the monument (*Edfou* I²: 9–11, fig. 2). One other 30th dynasty naos bears multiple columns of text on the doorjamb. The red granite shrine of Nekhthorheb found at Abydos is carved with two columns of text (Roeder 1914: CG 70018); the preserved part includes the king's nomen cartouche and a reference to *sed*-festivals.

The other surviving part of the front face is the left part of the threshold (CG 70016, Pl. 21). The decoration beneath was laid out

below a row of stars framed within an extended *pt*-sign (the left edge is damaged, so it is possible this was a simple band rather than a *pt*-sign; for an example, see Fig. 13) Nekhthorheb was originally depicted in symmetrical scenes kneeling upon a low pedestal, offering a small figure of the goddess Maat, but the right figure is almost completely lost. The figure on the left wears the blue crown, and his posture and head-dress are typical for this type of offering (Teeter 1997: 22–3). The symmetrical scenes are labelled as 'giving Maat to his mother who made him, may he cause life to be given'. The mother is evidently Bastet, whose image was housed within the shrine's cavity. The space between the figures of pharaoh is taken up with symmetrically opposed *prenomen* cartouches, *Sndm-ib-R' stp-n-In-Hr*. This double-scene represents the king facing towards the doorway, offering to the statue of Bastet, thus precluding the need to depict the goddess on the threshold (a lowly place for a deity). It is a good example of the interaction between two-dimensional art and three-dimensional architecture. Three short columns of text behind pharaoh give his titles, name and epithets:

Son of Ra, of his body, upon his throne,

lord of appearances, Nekhthorheb beloved of Onuris son of Bastet, beloved of Wadjit lady of *B3st* who is in Bubastis, she gives all life.

The invocation of Wadjit on a shrine principally dedicated to Bastet is unusual, but other naoi provide further examples in which gods, other than the principal beneficiary, are depicted or referred to.² A small-scale depiction of the king's *ka* is shown behind the column of inscription, presented as a human figure upheld by the *ka*-symbol, itself sprouting arms which brandish symbols including a *šw*-feather. The accompanying inscription identifies the figure as 'the royal *ka*, foremost of the [*pr*-]*dw3t*'. The combination of hands and arms holding symbols is often used to denote the king's *ka*, with either a figure of the king, his cartouche or his *serekh* supported by the arms (Schweitzer 1956: pl. I [b–c]). An identification between the royal *ka* and Horus or Ra-Horakhty is suggested by the falcon upon the figure's head (see Barguet 1951: 210). The royal *ka* represents 'the divine aspect of the king, linking him both with the gods and with all his royal predecessors' (Bell 1985: 256). Often described as 'foremost of the *pr-dw3t*', and created at the time of pharaoh's birth, the royal *ka* is not uncommon in temple reliefs. Frequently, it accompanies a figure of pharaoh as he approaches the divine image (Schweitzer 1956: 52–67; Bell 1985). Textual sources reveal that the royal *ka* could be the focus of offerings too, as a god in its own right (Goyon 1972: 69–70). Teeter notes that the southern part of Luxor temple, with its focus on the royal *ka*, does not feature any 18th dynasty scenes of the offering of Maat (1997: 8, 44–5, n.78), and she cites no examples of Maat offering scenes which feature the royal *ka*. In light of the cosmogonical interpretation of the decoration upon the naos, the presence of the royal *ka* may serve to indicate the enduring, eternal, aspects to this creative process,

independent of the lifetime of Nekhtorheb.

This area of the threshold is unfinished, as one of the symbols held by the arms beneath the *ka*-sign has not been fully carved, a falcon atop the figure's head has only been partially incised, and the left hand of the *ka*-symbol is not carved at all. Furthermore, the antenna of the bee-sign in the *nsw-bitj* titles have not been fully carved.³ The unfinished parts of the naos' decoration are discussed further below.

The left edge of the threshold, behind the royal *ka*, is taken up with a series of heraldic emblems: an *ḥt*-sign with arms holding two fans set into *šn*-rings, two half-*pt* signs above *šn*-rings, a scorpion symbol with *šn*-standard, a *dd*-pillar upholding the combined island and *n*-sign, and three 'horseshoe' symbols. This group of symbols, with variations, is found in similar contexts from Early Dynastic times (Firth and Quibell 1935: pls.15–17, 40–2). Leclant has described them as 'prophylactic symbols' (Leclant 1993: 236), and they are clearly associated with rebirth, resurrection and the confirmation of royal power, particularly in the context of the *sed*-festival (Spencer 1978; Egberts 1993: 64–5). The symbols appear behind the king on other 30th dynasty monuments: upon the decree stela from Naukratis and Heraklion which record the coronation of Nektnebef (Grébaut 1900: 40–4, pl.45; Yoyotte 2001b: 31, fig.4), on one of the greywacke architectural slabs (Arundale and Bonomi 1842: 1842: 110, pl.45 [fig.165])⁴ and in a scene of ritual running before Osiris-Wennefer and Isis on the gateway of the first pylon at Philae (Junker 1958: fig.68).

It is unusual for naoi to feature decoration beneath the cavity. Exceptions include three lines of dedicatory text on the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: CG 70021), and the décor on the naos of decades from the same site (Habachi and Habachi 1952). The presentation of Maat is one of the most common offering scenes found in Egyptian temples, particularly as a symmetrical scene set on or near a doorway (Teeter 1997), but it is not typical on naoi. The earliest such example, actually a chapel with an engaged statue of Amun-Ra in the cavity, dates to the reign of Amenhotep III (Roeder 1914: CG 70025). The lintel of this chapel features a double scene of offering to Amun-Ra over the doorway; the right scene is a Maat offering. Late Period naoi with such a scene include the two 30th dynasty naoi from Abydos, which bear scenes of Nektnebef and Nekhtorheb offering Maat to various deities on the side walls, but also an image of Onuris-Shu offering to Osiris (partly pictured: Saleh and Sourouzian 1987: no.257; see Roeder 1914: 50–5).⁵ Teeter only cites two other examples in which pharaoh is depicted offering Maat before his own name (1997: 31): Ramses III presents Maat to a combination of his *prenomen* and *nomen* on the lintel above a doorway in the palace at Medinet Habu (Hölscher 1941: pl.36b), and a seal impression shows Akhenaten presenting Maat to his *prenomen* (Berlin 25.145, unpublished). Neither case offers good parallels to the Bubastis naos; the Ramses III scene precedes a room where the king's throne was the central element, not an image of a deity. As explained above, the Bubastis naos scene is clearly conceived as referring to the goddess housed within the shrine. The pious pose of Nekhtorheb also underlines his role in temple cult, and echoes the ritual activities undertaken by the king on one side of the architectural slabs of the 26th and 30th dynasty (see note 4).

The interior

There is no evidence for internal decoration on the Bubastis naos,

though this could be ascribed to the monument's unfinished state. However, naos interiors were infrequently decorated. None of the sufficiently preserved shrines from Bubastis display decorated interiors (Roeder 1914: CG 70013, and Rondot 1989). It is possible the majority were simply polished, as their interiors were not properly visible once the god's image was installed. When the doors of the great naos were open, parts of any decoration would have been obscured. Internal decoration on other 30th dynasty naoi include restrained friezes of heraldic plants and winged creatures on the ceiling (*Edfou I*²: 11), or those in which the scheme follows the model of that on the outer wall, with registers of divinities (Roeder 1914: CG 70021, and another naos from Saft el-Henna, Griffith in Naville 1890: 70–4, pls.23–6).

The side and rear walls

The three other exterior faces bear the same decorative scheme (Pls.3–5, Colour Pl.2). The cavetto cornice is carved with a frieze of cartouches, alternately *prenomen* and *nomen*, embellished with sun-discs and feathers but not *nbw*-baskets, as on the front (Pl.7). A horizontal torus-moulding is carved beneath the cornice. The upper part of the decoration proper featured a horizontal line of large-scale hieroglyphs which formed the dedicatory inscription, partially preserved on both side walls (EA 1079: Figs.7, 9). The text is read from the rear towards the front of the naos, consistent with the notion that these were associated with pharaoh as he approached the goddess within the shrine:⁶

- | | |
|-------|---|
| Left | ... [lord] of ritual <i>Sndm-ib-R^c stp-n-]In-Hr</i> , son of Ra, of his body, upon his throne lord of appearances, [<i>Nht-ḥr-ḥb mry-]In-Hr s³ B3st</i> ... |
| Right | ...lord of ritual <i>S[ndm-ib-]R^c [stp-n-]In-Hr</i> , [son of Ra, of his body, upon] his throne lord of appearances, [<i>Nht-ḥr-ḥb [mry-]In-Hr s³ B3st</i> , like Ra, [beloved of] Bastet the great, lady of Bubastis... |

The dedicatory text, with the exception of the label above the figure of a king on a block recorded by Naville (1891: pl.47 [B]), is the only text preserved upon these three faces of the naos, in stark contrast to the Saft el-Henna naos, which bears a line of text between each register, in addition to the labels accompanying many of the divine images (Roeder 1914: CG 70021). At least four registers were arranged beneath the dedicatory text on the Bubastis naos, each provided with its own baseline, and framed above with an extended *pt*-sign filled with stars (Figs.7–9). A vertical line was intended to delimit the end of each registers: this is preserved on the left edge of the back face (EA 1079, Pl.12), behind both the falcon and snake-headed figures on the right face (EA 1078, Pl.16) and to the left of the resurrecting Osiris on the back face, but had not been carved in the register below (EA 1078, Pl.15). Interestingly, these lines are not consistently carved, as the one behind the falcon on the right wall (EA 1078, Pl.16) is noticeably thinner and less deeply carved than that in the register above.

Each register of decoration contains a row of representations of divinities, none of which are accompanied by hieroglyphic inscriptions. This lack of labelling is important, as it partly dictates how the role of the naos is interpreted (see Chapter 4). It is possible that further inscriptions were to be added later, once the decoration proper was finished, but the absence of hieroglyphic labels for some of the divine forms on other naoi makes it possible that there was no intention to include such information upon the naos. Furthermore, the unfinished elements on the main walls are all small details which are usually

executed at the end of the carving process. As such, it is unlikely that inscriptions were planned to accompany each divinity given that not one had been executed by the time work finished (see below), particularly as the dedicatory text is complete except for some minor details (Figs. 7, 9).

The figure of the standing king offering Maat (Naville 1891: pl. 47 [B]) is labelled with the cartouches of Nekhthorheb. This block must come from the start of a register, with pharaoh offering to the row of divine images (as found on similar naoi, see below). The orientation of the king upon the block copied by Naville indicates it was part of the back or left wall of the naos, if one assumes the gods followed the same pattern of orientation as found on the preserved blocks. It cannot be from the top register of the rear face, as a depiction of a seated Osiris is found in the position immediately in front of the king. However, as the king stands before a god holding a sceptre, it could come from one of the registers below. The fragment may also come from the right end of any of the four registers on the left wall, none of which are preserved in this area (it is placed in the second register from the top on the reconstructed elevation, Pl. 5). The king's head-dress does not favour this fragment being placed on one or other side of the shrine, as he appears to wear the double crown. A figure of the king may have been depicted at the beginning of most registers, as on several of the naoi discussed below, but no leading corners are preserved on the left or right faces to allow this to be ascertained. Pharaoh is shown offering to gods on several other naoi (see Chapter 3), in some cases depicted twice on one register to preserve symmetry about a shrine's principal axis (e.g. Roeder 1914: CG 70008, particularly pl. 11a).

The orientation of the registers upon the Bubastis shrine features some deviations from what might be expected. On the left wall, the first group face right, towards the front of the shrine, but the kneeling pharaoh and those to his left face the rear of the shrine (EA 1079, Fig. 9, Pl. 10, 11). This latter group takes up less than half of the original register (Pl. 5). There may have been figures of pharaoh offering at either end of this register. As one moves on to the rear wall, the deities again face to the right, with the exception of one of the goddesses mourning Osiris (EA 1078 and 1079, Fig. 8).⁷ Finally, the preserved portions of the right wall of the naos bear scenes in which the gods all face left, towards the front of the shrine (Fig. 7). The dedicatory inscription and cartouche frieze on both side walls are to be read from rear to front.

I have assumed that the now lost parts of the wall decoration would have borne decoration consistent with that known from the surviving parts. The other naoi with similar decoration indicate that this is likely (see Chapter 3), but the Saft el-Henna naos illustrates how the orderly registers could be interrupted by a different type of scene, such as the vignettes of pharaoh performing ritual actions, near the left end of the right wall (Roeder 1914: CG 70021, pl. 28).

A decorative frieze ran below the lowest register on the Bubastis naos. This is attested on one fragment, EA 1005, which also preserves part of the bottom registers (Fig. 10, Pl. 19). The orientation of the frieze upon the preserved fragment indicates it formed part of the right wall (see below, Pl. 3). The frieze consists of baskets topped with the hieroglyphs 'may he live like Ra', alternated with elaborately carved *hb*-signs which simultaneously enclosed the *nomen* and epithet, but also represented part of the name itself. This is an embellishment on

more typical protective friezes, such as the *ḥnh-dd-w3s* one found near the base of temple reliefs (e.g. Epigraphic Survey 1981: pl. 131). It is possible that a further decorative element lay beneath this, on the shrine's socle. The Saft el-Henna naos bears three rows of dedicatory text (Roeder 1914: CG 70021), while an Abydos shrine of the 30th dynasty features a frieze of lotus plants combined with the palace façade motif (Roeder 1914: CG 70017). However, the left side of the threshold block CG 70016 is highly polished but not carved, thus I propose the Bubastis naos featured an undecorated socle.

Having described the decorative framework for the three sides, it is here appropriate to describe the figures depicted in each of the registers. Recall that there is no text associated with any of the preserved divine images. Without labels, discussion of the identity of the various divine forms is far from exhaustive, and included only for those images that are particularly distinctive. It is fruitless to list, for example, all the gods which could have been depicted as a falcon (Fig. 7.b).

Left side

Elevation: Pl. 5

EA 1079 (Fig. 9, Pls. 10–11)

The decoration of the left side was never completed, as is evident from EA 1080, which is polished but bears no traces of relief carving (Pls. 8–9). Of course, the registers below, now lost, may have been fully, or partly, decorated; EA 1079 suggests the decoration was complete except for some minor detailing (Fig. 9). The upper register is divided into two parts through differing orientations of the divine figures, as discussed above. The first preserved figure in the group towards the front of the naos is a lioness-headed goddess seated on a throne, wearing an *atef*-crown. The position in which her right arm is held suggests she may be nursing a child, though there is no small hand holding her wrist as in the nursing group found on the right side (Colour Pl. 3). A very fine detail is the lightly carved *sm3-t3wy* symbol in the square panel at the side of her throne, surrounded by an area with a feathered motif. The identity of this deity cannot be confirmed without an accompanying inscription. Many goddesses could be shown in this guise, including Bastet, Sekhmet, Tefnut, Pakhet, Mehit and Wadjet (Germond 1981: 133, n. 3). If this does represent Bastet, it would be the only depiction of the goddess upon the preserved parts of the naos. However, one would expect an image of Bastet to be positioned more prominently, such as at the beginning of a register.

The next two images are grouped together on a low platform: a composite creature and a lioness bust. The former is a fantastical creature, featuring a male human head wearing a simple wig and royal beard. It is shown wearing a pectoral collar, but the remainder of the body is very stylized, in a shape reminiscent of the white crown or the body of a bird. The creature is supported by insect (?) legs with human hands. Further adding to the unusual nature of this animal is the protrusion between the legs, the position of which is suggestive of a phallus (though not its shape or orientation), an umbilical cord, or the feather which projects from the chest of a *ba*-bird. This creation is more reminiscent of the fantastical creatures encountered in the vignettes of *Book of the Dead* papyri or the Valley of the Kings tombs, rather than the more restrained forms of divine iconography typically encountered in temple reliefs of this

period. Late Period sarcophagi are also an important source for innovative iconography: the sarcophagus of Iufaa, from the Persian era cemetery at Abu Sir, features an image of Ptah-Tanen as a scarab with the head of a hare.⁸ However, I know of no close parallel for the composite creature on the Bubastis naos, even on the Saft el-Henna naos.⁹ A figure in the second register of the north wall in the Hibis sanctuary has a similar body-shape, though somewhat closer to that of a bird, with bird legs and a human-head wearing the simple cap and *atef*-crown (Davies 1953: pl.3 [II]). This creature holds out one arm before him, in which a Maat-feather is grasped. The partly preserved hieroglyphic inscription identifies the figure as ‘Eldest of the Eldest [ones] ... (?)’ (Cruz-Urbe 1988: 10).¹⁰ The register, and that above, feature gods that are evidently associated with Herakleopolis. ‘The Eldest of the Eldest Ones’ (*smsw-smsw.w* or *wr wr.w*) appears in the *Book of the Dead* as a designation of Osiris (Leitz 2002c: 354; Allen 1974: 119), but can also be used to designate other gods (Leitz 2002a: 431).

A closer parallel to the creature on the Bubastis naos, at least in terms of form, is a figure upon the *Mensa Isiaca* (Leospo 1978: 81, pl.2ob), in which a scarab beetle is depicted in side-view, with insect legs, and a male head wearing a simple cap wig and sun- or moon- disc combined with moon-crescent. While the *Mensa Isiaca* figure thus has clear lunar (and possibly solar) connotations (Sternberg el-Hotabi 1994: 86 [z]), the example on the Bubastis naos features no readily identifiable solar or lunar iconography. The iconography of the Bubastis figure, with simple cap wig and royal beard, is typical of Ptah; it is interesting that ‘Ptah lord of Thebes’ is shown as a male figure with the body of a scarab in the Hibis temple (Davies 1953: pl.2, register V). Scarab-forms of this god are not uncommon, including Ptah-the-Great, Ptah-Sokar and Ptah-Tanen, but other gods can also be depicted in similar guises (Lepsius 1842: pl.79; Graefe 1998: 122). Graefe discusses the primeval, creator-god nature of these representations of Ptah, many of which are depicted with erect phallus (1998).¹¹ Could the protrusion between the legs of the figure on the Bubastis naos be a phallus? The Bubastis creature is paired with an emblem of a lioness-headed deity; the close association between Ptah and the goddesses Sekhmet and Tefnut is brought to mind.

Moving towards the rear of the naos, where the figures face left, the first preserved figure is that of a standing goddess, wearing a sun-disc into which is set a feather. The combination of feather and sun-disc is known from depictions of ‘Maat daughter of Ra’, such as behind Amun-Kamutef in the 26th dynasty chapel of Osiris-Wennefer-Nebdjefa at Karnak (Mysliwiec 1988: pl. 60a). A Ptolemaic relief from the same site depicts this goddess with one hand raised in a protective gesture (Bianchi *et al.* 1988: 109–11 [20]). The two raised hands of the figure upon the Bubastis naos are more suggestive of adoration, a role in which Maat is not typically cast, though a scene in the Dendera crypts shows ‘Maat daughter of Ra’, without a sun-disc upon her head, in the same pose before an image of Hathor (*Dendara V*: 58, pl.365). Was there a figure of pharaoh or of another divine image at the left edge of the top register? A deity is more likely on account of the adoring pose of Maat. A trace of carved relief at the edge of the break is difficult to interpret. The carving of the goddess is incomplete, and the treatment of the fingers is rather clumsy when compared to other details on the naos, such as the right mourning goddess on the rear face (Pl.13). Maat is a central

figure in certain ancient cosmogonies, from as early as the *Coffin Texts* (Bickel 1994: 168–76), and can be portrayed as the power that nourishes the sun-god (Shirun-Grumach 1985: 173–9).

The figure following Maat is the goddess of Thebes, clearly identified by the *W3st*-symbol above her tripartite wig. She holds a very lightly incised bow and arrow in her hands, fairly common attributes for this goddess intimately associated with conquest. The Goddess of Thebes can also be described as ‘lady of the nomes’ while introducing the gods of various Upper Egyptian places to Amun-Ra (Helck 1968: 119–26). The sculptor moves seamlessly between low relief and light incisions to indicate the shaft of the arrow crossing in front of her left arm (Pl.10).

The final figure in this orientation is a kneeling figure, wearing a *shendjyt*-kilt and blue crown, facing a group of four plants upon a low pedestal (Fig. 9, Colour Pl.5). The blue crown, relatively common on contemporary sculpture in the round (many examples are illustrated in Josephson 1997), is known only from representations of pharaoh (Strauss 1981: 814). These depictions do not, however, always represent a historical figure. The ‘pharaoh of Biga (*Pr-ḥ n Smtt*)’, known from the Ptolemaic and Roman temples of Philae and Lower Nubia (Winter 1975), is one such re-interpretation of the office of kingship. As with the figure upon the Bubastis naos, the ‘pharaoh of Biga’ is usually shown wearing the blue crown (though he can also wear the *nemes*, Benedite 1895: 122 (7), pl.33). The inscriptions in these scenes usually invoke his destruction of enemies, or describe him placing terror amongst the foreign lands; a scene at Philae places him in the role of smiting enemies (Roeder 1930: 228, pls. 89). Other examples of gods designated as ‘*Pr-ḥ* of ...’ also date to the Ptolemaic or Roman periods (Leitz 2002b: 39–40). There is no proof that the examples upon the Bubastis naos represents any of these figures. However, in light of the position of this figure, behind several gods, not in an offering or adoring pose, I propose this represents an aspect of the eternal office of kingship, perhaps in a partly divinised form, rather than the historical figure Nekhtorheb. Naturally, the facial features display the stylistic attributes familiar from this reign, as do those of other male gods shown on the naos (see below). The omission of the king’s cartouches serves to emphasise the ahistorical nature of this figure, in contrast to elsewhere upon the shrine (CG 70016: Pl.21 and Naville 1891: pl.47 [B], cf. Pl.5)

The pose, with arms outstretched and palms turned inwards, is known from royal bronze statuary of the Third Intermediate Period onwards (Hill 2004: 125–9, those with blue crowns, pls. 56, 68). Unfortunately, the preserved examples do not include the base into which the figure was set, and thus we do not know if some statue groupings featured the king facing plants such as those shown on the Bubastis naos. Hill cites relief depictions where the king kneels in such a manner before standards, fetishes and ointment jars, and concludes that the pose represents the concept of ‘support, protection, and perhaps maintenance of vitality’ (2004: 129). Indeed, a king is shown in such a pose in the 30th dynasty wall reliefs from Bubastis, depicted at diminutive scale before an ithyphallic god (Naville 1891: pl.46 [D]). A scene in the treasury at Medinet Habu includes a representation of the king offering various gifts to Amun-Ra (Epigraphic Survey 1957: pl.322). These include shrines, vessels and statues in precious metals. One of the vessels is in the form of a kneeling king with hands held towards a bouquet of flowers, in a pose very similar to that found on the Bubastis naos.

The figure kneels before four papyrus plants, themselves on a separate low support, the nearest of which droops away from the king, its stem crossing that of the adjacent plant. Is the king in an act of reviving the heraldic plant of Lower Egypt, the representation capturing the point during which the last plant is being actively revived? The *mhw*-hieroglyph features two drooping or snapped stalks (Fischer 1988: 34) and a hieroglyph depicting a male youth beneath four drooping papyrus stems is also attested (Hannig 1995: 1125 [A421]). It is interesting that the papyrus, traditionally symbolising Lower Egypt, would follow directly after an image of a goddess personifying one of the principal sacred cities of the southern Nile Valley, particularly on the southern side of the naos. The protective nature of the papyrus plant can be interpreted in light of its role as a 'protective screen' in the Chemmis myths (Goyon 1972: 119, n.308); the depiction of a row of four stems may allude to this screen-like character. In the New Year rituals recorded upon a papyrus now in the Brooklyn Museum, the king holds the top of a papyrus plant, while the chief ritualist holds the stalk. Then the plant is cut: a protective rite performed *four times* to ward off enemies on the fifth day of the New Year (Goyon 1972: 74).

A small detail in the Hibis sanctuary offers a degree of parallel to this grouping (Kessler 2003: 212): an ibis and a pair of ibis-eggs are represented upon a *sm³-bwy* symbol, before which a diminutive figure of the king kneels. Cruz-Uribe (1988: 32) believes that this was a later addition, as the *sm³-bwy* bears evidence of recutting, with the left stem being erased and repositioned in the king's hand. In light of the chronology of Hibis temple, this may have been a 30th dynasty modification, heralding the restoration of Egypt to rightful rulers after the Persian occupation (not historically correct, but note Hatshepsut's similar approach to restoration history in an inscription in the Speos Artemidos, Allen 2002). Kessler refers to late Ptolemaic niche doors from the baboon galleries at Tuna el-Gebel which show either a king or a *w^cb*-priest in a similar pose (cited but unpublished, 2003: 219).

It is difficult to provide a succinct characterisation of the décor on this exterior face, of which less is preserved than the rear or right walls. However, the possible Osiride associations of the composite figure, and the cosmogonical role played by Maat, do fit in with some of the more overt symbolism on the other sides. The terrifying yet beneficent aspects of lioness gods, here complemented by the victorious nature of the Theban goddess, were perhaps further underlined through the inclusion of a non-specific royal figure performing ritual before heraldic papyrus plants.

Back

Elevation: Pl. 4

EA 1078 and EA 1079 (Fig. 8, Pls. 12–13, 15)

Most of the first register is preserved (EA 1079), along with the left end of the second, third and very top of the fourth register (EA 1078). With the exception of one of the mourning goddesses, the divine images face right. In the first register, the right edge is lost, but there is insufficient space for a figure of the king offering to have been included. Alternatively, one could envisage a relatively narrow divine image, such as a standard or emblem. The first preserved figure is a classic depiction of an enthroned Osiris wearing an *atef*-crown and holding the crook and flail

across his chest. Another unfinished detail is encountered here: the bottom edge of the white crown is not carved.

This depiction of Osiris is followed by a group of three figures: Osiris upon a bier, flanked by two mourning goddesses (Pl. 13). The goddesses, squatting on pedestals, are symmetrically opposed on either side of the bed, with simple sheath dresses and tripartite wigs. One hand rests on their near thigh, the other is held to the face; pairs of mourning goddesses can display a wide range of variation in pose (Cauville 1997b: 230–1). Some details differ between the two mourners, such as the treatment of the foot appearing behind the crossed leg, and the shape of the breasts. The collar of the right-hand goddess is incomplete. The need to represent this as a coherent group required abandoning the prevalent orientation in the strict sense (figures facing right), but not if one considers the trio as one group, with the horizontal Osiris figure as the dominant one. Osiris appears to 'float' above the bier, as the artist combines the depiction of a reclining figure with arms crossed over his chest, with the representation of a bier in section. The bier is embellished with leonine feet and the head and arched tail of a lion. Small supports beneath the lion-legs keep it off the register line; this representation is not provided with its own pedestal. The lion-head, at very small scale, displays the attention to detail typical of the relief-carving on the naos. The facial details are differently conceived to the lioness bust on the left side, which has a less-rounded, more elongated muzzle (Fig. 9, Pl. 11). This indicates that the sculptors were not replicating 'stencils' of images found to be used more than once upon the naos. The figure on the bier has unfortunately lost its head through damage, which was presumably intentional, in light of the preservation of the surrounding relief and polished surfaces. It is clear, through reference to other monuments, that the figure was depicted with a frontal view of the face, wearing a tripartite wig. A different composition of the same elements appears on a Saite naos from Athribis (Habachi 1952: 230, pl. 44 [A]). Here the god is seated upon a bier, with the goddesses also on the bier. The Saft el-Henna naos features two similar figures, one is unlabelled and without accompanying goddesses (Roeder 1914: pl. 22), while the other represents the goddess Wenut, who is flanked on either side by gods, all within a chapel (Roeder 1914: 80–1, pl. 25).¹² A representation in the Hibis sanctuary depicts 'Osiris of Naref who is upon the great throne' in this form (Davies 1953: pl. 3, register II). The latter deity is amongst a group of evidently Herakleopolitan gods, and other forms of Osiris are depicted in a similar manner.¹³ In Graeco-Roman temples, this god is often identified as Osiris-Hemag, as in the Sokar chapel (Dendara II: pl. 135), though there is considerable variation in the iconography of this god (Cauville 1997b: 116, n. 261).

In contrast to the space afforded to the Osiris group (which is not centrally placed in this register, Pl. 4), the following four images appear rather cramped, beginning with a finely carved vulture (Pl. 12). Mut and Nekhbet are the most common divinities who appear as vultures, but Isis can also be represented in this manner: a vulture is labelled as 'Isis mistress of the Two Lands' upon the naos of Amasis now in Leiden (Boeser 1915: pl. 3; see Chapter 3). The mourning goddess at the foot of the bier of Osiris, immediately preceding the vulture, could also be interpreted as a form of Isis. An upright mummiform Osiride figure wearing the white crown follows the vulture, his arms and hands shrouded by mummy wrappings. Many forms of Osiris can be shown in such a manner, but one possibility is that this is one of the *b³w* of the god

(Cauville 1997b: 199–200). In the Osiride chapel at Dendera, five statues of this type are shown, all explicitly labelled as manifestations of Osiris. Each is identified with different toponyms throughout Egypt, and stated as being made of wood, measuring over two cubits in height (Cauville 1997a: 228, 230; 1997c: pls.254, 277). As with the top register of the rear wall on the Bubastis naos, these five images of Osiris, accompanied by two other variant forms, flank the depiction of three stages in the resurrection of the god.

Another clear Osiride allusion on the Bubastis naos is the *djed*-pillar which follows the standing figure of Osiris, followed by a ram-headed god wearing the double crown (traces of the bases upon which both these divine forms rest are preserved near the top of EA 1078, **Pl.15**). Many gods could manifest as ram-headed males, including Banebdjed, Amun-Ra and Heryshef; the latter is invoked on the doorjamb of one of the other naos from Bubastis (Roeder 1914: CG 70013).

The focus of the top register is notably Osiride, and this continues in the two registers below. Only the upper parts of three representations are preserved in the central part of the second register: a type of shrine (?), followed closely by a shrine within a shrine, and a deity wearing a head-dress terminating in two tall feathers. The Saft el-Henna naos illustrates many varieties of shrine, not all of which contain deities (Roeder 1914: pls.19, 24–7, 30, 32). EA 1078 preserves the left end of this register: a recumbent male figure, wearing the *nemes*-head-dress with uraeus and straight royal beard, is depicted upon an elevated dais (**Pl.15**). The composition is rather reminiscent of a sphinx in side view, with the elongated human legs taking the place of the lion's body.

The attributes of this figure suggest an association with 're-awakening Osiris', as known from various sources. A fine Saite statue in Cairo presents a three-dimensional rendition, though with a more elaborate head-dress (Hornung and Bryan 2002: 176–7 [85]), but there are a number of two-dimensional depictions from temples and tombs of the New Kingdom onwards. Two of the naos discussed below feature similar figures. CG 70008 includes a recumbent figure upon a bier named as '... Osiris-Mert(y)', with crowns depicted beneath the bed. This example is paired with a seated child god labelled as a form of Horus, in a stylized shrine topped with standards (Roeder 1914: 34, pl.9). The Saft el-Henna naos shows such a figure (the face is not preserved) in a shrine with Nephthys and Isis (Roeder 1914: pl.32). Four figures stand beneath the bier, arms held up to support it; the crowns are depicted above the body of the recumbent god. The sanctuary reliefs at Hibis feature another example, labelled as 'Osiris *hnty sh-ntr* of the temple of Min' (Davies 1953: pl.4, register V). In this last example, the lower legs are somewhat raised off the bier, crowns are again depicted underneath, and he wears a *khat*-head-dress and curled divine beard. Such wrapped 'awakening' figures are more commonly found in funerary contexts, notably in the Osirideion at Abydos (Frankfort 1933: pl.74 but also the figures at the bottom of pl.78, labelled as *ngzyw* and *b3w*). Further examples are found in later tombs (e.g. Assmann 1977: fig. 41 with further references) and in the Litany of Ra upon sarcophagi (e.g. that of Nekhthorheb, British Museum EA 10). The presence in some of these examples of the hieroglyph for 'awake' above the god is the best hint at the meaning behind these representations. As with some of the naos depictions, attributes of divine power are often placed under the

bed, particularly crowns. The Bubastis example sits on a 'solid' pedestal, rather than a bed, leaving no space to place these attributes, in keeping with the restrained and uncluttered style evident throughout the exterior decoration of this shrine. What is intriguing about the figure on the Bubastis naos is the presence of a royal, not divine, beard, and the wearing of a *nemes*-head-dress, typically a head-dress of pharaoh, but also found on gods such as Khonsu-*wn-nhn* (Clère 1961: pl.9) and Tutu (Kaper 2003: 36, 44). The *nemes*-head-dress is also associated with Horus, and later, Heryshef (Goebis 1995). One example of a similarly prostrate figure which may wear a *nemes*-head-dress is found on a Late Period funerary papyrus (Piankoff and Rambova 1957: pl.10).¹⁴ In the Osiris chapels at Dendera, a very similar depiction appears to wear a tripartite wig, but since the surface is rather damaged, it is possible this example also wears the *nemes* (Cauville 1997c: pls.252, 275). A text from the *Book of the Dead* implies that Osiris wearing the *nemes* represents a display of legitimate rule (Goebis 1995: 169–70); perhaps the Bubastis example is also referring to a somewhat timeless concept such as resurrection and rule.

The register below is also only preserved at the left edge (**Fig.8a, Pl.15**). At the broken edge, there is the left end of a divine image, possibly the end of a bird's feathers, or an animal's tail. This was followed by two figures enclosed in a light shrine consisting of tent-pole columns, a tapering roof, and a cavetto cornice (**Colour Pl.4**). The first figure, i.e. to the right, is that of a standing baboon, poised to fire an arrow from a bow. The taut musculature of the monkey is well-rendered in the relief carving, and the treatment of the rear shoulder represents an interesting use of internal details, rather than simply a profile view of this part of the body. Note here that the bow and arrow are rendered in full sunk relief, unlike with the goddess of Thebes depicted on the left side of the naos (**Fig.9**).

Baboons are most commonly identified as manifestations of the god Thoth, or associated with solar theology, but this example can be identified as a manifestation of Atum. In particular, it may represent a form of Atum of Kheraha named *Ifw*, known from later temple texts but also alluded to in the *Amduat* and *P. Bremner-Rhind* (Brunner-Traut 1956).¹⁵ Texts relating to *Ifw* describe the destruction of enemies using the bow and arrow. Other divine forms can also be portrayed as aggressive baboons. A scene in an Osiris chapel at Dendera includes a standing baboon, holding bow and arrow in one hand and long knife in the other: 'Atum lord of Heliopolis ... in *T3-rr*, who reached the body of the Miserable One (Seth): "The bow is in my hand, the arrow is in my hand against anyone who comes"' (Cauville 1997a: 2; 1997c: pl.7).

One of the crypts in the same temple features an image of Horus-Sematawy in a shrine, with a standing baboon, labelled as frog-headed, brandishing two knives. This baboon is clearly charged with protecting Horus-Sematawy: '(You), your excellent name is that of the *Wpwtj*-monkey, your face is that of a frog: "I cut with a knife the throats of your earthly enemies, I throw your adversary into the burial place"' (Cauville 2004: 236–7, pl.32). This crypt focuses on the transformation of Horus-Sematawy from the moment of his creation through to his manifestation as Ihy (Cauville 2004: 15–18). The Bubastis baboon may well be performing a protective role with regards to the figure depicted behind him in the shrine.

This standing male mummiform figure wears a head-dress combining ram horns and two tall feathers (**Pl.15**). His hands

protrude from the wrappings to grasp a *w3s*-standard, combined with *dd* and *ḥnh*-symbols. The form of this figure suggests that it represents one of several deities, on the basis of parallel representations. From the 1st millennium BC, Osiris-Anedjty is usually shown with this type of crown, and commonly holds *w3s*- and *ḥnh*-symbols (Vassilika 1989: 91; Perdu 2004: 24). Other forms of Osiris can take a similar guise (Cauville 1997b: 200; 1997c: pls.259, 282). Such crowns are also worn by Ptah-Tanen (Barguet 1951: 210–13); a depiction of the latter god in Nekhthorheb reliefs from Bubastis show him as a standing man holding a *w3s*-sceptre and wearing this crown, though not enveloped in mummy wrappings (Neville 1891: pl.46 [B]). However, given that he was closely associated with funerary rituals, Osiris is a more convincing interpretation for the figure behind the baboon (Favard-Meeks 1991: 452–8), and would fit well with the Osiride emphasis of this rear wall.

Only part of the extended *pt*-sign with stars is preserved on the fourth register of the rear wall, indicating that decoration had been (at least) partly completed on this lower register.

The rear wall of this naos evidently bears strong Osiride imagery, with various forms of the god together with the mourning goddesses and the *djed*-pillar. The distinction between the different forms of Osiris shown on the rear wall undoubtedly reflects different stages in the god's transformation, well attested in textual sources (Herbin 2003) and in the decoration of the Osiris chapels at Dendera (Cauville 1997a, 1997b, 1997c). These chapels illustrate various stages in the myth-cycle of Osiris as one reads from the bottom register upwards: birth, embalming, the mummified body resting in various sanctuaries throughout Egypt, and finally re-awakening and triumph as an enthroned god (Cauville 1997b: 129–30; 1997c: pls.105–8, 236–8). There are a profusion of deities represented in addition to the Osiride forms in these chapels at Dendera, including guardian figures, particularly around vulnerable areas such as doorways. Further figures represent statuary (explicitly labelled with dimensions), and deities bringing offerings and conducting rituals before forms of Osiris. The Bubastis naos is insufficiently preserved to ascertain if a similar progression is intended, though the two stages of re-awakening shown in the top and second register are suggestive of this, as are the multiple forms of the god on that top register, including an awakened form and an enthroned manifestation. It is notable that in the third chapel of the western group at Dendera, the stages of transformation of Osiris, clustered in the upper register, are flanked by standing mummiform statuary of the god similar in form to the standing mummiform Osiris shown on the Bubastis naos. The Dendera chapel, of course, embeds this process in an explicitly topographical setting, seemingly eschewed upon the Bubastis naos (see Chapter 4). It is also interesting to note that the presumed orientation of the naos within the Bubastis temple, i.e. facing east at the western end of the complex (see Chapter 6), would imply that the Osiride decoration on the rear exterior wall faced west, fitting for the funerary connotations and references to rebirth. One of the cemetery areas at Bubastis is to the west (rear) of the temple, and one would expect an Osiris-tomb in a large temple enclosure of the Late Period (el-Sayed 1975: 208–13; Coulon *et al.* 1995; Coulon and Defernez 2004: 136–42).¹⁶

Right side

Elevation: Pl.3

EA 1078 and 1079 (Fig.7, Pls.14, 16); Cairo Museum, number unknown (Pl.22)

Significant parts of three registers are preserved on this side, in which all the deities face left, towards the front of the naos. The first preserved figure is that of a bull-headed god, seated upon a throne and holding a *w3s*-sceptre. He is depicted wearing a head-dress that could be interpreted in three ways: combining the full and crescent moon, the crescent moon and sun-disc or the sun-disc and horns. Bull-headed gods frequently bear a sun-disc between the horns, usually combined with a uraeus (Roeder 1956: 323–36), though sometimes without (Roeder 1956: 332, fig. 442). A possible aspect in favour of it being identified as a moon-crescent is that the element in question is not joined to the bull's head, as it usually is in the case of horns (Figs.7b, 8b; see Fazzini *et al.* 1988: 97–8 [10]). Moon-gods are typically anthropomorphic, mummiform or in a form in which Thoth manifests himself (ibis, baboon); a statue of Thoth as a baboon from the reign of Nekhthorheb bears an inscription describing Thoth (the name is written as a seated baboon wearing the lunar head-dress of crescent and full moon) as 'bull in the *Hwt-ḥt*' (Enzoli-Vittozzi 1990: 27 [20]). A profusion of other gods could be depicted as bulls; examples on 30th dynasty monuments include the Apis (Fazzini *et al.* 1988: 97–8 [10]) and the Buchis bull (Mond and Myers 1934: pl.37).

The following five figures all stand upon low pedestals. Firstly, a serpent-headed male figure with long antennae wears a tripartite wig and holds an *ḥnh*-symbol and *w3s*-sceptre. The gender of this figure substantially reduces the number of deities which it could represent; it fits well with the guardian snake Heneb, associated with Herakleopolis (Sotheby's 1981: 161; Limme 1988: 23–4 [5]; Aubert and Aubert 2001: 206).¹⁷ Similar iconography is used for the deity who drives away enemies at Edfu (*Edfou* IV: 237, 8), and protects the king's body at Dendera (Cauville 1997a: 152, 177). Thereafter follow four identical figures: frog-headed, wearing tripartite wigs and with hands held by their side (Pl.25). The register beneath features another set of four identical figures, though in this case they are female figures with snake-heads, seemingly depicted naked apart from their footwear in the form of jackal-heads (Pl.24). Each sandal worn by these figures is transformed into a jackal through the addition of ears and eyes.¹⁸ It was intended that each of these frog-headed figures would be provided with a collar, but this has only been completed on the third figure from the right. The other three figures have only a lightly incised guideline carved, to indicate the intended position of the collar. The same incomplete collars are visible on the snake- and bull-headed figures at the left-hand edge of this register.

Identifying this group of eight gods spread over the first and second registers is straightforward: they represent the Hermopolis Ogdoad. An obvious parallel is the group of similar deities upon the back wall of Louvre D29 (Piankoff 1933: 167, fig.7), identified in the accompanying inscriptions as the pairs Heh and Hehet, Kek and Keket, Naw and Nawt, Amun and Amunet. They are also provided with jackal-sandals, and as alternate male and female forms. In the second columned hall at Hibis, this Ogdoad is shown in a similar guise, though with Gereh and Gerehet in place of Amun and Amunet (Davies 1953: pl.33).

The male figures in this case wear simple kilts, while the female gods may be naked as the navel is visible (though a band above the ankles is suggestive of a sheath dress). Again, the group wear jackal-sandals. In reliefs in the Hibis temple sanctuary, the same Ogdoad is shown adoring the child sun-god (Kessler 2003: 212) and a ram associated with Herakleopolis (Sternberg el-Hotabi 1994a: 241, fig. 1). The Ogdoad are by no means confined to royal monuments at this period: they form part of a row of gods adoring Heryshef upon the Naples stela of Samtutefnakht (Tresson 1931: pl.1). They can also take other forms, such as the purely anthropomorphic examples in the Khonsu temple at Karnak (Mendel 2003: pl.1).

In front of the four snake-headed goddesses in the second register, an anthropomorphic goddess is depicted seated upon a throne, wearing a tripartite wig topped with cow horns and a sun-disc. She wears a collar, and originally grasped something in her left hand, now lost. Her head-dress combines sun-disc and cow-horns, a relatively common form in which various goddesses were shown in the second half of the 1st millennium BC, most notably Isis and Hathor.

The first preserved image on the third register, which seems less well-spaced than the two above it, is the corner of a shrine with cavetto cornice, presenting a more substantial appearance than the shrine shown on the rear wall (Fig. 8b). Unfortunately, nothing of the image housed within is preserved, though the end of a feature, possibly the tail of an animal or a plant feature, can be seen arching to the right of the shrine's back wall. The second figure is that of a goddess wearing the red crown and a collar, seated upon a throne and suckling a young male. There is exquisite detailing here. A tiny Bes-amulet hangs from a necklace and rests on her stomach (Colour Pl.3),¹⁹ a delicately poised index finger supports her breast and the child's hand tenderly grasps the goddess' forearm. The transition from low relief within the area of her torso to sunk relief, as her arm crosses the space between her and the child, is adroitly handled. The rather corpulent child is shown wearing a simple cap wig. In contrast to these touches, the artist rendered her right arm in a more awkward fashion, to indicate the protection of the vulnerable child-god, while also enabling a clear depiction of the child's face. Many nursing goddesses are depicted on the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: CG 70021), though none with a Bes-amulet. Those with labels can be identified as Isis, Mut, Wenut and Neith. While the latter would be the best identification for that on the Bubastis naos, as she wears a red crown, this does not rule out other possible identifications. A hymn to various forms of Bastet inscribed in the hypostyle hall at Edfu includes a reference to 'Bastet the White One (*Hdt*) in *Iwnw*', with a determinative of a seated nursing female figure wearing the red crown (*Edfou* III: 300, 12).

Immediately behind the nursing goddess is a hippopotamus standing on a plinth (Pl. 23). This is one of the finest pieces of relief carving on the monument, with finely rendered facial planes, folds of fat under the neck, and even a sense of motion conveyed by the stance of its hind legs. Hippopotami are usually encountered in later Egyptian temple art as embodying the forces of chaos (Säve-Söderbergh 1953: pl.4), but in this context we should look for a positive interpretation. Cults of Hippopotamus divinities manifesting as this mammal are known at Papremis (near Damanhur?), the Fayum, Oxyrhynchus and Thebes, labelled as 'the White One (*Hdt*)', Ipet, Reret or Taweret, but the

hippopotamus can also represent the goddesses Isis, Hathor, Neith²⁰ and Nut (Billing 2002: 21–2). These hippopotami goddesses can be closely associated with ideas of rebirth and the protection of the young (Seeber 1976: 176), which would fit the Bubastis naos well, as here it is shown alongside a nursing goddess and beneath the Ogdoad. Astronomical reliefs attest to a close association between Isis and the hippopotamus, with the two typically depicted one after another (Neugebauer and Parker 1969: 189–91). Upon the naos, of course, the hippopotamus appears behind a nursing goddess..

The final divine representation on this register is a classically rendered falcon, with plumage carefully indicated. The second register of the right exterior wall of the Saft el-Henna shrine (Roeder 1914: pl. 29) includes a nursing goddess followed by a falcon.

The only preserved part of fourth register on this side is a section of the extended *pt*-sign

The preserved parts of the rear wall feature an undeniable Osiride emphasis, whereas the right wall seems to emphasise the stages of creation, particularly through representations of the Hermopolis Ogdoad and the goddess nursing the young child. It is possible that the other figures, particularly the hippopotamus, falcon, and goddess wearing sun-disc and cow-horns, could also allude to episodes in one or several cosmogonies.

Other fragments of the naos

Several parts of the side wall decoration cannot be securely assigned to a register.

Private Swiss collection no. 240 (Pl. 20)

This block was recorded by Naville, and grouped with the other fragments of the naos in the plates (Naville 1891: 56–7, pl.47 [F]); it is now in a private collection in Switzerland. Photographs indicate that the style and scale of decoration is entirely consistent with the rest of the naos. The block is preserved to 9.8cm thick, with no remains of the original inner surface,²¹ which would have been polished smooth, as on the other fragments with interior wall surfaces preserved (Pl. 18). In the upper register are remnants of the heraldic symbol for Lower Egypt, a seated and enthroned goddess wearing the red crown, and a mummiform figure in an Osiride pose. The lower register was not recorded by Naville. It includes the rear wall of a shrine (?), part of a lion-headed image similar to that shown in the top register of the left wall (Fig. 9), followed by a figure (now lost) holding a smaller lion-image in his or her hand. This figure may have been a priest holding a divine emblem (there are many examples in the Osorkon II reliefs from Bubastis, e.g. Naville 1892: pl.2). At the far left, are the remains of a head-dress featuring cow-horns and a sun-disc.

This block is unlikely to be from the right wall, due to the orientation of the figures. The block cannot be from the rear wall for architectural reasons. It is too wide (47cm) to be placed at either side of this wall, as there is only a 40cm width of wall which is thicker than 8cm. The central part of the rear wall is only 8cm thick, thus too thin to allow this fragment to be placed there (Fig. 3). This leaves the left wall: the right-facing orientation of the figures suggests that it must be from near the front end of that wall (as depicted on the reconstruction, Pl. 5). This placement would reveal an Osiride aspect to this side also, as the fragment includes a standing mummiform figure.

EA 1005 (Fig. 10, Pl. 19)

This small relief fragment comes from the foot of one of the side walls, and was also recorded by Naville and grouped on a plate with other fragments of the naos (1891: pl. 47 [A]). Only the very bottom of the lowest register is preserved, featuring three divine images facing left. This makes it unlikely the block was part of the back wall, while both the left and right walls feature figures in this orientation. The orientation of the name-frieze matches that found in the dedicatory text upon the right wall (Fig. 7), and I thus favour the block being placed on the right wall. The preserved fragment is 35cm thick, indicating it must come from the rear part of that wall, as near the front the left wall is only 17–21cm thick (Pl. 3). A mummiform figure stands in a form of shrine upon a low pedestal, followed by a figure placed upon a higher pedestal. The more elevated pedestal suggests that the latter figure was not an anthropomorphic image. The preserved traces of this image are consistent with a lion- or sphinx-form, with parts of a forepaw, and the detailing of the rib-cage (e.g. Bologna 1990: 172 [119]). The final figure on this side is only preserved as a foot; the depiction of toes indicates that the figure was not mummiform. The bottom of a standard or staff is also preserved. The main interest in this block, however, remains the frieze of names carved beneath the register line, with exquisitely carved detailing of the basket element in the sign-groupings. This is not preserved on any of the other surviving blocks and is discussed above in the outline of the naos' decoration (page 7).

Location unknown (Naville 1891: pl. 47 [B])

This small relief fragment was recorded by Naville and grouped on the plate with the other shrine fragments; its scale fits with that of the naos decoration. The king is shown, facing left, offering Maat to a figure who holds a *wꜣs*-sceptre; only the top of the sceptre is recorded by Naville. A row of stars is depicted above, presumably part of an extended *pt*-sign, and the bottom line of the register above is preserved. This is undoubtedly a fragment from the beginning of one of the rows of divine images, with the king shown offering. Naville's drawing suggests pharaoh is wearing the double crown. A very close parallel is visible on the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: pl. 21). The orientation of the king suggests this fragment was part of the left or rear faces, as discussed above (the reconstructed elevation features the former, Pl. 5).

Several other blocks deserve consideration as candidates for identification as part of this monument. None are included on the reconstruction elevations (Pls. 2–5), as with present knowledge one cannot prove they belong to the naos. The present whereabouts of all of these blocks are unknown.

Two sets of royal cartouches (Bresciani 1982)

The papers of G. Acerbi record his visit to Bubastis on 12 March 1830. He describes as a 'great mound' visible from a distance, with an area of confused monumental remains of Aswan granite. Acerbi notes his diminishing hope of finding inscribed blocks, which mirrors Naville's first impressions of the site nearly 57 years later (Letter of Naville to Amelia Edwards, January 2nd 1887 [EES Archive Ve], quoted on page 39). The two blocks he did recover were in fact 'covered', presumably by debris; note the amount of archaeological deposits which had accumulated above many of the blocks (Pl. 1; see Naville 1891: pls. 5–7). One of these

(Bresciani 1982: fig. 3) is clearly the block now in Greenock (Naville 1891: pl. 46 [D]), while the other is not otherwise known. Acerbi's sketch of this block (Bresciani 1982: fig. 2) shows the cartouches of Nekhthorheb (he read the name as that of Amyrtaeus, as was common at the time), preceded by his Horus-name (*mry-tꜣwy*). Another group of cartouches is found to the right, with standard epithets running beneath the groups of text columns. Bresciani proposes (1982: 3) that this block was part of a monumental naos, but the décor does not support this argument. The close proximity of the groups of royal titles also suggests it is not a standard offering scene; could it have been a statue base, with heraldic plants at the centre of each face? Interestingly, the prenomen cartouches are not symmetrically opposed. A nice parallel for the combination of cartouches, epithets and heraldic plants can be found upon the small limestone column drums of Domitian at el-Ashmunein (Snape 1989: pls. 1–2).

Goddess with vulture head-dress (Pl. 26, Christie's 1991: no. 45, formerly Pitt-Rivers Collection)

This relief fragment bears the upper part of a depiction of a goddess, facing right, wearing a vulture head-dress. The vulture head-dress is commonly worn by forms of Nekhbet and Mut, but is also worn by queens (e.g. Capel and Markoe 1986: fig. 15), though there are no examples post-dating the New Kingdom (Brunner-Traut 1977), when queens played a less prominent role in temple iconography.

On the basis of the published auction photograph, the workmanship, style and material of this relief demanded it be considered for the Nekhthorheb naos. The extended line of the deity's eye on the Sotheby's relief is not found on the figure of the kneeling king on the left side of the naos (Colour Pl. 5), but it is present on other figures upon the naos (Colour Pls. 3–4).

The published image and the accompanying measurements for the block suggest the following dimensions for the figure: 4.2cm from the band of the head-dress to the bottom of chin. These are somewhat larger than the standard dimensions of the divine figures upon the naos (EA 1078, goddess and nursing goddess, Fig. 7b: 2.1cm). While there is significant variation in the scale of the divine figures, particularly with smaller figures, standards and head-dresses, the anthropomorphic figures are consistent in scale (see below). Nonetheless, one must remember that fine pink granite reliefs of this period are found in other monuments at Bubastis, but also at other sites (ns. 22–23).

Lioness deity (Pl. 27; Ede 1984: no. 7; present whereabouts unknown)

A small red granite sunk relief fragment bears the upper part of a lioness deity facing right, holding a *wꜣs*-sceptre. The quality of the published photograph precludes any assessment of the level of polish or the style of the carving. From the dimensions given, it is possible that it could have formed part of the naos, but this is far from certain.

Two blocks seen at Bubastis by Habachi (Habachi 1957: 84–5, fig. 24).

Habachi mentions two blocks bearing images of divinities, but does not specify their material or scale, or offer a photograph. The first block depicts a naked child-god within a clump of papyrus. Divine figures combined with heraldic flora are found on naoi (Roeder 1914: CG 7002I, pl. 31), but this block could also

be from the reliefs depicting gods on various temples (Naville 1891: pls. 45–6). The second block is not illustrated (1957: 85):

the upper (register) has the figure of a winged falcon-headed god, while the lower has a falcon-headed god with the goddess Mert who is usually present in scenes of festival.

Cornice block with cartouches (Pl. 28)

This block, reproduced at very small scale in the *Description de l'Égypte* (V: pl. 29 [9]), seems to match EA 1080 (Pl. 7) in its architectural form: a frieze of uraei tops a cornice containing a sun-disc, itself separated from a row of six vertical cartouches, presumably alternating between a royal *prenomen* and *nomen*. No roof is visible, perhaps being obscured by the mud in which the fragment is partly buried. Naville cites this block and states that he excavated several fragments of the upper cornice. If this is the case, it would provide a *terminus ante quem* for the naos' destruction, though it is very likely this happened many centuries before this date. If this is not the fragment now in the British Museum, then it must be from the front of another naos from Bubastis. It cannot be from the side walls of the great naos (the cornice is partly preserved on EA 1079 [Pls. 3, 5], and features cartouches without the *nbw*-sign). The block is also very unlikely to come from the rear of the shrine, due to the uraeus-frieze and winged sun-disc. The block lying next to the shrine fragment is carved with stars, and thus is undoubtedly from a ceiling. The lack of ceiling decoration upon the preserved parts of the naos presented here (EA 1079, 1080) suggests that this block is from elsewhere, whether from the roof in part of the temple, or from another shrine (see Chapter 6).

It is likely that further blocks of this monument survive, whether in museums or private collections, in archaeological deposits at Bubastis (including Naville's spoil) or even built into the foundations of later structures in Zagazig or the surrounding area (ancient, medieval or modern). Identifying those blocks which fit the naos is difficult, as many blocks are only known through auction catalogue photographs, and it is impossible to ascertain if the distinctive polish, or wall thickness is preserved. The widespread use of red granite in 30th dynasty temples, both in the Delta²² and the Nile Valley²³ increases the number of possible provenances for many blocks, though remains in black granite or granodiorite are much more plentiful. It should also be remembered that nothing survives of the decoration of Late Period royal tombs. The burial chambers and superstructures may have been decorated with finely carved hard stone reliefs.²⁴

Many finely polished but little decorated fragments were noted at Bubastis by Habachi (1957: 81). Further blocks have been recorded as part of the joint University of Potsdam–University of Zagazig project at Tell Basta (see Chapter 6). The contemporary temple is discussed further below by Rosenow, but it is relevant here to mention the other blocks recorded by Naville (1891: pls. 44–6), and why these are not further fragments of the great naos. These all come from the same general area in the temple site, and many bear the names of Nekhthorheb. Several bear registers of divine images, albeit with hieroglyphic labels between groupings. The presence of labels, and vertical dividing lines also containing texts, indicate that these do not come from the same naos, and are probably reliefs from the sanctuary or adjoining rooms. Naville classified them as such, and emphasised that only those blocks on plates 47–8 of his publication featured material with the fine polish extant on all parts of the naos that I have

seen. The presence of *kheker*-friezes on many of these blocks strongly argues against their being part of the naos, as this is an unknown motif upon the many preserved contemporary naoi. The nature of some of the texts supports the attribution of these blocks to wall reliefs, while the thickness of some reliefs precludes them being interpreted as naos fragments.²⁵ Evidently, this also applies to the fragments recorded by Habachi (1957: 72–81), though he did confuse the two groups (1957: 84). Where there is a dedicatory text below a register of gods upon a block, it seems to be from the temple walls.

The sculptural style

One of the considerations when choosing the format of publication for this book was how best to represent the aesthetic qualities of the relief carving. In stark contrast to the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: CG 70021) which does not have torus-mouldings, commissioned by Nekhtnebef between 2 and 36 years earlier than the Bubastis shrine, and set up in a temple only 10 km east of Bubastis, the decoration upon the naos erected under Nekhthorheb at the latter site was conceived and realised as a temple in miniature. Whereas the earlier naos features lightly incised figures, carved in a more summary fashion dictated by the smaller scale of the registers, the Bubastis naos is actually carved with reliefs as if they were 'reductions' of full-scale temple reliefs, rather than the miniaturised decoration on the side of a naos. Thus, when examining enlarged photographs of the reliefs, there is little discernible deviation from the relief style of Nekhthorheb attested at other Delta sites such as Samanud and Behbeit el-Hagar. Consider, for example, the facial features of the kneeling king shown on the left wall of the monument (Colour Pl. 5). The faint smile, fleshy cheeks, upturned almond-eye and the hint of the eyebrow are all stylistic traits well attested in contemporary hard stone reliefs (e.g. Mysliwiec 1988: pls. 89 [c], 90 [a, b], 92 [a]). The Bubastis image omits the cosmetic line extending from the eye: the sculptor omitted this detail to allow sufficient space to create an adequate modelling of the eye proper, the more dominant feature in the face. The enigmatic 'sculptors' plaques' may have performed a role in the accurate scaling of two- and three-dimensional representations.²⁶

When one considers the possibility that this naos may have been set up within a fairly narrow sanctuary, and, if roofed, a very dark space, it represents a stunning example of how aesthetic beauty and attention to detail were thought necessary for the reliefs to fulfil their sacred role. It should be noted that an ancient intention to paint the naos once carved is quite possible, though no evidence of paint is preserved. Some of the details are almost invisible due to the colour of the stone and the shallowness of carving. Examples include the feathered motif and the subtly rendered *sm3-t3wy* symbol on the side of the throne of the seated lioness goddess (EA 1079, Fig. 9, Pl. II).²⁷ The latter detail recalls the small *sereks* which feature on the greywacke architectural slabs of the 26th and 30th dynasties (rarely visible on photographs, but see Perdu 2002: 92, n.d), though these monuments were undoubtedly illuminated by a degree of natural light, whereas the naos was probably not.

The variety of divine forms which received some form of cult in any major temple complex was rather overwhelming. Upon shrines with such decoration (see Chapter 3), there is no consistent pattern, at least to the modern viewer. I believe this further underlines the incredible variety of Late Period temple

cult, from one location to another. Evidently, some forms are repeated. Falcons, nursing goddesses (cf. Roeder 1914: pls.29–32), recumbent male figures (at Dendera: DE V: pl.24 [9]; on a shrine of Apries: Roeder 1914: pl.9) and mummiform gods are known on naoi of this type, but do not necessarily represent the same deity in each case. The Saft el-Henna hippopotamus (Roeder 1914: pl.32) does not look like the Bubastis one. Each of these naoi is notable for imagery that includes rare forms and variants. I have not found an exact parallel for the image of king and papyrus-plants shown on the Bubastis naos, nor the composite creature behind him (**Fig.9**). There are some interesting compositions and active groupings on these naoi, such as the depiction of Mahes devouring a captive, yet still wearing a formalised crown, on the Louvre naos (Piankoff 1933: 166, fig.6). A dynamic form of the same god is shown on the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: pls.23, 32), while an example in the Hibis sanctuary is labelled as Nefertum (Davies 1953: pl.3, register IV). Departures from the ‘traditional’ canons of Egyptian formal temple iconography seem to be a feature of these naoi and the Hibis sanctuary. The Leiden shrine includes a depiction of a standing male figure with his face shown frontally (labelled as *ḥh-m-fdt*, cf. Boeser 1915: pl.3), while the Bubastis naos has a re-awakened figure ‘floating’ above a bier. Though the face is damaged, parallels indicate it was a frontal view of the god. Other relatively unusual depictions include a baboon and ostrich feathers enclosed above a basket (Roeder 1914: CG 70008, cf. Pl.9, top left), a pair of cats at the foot of a Hathor-column with the monkey touching a *hm*-jar just above (Cairo 30-5-24-5, see Chapter 3) and a plethora of examples on the Saft el-Henna naos, including a four ram-headed figure, and a winged seated figure (Roeder 1914: pl.19). It is possible that some of these representations were very rare forms, at least in formal temples. A similar degree of innovation and variation occurs at Hibis, including some that look like variants created by individual artists: the figure of Anubis carrying a sarcophagus lid looks somewhat non-formal for a temple sanctuary (Davies 1953: pl.3, register V).

The Bubastis naos was clearly carved on site, where it remained unfinished. We shall probably never know to what degree local tradition could affect the details of decoration. Rare (or even unique?) forms carved on these monuments may reflect local creations or variants. Should we not allow the artist(s) some freedom, in the details of certain divine forms? A schematic plan of the naos decoration undoubtedly existed, such as that preserved upon a papyrus from Thebes (Goyon *et al.* 2004: 359, fig.467), but the individual representations may have offered more of an opportunity for invention. It is possible the ‘sculptors’ plaques’ may have performed a role in such an environment. The majority are in limestone, but examples in hard stone are known (see n.26). Complex manifestations of gods seem to proliferate in the latter part of the 1st millennium,²⁸ though the paucity of preserved temples of the New Kingdom, particularly when one discounts the Theban mortuary temples, may place too much emphasis on this development. One suspects this artistic/iconographical speculation on the forms of the divine first developed in the large temples of the Delta, thus partly explaining why no examples of such naoi are attested to south of Herakleopolis (see Chapter 3). The priests and artisans who worked together on such designs were effectively highlighting their access to the divine (or implicitly, the king’s access), or in

real terms, their access to the sacred texts within the temple libraries. Such divine imagery is generally not found on private monuments, though healing statues, cippi and sarcophagi do display some degree of parallel.²⁹

Nonetheless, such developments in the visual vocabulary of gods could reflect a ‘loosening’ of the limitations in formal temple art; one is reminded more of funerary compositions found in royal tombs of the New Kingdom, and *Book of the Dead* vignettes. While the Bubastis naos employs some of this visual vocabulary apparently unusual in temples, it is less ‘innovative’ than the Saft el-Henna naos. Due to the more spacious layout of the registers, the overall impression of the large Bubastis naos is of a traditional temple monument. Indeed, the naos has more in common with some of its Saite predecessors than the Saft el-Henna shrine commissioned by Nekhtnebef. Of course, the possibility that some of the artisans who worked on the Saft el-Henna naos later worked on the Bubastis naos is not unfeasible in terms of both time and distance, given the proximity of the two sites. In addition, the artists still approached some representations in a rather awkward manner, such as the hands of Maat (**Fig.9**). The faces of the two mourning goddesses, carved in the top register of the rear face, also exhibit differences. The left goddess has a more pronounced smile, more slender nose, less fleshy mouth and narrower eyes carved at a slight angle (**Pl.13**). In the case of the Ogdoad, there is also variety. Of the four snake-headed figures, the one to the viewer’s left is standing on a slightly lower pedestal than the three following ones, and the footwear also exhibits variations, particularly in the shape of the ‘eyes’ (**Fig. 7b**). Furthermore, the general form of the hands and feet of the anthropomorphic deities varies. The symmetrical scene on the threshold includes two identical standard inscriptions flanking the prenomen cartouches: *di M3^ctn mwt.f, ir.f di ḥh* (**Pl.21**). The lack of symmetry to the layout is quite striking, with the text on the right fitted into a significantly smaller area. There is no such inconsistency in the symmetrically opposed cartouches.

Such minor variations may hint at the work of several sculptors, which is to be expected on a monument of this scale. But can details be assigned to the work of individual sculptors? I am sceptical whether this is possible here, as one must also allow for minor variations and mistakes caused by the difficulties in working with red granite, where the mottled surface colour would make initial outlines, whether carved or drawn in ink, more difficult to see. One should remember the minute scale of these details, which may result in more variation between similar elements when carved by the same hand.

Consideration of the unfinished areas plotted on elevations of the monument (**Fig.5**; summarised in the table on the next page) reveals that the basic surface polish had just been completed on the cavetto cornice at the front of the left side (EA 1080), whereas the cartouche frieze upon the cornice at the other end of the face and the dedicatory text were virtually complete, except for some very minor details (internal detailing of hieroglyphs and divinities). The four registers of gods in all three exterior face seems to have been similarly near completion, again with small details missing only. Polishing of the surface to be decorated and carving of the scenes and inscriptions may have progressed in parallel, at least to some degree. Two fragments of uncertain emplacement, which may come from this side (**Pl. 20** and Naville 1891: pl.47 [B]) would indicate that the figures here were complete, possibly excepting some final detailing. Thus it is

Evidence of unfinished carving upon the shrine³⁰

Figure 5 illustrates the location of these areas

Front	
Threshold (PL.21)	<i>k3</i> -sign; no left arm Falcon atop royal <i>k3</i> ; initial incision only Sceptre held by <i>k3</i> ; initial incision only Antennae on bee in left-hand <i>nsw-bity</i> title; initial incision only
Left	
Cornice, towards front	Smoothed and polished, no carving (PLs.8–9)
Dedication text	<i>ht</i> -sign; lower notches not fully carved (Fig.9, PL.10)
First register	Lady of Thebes; collar only partly incised (Fig.9) Maat; proper left hand not fully carved (Fig.9) ³¹
Back	
First register	Bottom line of white crown of Osiris not indicated (Fig.8b, PL.13) Right-hand mourning goddess: lower line of collar not indicated (Fig.8b, PL.13)
Third register	Vertical end-line to left of shrine with baboon has not been carved (there are noticeable scuff marks in this area, which correspond to the expected position of the line, and may attest to ancient preparatory work (Fig.8a, PL.15))
Right	
First register	Frog-headed deity (second from left); 'ears' of jackal-sandals are incomplete (PL.25) Frog-headed deity; 'ears' on jackal-sandals of left-most figure at top of EA 1079 may be unfinished, or damaged (Fig.7a, PL.25) Collars on deities only feature initial guidelines for shape, except the second frog-headed figure from the left, for which a row of pendants have been completed (Fig.7a, PL.25)
Second register	Snake-headed deity (second from right); dividing line of legs not carved (it is on other three) (Fig.7b, PL.24) The 'eyes' of the sandals are handled differently in each case, and not to same level of detail in register above. The sandals of the middle two figures are candidates for unfinished work (Fig.7b, PL.24).
Interior	
CG 70016	Floor of cavity not fully cut back before smoothing
Roof	
EA 1080	Horizontal 'lip': upper surface only partly smoothed, not polished
Unplaced blocks	
EA 1005	The <i>ꜥnh</i> -sign to the left does not feature all of the interior details present on the <i>ꜥnh</i> -sign to the right (Fig.10, PL.19).

NB. It is assumed that the interior was intended to be undecorated, as this seems to have been typical; however, three of the Saft el-Henna naoi bear interior decoration (see Chapter 3).

possible that the work was progressing from bottom to top in this area of the left exterior wall, with the register decoration largely complete, and possibly the dedicatory text, but not the front end of the cornice on this left side.

The preserved part of the right side also suggests the dedicatory text may have been complete. The main registers are again virtually complete, though some details remain to be added. Figure 5 suggests these details were clustered around the rear end of this wall, but this probably reflects the distribution of preserved blocks rather than the progress of work. The surviving part of the third register from the top has no unfinished details, so it is possible that work on this side followed a progression from smoothing to dedicatory text, and then with registers being checked for detailing from bottom to top. Fragment EA 1005, from the bottom of the right side, features unfinished detailing of individual hieroglyphs (Fig.10). However, the virtually complete state of the dedicatory inscription does suggest that the text was a priority; a contemporary relief from Behbeit el-Hagar has several unfinished details in the figures of pharaoh and the gods, but the text above is apparently complete.³²

The preserved area of the rear exterior wall reveals that a rather basic element was in the process of being carved at the left end of the second register, but is complete in the register above: the vertical line which acted as a framing device (Fig.8a). The top register seems to be complete excepting two small areas of detailing. The front also features a mixture of small-scale elements of the decoration yet to be carved (e.g. the large *k3*-arms). Some of the unfinished details were clearly in the process of being carved when work stopped (e.g. the *k3*-sign on the threshold, CG 70016), while others have not yet been added, such as the dividing line between one of the snake-headed deities' legs, which is found on the three other figures (Fig.7b, PL.24).

Unfinished reliefs from all periods demand we should expect a wide variety of working methods affected by local conditions and circumstance: at Philae there are clear examples where the text was to be added after the carving of accompanying scenes (Vassilika 1989: 156, pls.37–8), and examples of relief decoration being undertaken from top to bottom, or bottom to top (Vassilika 1989: 178–9). As on the Bubastis naos, a wall in the Opet temple at Karnak preserves areas of undressed blocks, smoothed surfaces ready for carving and completed decoration adjacent to each other, with no evident progression from top to bottom or *vice versa* (Goyon *et al.* 2004: fig. 443). Arnaudès-Montélimard surveys the evidence for unfinished decoration in the barque chapels of the New Kingdom at Karnak (2003: 205–6). It is particularly notable that a dressed and smoothed area could be left uncarved on both upper and lower registers, despite the scenes to either side being (apparently) complete in terms of both figures and text. There are also areas where paint may have been used to complete the decoration of the Karnak chapels, though there is no evidence of the intended use of paint on the Bubastis naos.

On a monument of this scale, presumably being finished in its intended position of installation, several teams of workmen could work simultaneously.³³ The almost-complete nature of the divine images suggests that detailing was being added in degrees; at such a scale, one can imagine the need for a master sculptor to 'check' for missing details before the monument was ready for dedication. Artists checking a completed monument would be more likely to miss details at the edges and near the bottom of such a large shrine. Vassilika's analysis of the process of work at Philae includes several examples where text and scene are both virtually complete, but with details such as the patterning of feathers, eyes on uraei, beading of collars and cosmetic lines still to be added (1989: 182). Similar minute details required a final treatment in the hieroglyphic texts. It is precisely some of these details that are unfinished on the Bubastis shrine, and prompt me to suggest that significant textual content did not remain to be added. Clearly the monument was (1) sculpted, (2) polished, (3) the scenes and inscriptions were carved (with no clear evidence to support a uniformly top to bottom, or bottom to top, system) and then (4) the details were added and checked. Stage (2) was achieved in all but the front end of the left side, which indicates that the stages were not strictly consecutive, but could have been progressing at different times and rates upon different parts of the naos.

In such temple monuments, one should not preclude a degree of initiative on the part of individual master sculptors: a decision to modify the appearance of a certain figure in relation to the original design³⁴ (there are no signs of recarving upon this naos).

There are no traces of preparatory grids upon the naos surface, although examples do survive from contemporary red granite reliefs (Jenni 1998: pls.98, 118 [h–i]). It must not be assumed these were always deemed necessary. The Ogdoad provide a nice discrete data set in which to examine the consistencies in representation; elsewhere the variety of representations and the loss of so much of the monument clouds any detailed analysis of proportion and style between figures. The frog-headed deities are remarkably consistent in appearance, excepting unfinished details (**Fig.7a, Pl. 25**). All are 23cm tall, measure 7cm across the shoulders, and have waists of 2.7cm; there are small variations in the length of their feet. The figures in front of the frog-headed deities also exhibit these proportions. The snake-headed deities of the Ogdoad are similarly consistent, though with narrower shoulders than their male counterparts (5cm). Where other comparisons can be made, consistency in proportions and scale is clearly being sought: the seated gods on the second and third registers of the right side (**Fig.7b**), and on the left (**Fig.9**) and rear faces (**Fig.8b**), all feature the same basic proportions (e.g. from feet to shoulder, 16cm).

Finally, while it is easy enough to explain a possible reason for the monument's incomplete state, the invasion of the Persian army in 343 BC, it is less easy to suggest why the carving was not finished in a subsequent reign, particularly in the Macedonian or early Ptolemaic period, when the décor upon so many 30th dynasty structures was completed (see Chapter 7). The only piece of intentional damage to the decoration is the hacked out face of Osiris during resurrection (**Pl.13**); the preserved cartouches have not suffered (**Figs.7a, 9 and Pls. 7, 21, 22**; Naville 1891: pl.47 [B]). Could the Persian army have been responsible for the breaking up of the monument into the fragments known today? The fragments of the shrine may then have been reburied in the temple compound during any Ptolemaic rebuilding, which would help explain the near-perfect preservation of the polished surfaces. Evidently, this is only one possible scenario, but one worth considering.³⁵

Notes

- 1 Roof surfaces did bear decoration in rare cases, such as upon the naos of Amasis now in Leiden (Boeser 1915: 1, pls.1–5), further discussed in Chapter 4.
- 2 One of the other naoi at Bubastis bears dedications to different gods on either jamb, namely 'Heryshef king of the Two Lands who is in Bubastis' and 'Bastet the great, lady of Bubastis' (Roeder 1914: CG 70013). The naos of Amasis now in Leiden (IM.107, Boeser 1915: pls.1–5) is explicitly dedicated to Osiris-Hemag according to the dedicatory text, but this god is not one of the many depicted or named on the front.
- 3 These observations were made during study of the fragment in the Cairo Museum in February 2003.
- 4 This drawing is not accurate, but the signs are clear. These architectural slabs, of the 26th and 30th dynasties, were the focus of a recent study (Yoyotte 2003). However, two of the British Museum examples remain to be fully published (EA 22 and 998, both inscribed for Nekhtnebef), and will form part of a study on these monuments currently being prepared by the present author.
- 5 Teeter also cites the 'post-Ramesside naos of Amasis (Louvre E605)' as bearing a depiction of the presentation of Maat (1997: 39, n.21; a photograph is published in Yoyotte 1972: pl.19 [B: N.504]). This naos is one of the small wooden shrines with glass inlays discussed in Chapter 1.
- 6 The same orientation is used on the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: CG 70021), but three 26th dynasty naoi bear a dedicatory text to be read in the opposite direction, Roeder 1914: CG 70011, Piankoff 1933 [Louvre D29] and Boeser 1915: pl.3 [Leiden IM.107].
- 7 The group of mourning goddesses flanking Osiris represents a sub-

- group treated as a unity within the register, with Osiris as the dominant orientation (see Clère 1973: 101). More elaborate and lengthy groupings around one god are found on other naoi (Roeder 1914: CG 70021, pl.20).
- 8 Illustrated by Ladislav Bareš in a lecture at the conference *Aegyptus et Pannonia III: Diversity and Similarity in Egyptian Religion* (Budapest, November 15th 2004).
- 9 I am grateful here for the comments of Dr. I. Munro (Totenbuch Projekt, University of Bonn), who notes that no exact parallels in *Book of the Dead* papyri are known to him.
- 10 Cruz-Uribe describes this figure as a 'human-headed vulture' (1988: 10) and Leitz prefers 'human-headed falcon' (2002a: 431), but the form of the body, and especially the legs, is not that typical in depictions of either of these birds. Rather, the form of the legs is that familiar from other birds such as the lapwing (G24), heron (G32), and the fledgling chick (G47) (Hannig 1995: 1050–3), while the body is rather a generic bird-form, in contrast to the rather abstract form of the body of the composite creature on the Bubastis naos.
- 11 Cippus fragment British Museum EA 15974 also bears a scaraboid depiction of Ptah-*hpl[r]-ds.f*.
- 12 The goddess' face is viewed in profile, rather than frontally.
- 13 e.g. 'Osiris upon the *mdny*, great god' in Davies 1953: pl.3, register VII.
- 14 Foreign and Egyptian dignitaries are depicted in similar poses in the *sed*-festival reliefs of Osorkon II at Bubastis (Naville 1892: pl.2, 11, 14–15); here the pose clearly intimates loyalty and humility towards pharaoh.
- 15 A similar baboon figure, 'Atum who dwells in his city' is shown upon the 'Theban' west wall of the Hibis sanctuary, followed by two standing figures of Bastet, holding knives. A figure with near identical iconography, although very different in style, is found in the tomb of Petubastis at Qaret el-Muzawaqqa in ed-Dakhla oasis: Osing *et al.* 1982: pl.20 [b].
- 16 It is noteworthy that the Osiris chapels at Karnak feature exterior reliefs which emphasise Amun-Ra and Theban gods, but the sanctuary of each chapel bears Osiride decoration (Claus Jurman, lecture to *Aegyptus et Pannonia III: Diversity and Similarity in Egyptian Religion* conference, Budapest, November 15th 2004). This highlights that caution is needed when interpreting partly preserved structures, which applies to all of the temples at Bubastis.
- 17 The Brussels example published by Limme is unusual for the human ears that flank the snake's 'neck', between the tripartite wig. A similar bronze figure in the British Museum, also of unknown provenance, wears an elaborate *atef*-crown (EA 46676).
- 18 This type of footwear is discussed by Quaegebeur 1992; a further faience figure of Thoth with this attribute is Eton Myers Museum ECM 1587, Schneider *et al.* 2003: 74 [91]. Note that many of the statuettes depict Thoth naked, as are the snake-headed goddesses upon the Bubastis naos. A similar type of sandal is often featured on images of *Bes-pantheos*, e.g. Etienne 2000: 55, cat.141 (faience stela), Kákósy 1985: 113 (papyrus) and also upon a cippus fragment in the British Museum (EA 36254, unpublished).
- 19 The association of Bes and nursing children is also evident from small glazed composition amulets, e.g. Wilkinson 2003: 103.
- 20 A bronze statue of a Taweret-style hippopotamus in Cairo bears an inscription invoking Neith (CG 39151, Daressy 1906: 287); the personal names suggest a Saite or later dating.
- 21 I am grateful to Robert Bianchi, for this information (February 14th, 2003).
- 22 In addition to Bubastis, red granite temple reliefs and architectural elements are known from Samanud, Spencer, N.A. 1999; Saft el-Henna, Naville 1887: 5, pl.8c; Tanis, Montet 1952: 48, 76, pl.11; Horbeit, Kuentz 1932: 62–3; a column fragment from el-Tawila, Naville 1887: 4, 28, pl.9H; Memphis, Mousa 1985; and possibly Tell el-Balamun, Spencer 1996: 37, pl.8b.
- 23 el-Ashmunein, Roeder 1914: 45–6, pls.11b, 49d–e, Szafranski and Makramallah 1989; Abydos, Roeder 1914: 53–5; Elephantine, Jenni 1998 and Niederberger 1999; note also unprovenanced statues such as Louvre E27124, Berman and Letellier 1996: 84–5.
- 24 A relief recently acquired by the Louvre has been assigned to the undiscovered tomb of Psamtek II (Louvre E32580; Christie's 1999: no. 235)
- 25 E.g. Boston Museum of Fine Arts 90.233, a relief block which is 57cm thick (Bothmer 1953: 2, n.5), whereas the thickest wall known from the preserved parts of the great naos is 40cm (see Chapter 1).
- 26 There is much debate about the purpose of these objects, see

- Stanwick 2002: 90–3; Tomoun 2005. Modern attempts at classification might be misleading: there is no reason objects used to facilitate the production of sacred statuary and reliefs could not then be employed as votives, or even used in some form of dedication ceremony.
- 27 It is possible that *sm3-t3wy* symbols were to be added to other thrones (e.g. the nursing goddess on EA 1078, **Colour Pl.3**), but that these remained unfinished.
- 28 A composite deity in the form of *b3*-bird and scarab is depicted on an unprovenanced relief fragment now in the British Museum (EA 894, unpublished).
- 29 For example, the sistrum flanked by seated cats is found on healing statues, e.g. Kákósy 1999: pls. 3, 32, where both cats are labelled as *Nb-nfrw*. Baines (1990: 7–10) offers some comments on officials who seem eager to highlight their ability to access or understand types of skills or information.
- 30 I have only included examples which can reasonably be termed unfinished. Of course, further detailing may have been planned for other areas, such as interior detailing of the tall double feather worn by the god behind the baboon on EA 1078 (**Colour Pl.4**).
- 31 There is surface damage in this area, but close inspection reveals the surface has not been cut back to the same depth as on the proper right hand.
- 32 Montreal Musée des Beaux Arts, 1964.B.1. See Russmann 1972; I examined the unfinished areas during January 2005, for which I would like to thank John Fossey, Curator of Archaeological Collections.
- 33 Though from a funerary context and an earlier era, and concerning painters not sculptors, the number of artists (including master and apprentices) posited for the small, cramped interior of the Tutmoside tomb of Suemniwet at Thebes (TT 92) gives an idea of how much work could take place simultaneously (Bryan 2001).
- 34 From a different context, note Bickel's comments on how the variation in the formulation and phraseology in the Coffin Texts may attest to the initiative of individual priests, or even scribes (1994: 246).
- 35 The attitude and actions of the invading armies of Artaxerxes III towards Egyptian temples is not well represented in the archaeological evidence. However the destruction of the 29th dynasty royal tomb at Mendes seems to date to this period, Redford 2004: 13–22; similar destruction may have been wrought upon the installation for the sacred rams at the same site (Redford and Redford 2005:191).

3. Compendia of Divinity: Naoi Depicting Rows of Divine Images

One striking aspect of the 30th dynasty temple-building programme is the number of monolithic naoi set up throughout Egypt. These are attested in a wide range of sizes, materials and architectural forms, with various styles of decoration (see Appendix 4). This chapter traces the development of the type of decorative programme found upon the Bubastis naos, followed in Chapter 4 by a consideration of possible interpretations for the function of the decoration on the Bubastis naos. The 30th dynasty represents the apogee for this shrine-type. No securely dated examples are known from later periods, despite a number of surviving Ptolemaic monolithic naoi. The absence of such shrine decoration in the early Ptolemaic era is particularly striking when one considers the evident efforts to continue 30th dynasty approaches to temple architecture (see Chapter 7).

The decorative scheme under discussion is that in which the exterior walls of a naos are divided into registers, each with depictions of a row of various divine forms, usually facing in the same direction. Such decoration usually forms the majority of the decoration on the three outer faces. In some cases, the inner wall surfaces are decorated in a similar manner. Pharaoh is sometimes seen offering to the gods, but we are not concerned here with naoi where one or several standard offering scenes adorn the outside walls,¹ nor those that bear decoration only upon the door-thicknesses.² The latter type of shrine was the common form employed in the Late Period, if the preserved naoi form a representative sample. Of course, further types of shrine also existed (e.g. Saleh and Sourouzzian 1987: nos.204–5). The first naoi bearing registers of divine image date to the late 26th dynasty, and examples are known from the ensuing 250 years. Throughout, there is significant variation in the architectural form, scale and decoration of these shrines.

Earlier naoi of this type may well have existed. Third Intermediate Period temples, and the shrines and statuary housed within them, are very poorly preserved. If one excludes the large number of private statuary of this date found in the Karnak cachette, and the small-scale architectural additions to temples at the same site, the surviving sources amount to very little. In the chapel of Osiris-*wp-išd* at Karnak, dated to the reign of Osorkon II, the western room bears reliefs depicting divine images. These are unfinished but a brief description indicates they bear iconographical similarities with the naoi discussed below. On the West wall, a depiction of the seven Hathors is followed by a figure holding a shield topped with an image of Horus. The rear wall features an image of a Horus falcon amongst reeds (PM II²: 203; Leclant 1951: 463). The unpublished eastern room also contains images of deities arranged on registers, at least on the east wall.³ Though badly damaged and very fragmentary, the reliefs depict two seated figures, one crocodile-headed, followed by a series of four seated goddesses. At least one of the goddesses is identified with a toponym, of which only the *nwt*-determinative survives. The four goddesses are followed

by a seated falcon-headed deity and a representation of a sacred barque. The latter contains a panel bearing the name ‘Osiris’, topped with a damaged element and identified with the term *ššm*. This word is commonly used for divine images, including those installed in portable barques. Though the representations are lost, further labels are partly preserved behind this barque, underlining that the decoration invoked terrestrial cult topography: ‘the bull of Heliopolis’ and the ‘*b3w n iwnw*’.⁴ The décor in this small chapel at Karnak provides evidence for earlier use of this iconographic scheme than the surviving naoi suggest. Chapels of such modest size may not have been provided with monolithic shrines. Furthermore, it is interesting that it is found in a Theban monument, when the surviving naoi of this type all come from a northern context.

A stela attributed to a daughter of Khufu by its inscriptions, but seemingly set up in the Isis temple at Giza during the Third Intermediate Period or shortly thereafter (Zivie-Coche 1991: 218–46, pls.39–40; Desti 2004: 164–5 [83]) employs similar iconography across four registers. It shows divine forms, emblems and a sacred barque, accompanied by short inscriptions giving the name, material and size of the image. The quality of carving is very poor, and this monument, at only 69cm tall, is on a much smaller scale than the naoi. The artist evidently sought to emphasise the representation of the barque of Isis and the Sphinx (Horemakhet) through their position and scale; Zivie-Coche (1991: 233) feels this distinction is reflected in the quality of the carving too. It has been suggested that the order in which the representations are shown may echo that of a festival procession (Zivie-Coche 1991: 235). The dedicatory text purports to record the rebuilding of the Isis temple in the reign of Khufu, and the production of ‘an inventory upon a stela (*spt dit r wd*)’. No-one, whether king or dedicant of the stela, is depicted offering to the gods in any of the registers. The text then sums up Khufu’s achievements, noting that offerings were renewed, the temple was rebuilt in stone, ruins were reconstructed, and ‘the gods were in their place’. This last, rather standard, phrase may be significant in the inventory as it may well have served to draw attention to the state and location of the divine images. Indeed, should some of the statuary have been damaged, the depictions upon the stela may have performed the role of substitutes.

The first use of a decorative scheme similar to that upon the Bubastis naos on a free-standing shrine is upon a sandstone naos of Apries from el-Baqlieh, Cairo Museum CG 70008 (Roeder 1914: 29–36, pls.9–11a; Zivie 1975: 104–12). This is an unusual material for a monolithic shrine: none of the 30th dynasty examples are of sandstone or limestone (see Appendix 4). The inscription upon the façade gives part of the king’s titulary, qualifying him as ‘beloved of Thoth *wp-rhwy*’. All the basic elements of the decorative scheme were already in place by this date, though at a much smaller scale than in later examples: the naos is only 1.56m in height, less than half that of 30th dynasty shrines with this type

of decor. Pharaoh faces divine images on each of the three decorated outer wall faces; two representations of pharaoh are used on the back wall to preserve symmetry. No dedicatory inscription was included, thus precluding a definitive interpretation of this monument. Short inscriptions act as hieroglyphic labels to identify the divine forms, except on the rear exterior wall. The king undertakes different cult actions in each scene, again identified with a short text (e.g. *dw3-ntr, irt sntr*), displaying a certain degree of symmetry between right and left walls (Zivie 1975: 111). The divine images exhibit the variety evident in later monuments: anthropomorphic, theriiform and emblematic forms of deities are depicted, some on pedestals, thrones or within sacred structures. The interior is decorated, but only on the rear wall, where pharaoh is shown kneeling before 'Hathor-Nehmetawy lord of heaven, powerful one, divine one, who creates what exists'. This goddess is depicted within a shrine. I presume an image of Thoth *wꜣ-rꜥwꜣy* was housed in the shrine, as he is invoked in the text upon the front of the naos; perhaps the presence of the cult image precluded the need for a representation on the rear wall. There is a preponderance of divine forms which could be manifestations of Thoth upon this shrine (e.g. ibises, baboons), suggesting a local focus to the decoration. The only toponym cited in the inscriptions is that which occurs in the inscription identifying an ibis-headed god as 'Lord of Khemenu'. This is the ancient toponym for el-Ashmunein, where a significant cult temple of Thoth was located. However, one should also expect to find this form of the deity represented in the Lower Egyptian city of el-Baqlieh, where a sizeable temple dedicated to Thoth *wꜣ-rꜥwꜣy* is known to have existed (Zivie 1975).

Another monument from the reign of Apries is a dark black stone (probably schist or greywacke, rather than basalt) fragment in Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E.5818. Acquired from the Amherst collection in 1921, it is usually ascribed to Sais on the basis of its inscriptions (PM IV: 48; Speleers 1923: 88–9). This fragment is the left wall and door thickness of a naos. The interior is highly polished but undecorated (Luc Limme, pers. comm. 1 August 2003). A column of large hieroglyphs is inscribed upon the door thickness, flanked by *w3s*-symbols, giving the Horus-name and *nomen*-cartouche of Apries. Parts of eight registers are preserved on the main surviving decorated face, originally the left wall of the shrine, featuring rows of divine images beneath an extended *ꜣt*-sign. The figures mostly face right, towards the front of the naos. A figure of Sekhmet, in a pose familiar from depictions of Meret-goddesses, faces in the opposite direction, clearly part of a group centred around a form of Neith (in a similar manner to the mourning goddess and Osiris grouping on the Bubastis shrine, Fig. 8b). The label for Neith clearly indicates she faced right. The king is not shown offering to the rows of divine images in any of the preserved registers. Short hieroglyphic inscriptions identify each image, but any dedicatory text that may have existed is not preserved on this fragment; it may well have been located above all the registers.⁵ The divine images include anthropomorphic figures, animal-forms, divine emblems and sacred barques. Some images are upon pedestals, either simple rectangular forms or ones combined with a staircase, while the standing figures are placed directly on the baseline of each register.

A column of text precedes certain divine images, a device which groups several deities by association with a toponym. The second preserved register from the top features a group

associated with the *r(w)ꜣnt niwt hry*, 'the gate of the upper town'. In the register below, there is a group preceded by the text 'Lady of the *mrꜥ*'. This term, written with the house determinative, can refer to an avenue (Hannig 1995: 347), as el-Sayed prefers (1982: 413), but it is also a type of chapel best attested in Old Kingdom sources, and particularly associated with Hathor (Barta 1983). The images associated with the section labelled 'Lady of the *mrꜥ*' include 'Neith foremost of *B-ꜥnꜥ*', 'Neith beloved of all the ladies', Wadjit, Nekhbet and a 'Sekhmet who resides in Sais'. The iconography of these figures does not recall types particularly associated with processional routes, so that it is difficult to discern which type of *mrꜥ* is intended. The next register down refers to a '*Hwt* (of the) Meret(-goddess) of Upper Egypt'. El-Sayed proposes that these sections reflected parts of the Neith temple at Sais (1982: 413). The toponyms and epithets of certain deities certainly support the theory that this monument refers to deities in the context of different parts of the Sais temple, but without any references to dimensions or material for each divine image, caution is needed in viewing the depictions as statuary, especially on such a partially preserved monument. Furthermore, there are at least three divine forms explicitly associated with *ꜥꜣt* on the lowest register preserved to its full height, two of them Sobek. None of the representations are provided with dorsal pillars, as on the Saft el-Henna naos (see below), and the only anthropomorphic figures placed on pedestals or bases are those depicted as seated. Some of the forms, however, are reminiscent of statuary, particularly that in the uppermost preserved registers. Here, a cow is fronted by a standing royal figure, with another royal figure below the udder. This is, of course, a depiction of a statue type known from the 18th dynasty (Saleh and Sourouzian 1987: no.138; Ziegler 2002: 218, 405 [47]), indicating that such forms were still in use during the Saite period (if not the survival of earlier examples in later temples). The depiction of divine barques, a feature of the Saft el-Henna naos discussed below, may further suggest this decoration represented statuary housed in various parts of the temple(s) at Sais.

A limestone monument, also from the reign of Apries, is known through two fragments now in the Cairo Museum, 22-11-55-1 and 30-5-24-5. A frieze of uraei at the top of the relief suggests a temple wall or screen. The three-dimensional nature of the object appears somewhat 'flattened', with very little depth to the uraei, and the undecorated band below may be a schematic rendering of a cavetto cornice. Five registers are preserved on 30-5-24-5,⁶ with the familiar variety of divine forms, facing left. Hieroglyphic labels are preserved above most of the divine forms, simply identifying the divinity but providing no association with a particular toponym or manifestation. Many of the gods are shown in typical form, such as a falcon, a nursing goddess, Neith depicted as a standing woman wearing the red crown, or Hu and Sia as a pair of male gods. Sekhmet is shown as a lioness-headed woman, but with her arms held across her chest in an Osiride pose. A baboon is shown seated upon a pedestal, with one arm outstretched above a large *ꜣm*-symbol. The accompanying inscription identifies the baboon as a representation of *Dꜣ(ꜣ)* (?). The most striking figures are in the second and third registers: Hathor-sistra columns. Two such columns are preserved on the second register, that on the left being flanked by two seated cats, and at least five identical columns were depicted on the register below. However, no texts were carved to elucidate the purpose of

these columns.⁷ It should also be emphasised that dimensions and material are not given for each image. Where sufficiently preserved, the deities are all on small pedestals or seated upon thrones. The deities depicted present quite an unusual group, with 'secondary' deities such as the baboon-form *Df(3)* alongside 'primary' deities more familiar as the focus of temple cult and ritual, such as Neith and Sekhmet. As such, I am wary of interpreting the decoration as representing statuary.

A red granite naos from the reign of Amasis, Leiden Rijksmuseum van Oudheden IM 107 (Boeser 1915: 1, pls. I–5; Zecchi 1996: 12–15)⁸ is now known to be from Kom el-Ahmar, near Shibin el-Kom in Menoufiyeh province (Yoyotte 2001a: 72–5; site no. 44 in the EES Delta Survey: www.ees.ac.uk/fieldwork/deltasurvey.htm, see location on Fig. 1). Its architectural form is rather simple, with a pyramidal roof but no cavetto cornices or torus mouldings. The exterior walls bear a dedicatory text stating that the 'great naos (*k3r ʿ3*)' was dedicated to Osiris-Hemag. Yoyotte suggests a statue of a reawakening Osiris may have been placed in the shrine (2001a: 75). The cavity of the Leiden shrine is significantly wider than it is deep; perhaps it housed an image such as the 26th dynasty gneiss statue with a head-dress of precious materials now in the Cairo Museum (Hornung and Bryan 2002: 176–7 [85]). A further unusual feature of this naos is that the surfaces which form the pyramidal roof are fully decorated, with the royal titulary, epithets and representations of the *imy-wt* symbol. The front of the naos is rather funerary in character, with the four sons of Horus, images of Anubis (accompanied by lions labelled as 'heir of the god (*iwʿ-ntʿ*)), and Nekhbet and Mwyt shown on the lintel and doorjambs.

The three exterior walls bear two registers of deities, with a range of anthropomorphic and animal forms depicted. Pharaoh is not represented. Many of the gods could be classed as 'guardians', similar to those upon the Saite and 30th dynasty architectural slabs (Bologna 1990: 172 [119]; Satzinger 1994: 46–7; Perdu 2002: pl. 7), from funerary contexts such as the *Book of the Dead* (cf. Zecchi 1996: 12–15, nn. 31–7) and the decoration in Ramesside royal tombs (e.g. Bénédite 1891: 403, pl. 3). Three-dimensional representations of these figures are also known (Clère 1986). However, deities such as Maat, Horus, forms of Osiris and 'Isis mistress of the Two Lands' also appear on the Leiden naos.

The upper register on the side and rear faces features deities that Zecchi identifies as belonging to the Osirian cycle (1996: 12–15). The left side is explicit in this respect, with three forms of Osiris (*Nb-ddw*, *3tf-wr* and *Nb-R-st3w*) preceded by Isis and Nephthys. The rear and right walls are less well preserved, but do not present an obvious grouping of deities. Ascertaining a motivation behind the distribution of the divine figures is difficult, further hampered by the fact that the decoration was never completed (most evident on the right side). The Hemag form of Osiris invoked the god at a stage of rebirth, thus the presence of so many deities familiar from the Osiride/funerary sphere seems fitting, both on the front, the roof (*imy-wt* symbols) and in the exterior registers (manifestations of Isis in the form of a vulture are typically found in funerary contexts, Russmann 1997). Despite this apparent emphasis, no representation of the god lying or hovering above a bier is included on this shrine; such images are found on many of the naoi discussed in this chapter.

Could the images upon the Leiden naos represent statues? There are three classic depictions of a falcon, two shown in the

second register on the left side, all labelled as Horus. One could imagine three falcon-images housed in a sizeable temple. However, none of the divinities are shown with dorsal pillars, and there are no references to material or dimension. Furthermore, there are no composite groupings, barques or deities depicted within shrines, as found on the Brussels fragment, and the Saft el-Henna naos (see below). The anthropomorphic standing divine images are not provided with pedestals, except for the upright mummiform figure of 'Osiris lord of Busiris'. Toponyms are generally omitted from the gods' designations, suggesting that a cult topographical approach was not a primary consideration, with the exception of the Osiride forms related to Busiris and Rosetjau. While the decoration of this naos may recall that found on the Bubastis shrine, it seems to fulfil a more focused cultic role: the gods depicted are evidently closely associated with the resurrection of Osiris.

Another naos from the reign of Amasis and originally installed at the same site, Musée du Louvre D29 (Piankoff 1933, for provenance see Yoyotte 2001a: 66–72),⁹ is markedly different in decorative content and architecture. This shrine takes the form of a temple in miniature, with cavetto cornice, torus mouldings and a frieze of uraei. In contrast to the Bubastis naos, this frieze runs around all four faces. The Louvre naos is topped with an arched roof. Both doorjambs feature three registers of two gods: including the four sons of Horus, Nile inundation figures and offering bearers. The decoration of the door-thicknesses with scenes, as found on these two naoi of Amasis, is not encountered on any 30th dynasty naoi, where the jambs only feature the royal titulary, and occasionally texts relating to the deity housed within (Roeder 1914: CG 70021, hymn of Soped and a small scale figure of pharaoh).

Returning to Louvre D29, the side walls feature three rows of divine images, with an identical dedicatory text elucidating their purpose:

He made as his monument for his father Osiris-Merty, the god foremost of *Fk3t*, a great naos (*k3r*) in (red) granite on which are placed the names of the gods who follow him. May he be given life! (Piankoff 1933: 164)

The back dedication highlights another reason for depicting the gods:

He made as his monument for all the gods who are found in the temple of Osiris-Merty, so that their name is durable for eternity. (Piankoff 1933: 167)

Each row of gods is then introduced with the following phrase in the first register:

Words spoken by those (who) give all life and dominion to the Horus *Smm-M3ʿt*.

Subsequent registers substitute stability (*dad*) and well-being (*snb*) for life (*ʿnbt*) and dominion (*w3s*), with the same pattern observed on the other two decorated faces.

These texts are the earliest explanatory glosses for a naos of this type, and enable us to understand one possible role fulfilled by such decoration. According to the ancient text, this naos emphasised the reciprocal relationship between the gods of this temple and pharaoh, who is rewarded with attributes of kingship for his piety towards those deities. The number of gods in each register varies, but as with the Bubastis naos, a variety of forms are employed, including anthropoid, animal-headed and purely theriiform deities, but here two *djed*-pillars are also depicted. One

is labelled as Osiris-*dd*, while the other is a subsidiary element within a shrine containing an image of Ptah-*dd*. Shrines are used to enclose pairs of deities (Piankoff 1933: fig.4), and each register is topped with an extended *pr*-sign, though without internal stars indicated. While some deities are depicted upon small thrones or pedestals, many are just standing on the register line. The majority of the hieroglyphic labels which identify the gods lack epithets, though some are associated with a toponym,¹⁰ while others are in groupings denoted by a label.¹¹ It is interesting that the gods qualified with a toponym are clustered in the lower two registers on each side. Zivie-Coche describes the scenes on the Louvre naos as representing divine statues (1991: 234), but as discussed below, this need not apply to all naoi of this type. The inscription explicitly states that these gods ‘are found in the temple of Osiris-Merty’. Thus it is reasonable to assume that they were represented by statuary somewhere in the temple, though this does not imply that the naos bears depictions of that statuary. Interestingly, the rear wall seems to feature an emphasis on creation, with the Hermopolis Ogdoad and ithyphallic gods in the first two registers, and the Osiride cycle (and Sokar) depicted below. The latter aspect is also emphasised in the top register of the left wall and, of course, clearly present on the Bubastis shrine’s rear face. The Osiride cycle is closely associated with creation through the myth of the resurrection of Osiris. The top register of the left wall and the first part of the second register also underline the creative aspect of divinity, with representations of Ra-Horakhty, Atum, Shu, Tefnut, Geb, Nut, Osiris, Isis and Nephthys, which may well refer to one form of the Heliopolis Ennead (as noted by Piankoff, 1933: 178). If this was the case, then aspects of two cosmogonies are being alluded to on adjacent sides of the shrine.

Another preserved naos from the reign of Amasis is from Athribis in the central Delta (Cairo Museum CG 70011, Roeder 1914: 38–42, pl.12a, the majority of the base was subsequently recovered, Habachi 1982: 224–35, pls. 42–5). The front, beneath the opening, is decorated with protective deities, but it is the side walls that interest us. Unusually, the area above the cornice is decorated with a scene of the king facing a series of gods. These figures are carved in a rather summary fashion, somewhat reminiscent of the *chronocrates* in the upper frieze of the corridor around the sanctuary in the temple at Dendera (Cauville 1999: 3–5; Leitz 2001: 327–35). On the left side (Habachi 1982: fig.7), this includes a form of Osiris (*Wsr m sht-htp*) sitting upon a bier in a shrine, followed by a row of anthropomorphic divinities, seated on thrones. After the goddess *Mnht-št3*, groups of three figures are depicted, labelled as: ‘*ntrw hntyw sht-htp*’, ‘*ntrw imyw hwt-št3*’, ‘*ntrw imyw stp-s3*’ and ‘*mdh m ...*’. The right side (Habachi 1982: fig.10) features similar decoration, and here pharaoh is described as ‘adoring four times’. The first group, labelled as *hry-nmit.f*, consists of an Osiride figure upon a bier, attended by two goddesses. Thereafter follow seated anthropomorphic figures: the goddess *Mnht-hbt* and groups labelled as ‘*ntrw imyw hwt-št3(t)*’, ‘*ntrw hryw-ib pr-hnw*’, ‘*ntrw m t-wrt*’, ‘*ntrw hntyw pr-psdt št m št-ntr*’. Evidently, there is a strong emphasis on identifying groups of gods with toponyms or individual cult installations. The frieze reliefs would have ensured pharaoh ‘adored’ all these deities when ritual was enacted before the naos.

Were all these toponyms at Athribis, or was a wider cult sphere being invoked? It is interesting that *št-ntr* and both goddesses *Mnht-hbt* and *Mnht-št3* appear on the 30th dynasty altar

from Athribis (Vernus 1978: 120–35) which may feature a listing of certain cult *foci* in the temple complexes there, or in the surrounding region. The depiction of three groups of three seated generic divine figures strongly suggests the importance of all-encompassing plurality, as opposed to depictions of individual cult images stored in the temple. Unfortunately, many of the locations alluded to, such as *hwt-št3*, *t-wrt*, *hwt-št3(t)* and *št-ntr*, can be associated with many temple complexes. Thus there is some ambiguity for the modern viewer, as to whether these gods are explicitly associated with Athribis, or a wider cult landscape.

Most of the surfaces below the cornice are now lost, but enough of the bottom register survives to indicate the nature of the décor. On the left wall, the king is shown kneeling before a series of anthropomorphic seated figures, interspersed with cobras upon pedestals (Habachi 1982: fig.9). The right wall is better preserved, with the same layout of figures, all of which are named in the accompanying inscriptions (Habachi 1982: fig.11). The remnants of a register above indicate that a standing figure of the king faced different forms, including male and female forms, but also a trio of figures grouped together on a low platform. Finally, the top register of the rear wall depicts a standing king offering *nw*-jars to three seated gods and three further figures upon a bier (Habachi 1982: fig.12). A further group face away from the king, possibly towards another image of him to the right, now lost (as on CG 70008, see above). The lack of preservation, of both the rows of deities and any explanatory texts, makes it difficult to understand the purpose of the main registers, and the motivation behind distinguishing the deities on the frieze and those on the main walls. All the divine images are seated upon thrones, placed on pedestals, or grouped on a bed. The divine forms display considerably less iconographic variety than the other naoi discussed here, being confined to anthropomorphic (some shrouded in wrappings) and serpent forms. There are no other animal forms, emblems or standards on the preserved parts of the naos. Did the main walls feature a more focused theological grouping, as on the Leiden naos (IM.107), a representation of deities associated with different parts of a temple complex (Brussels E.5818), or did this naos fulfil another purpose?

One final monument, now almost completely destroyed, seems to fit into this group of naoi commissioned under Amasis. Apparently of greywacke, the naos is known through Medieval descriptions, and it can be dated on the basis of the lintel built into a Cairo mosque (Stricker 1939). One of the descriptions clearly indicates that the outer walls were decorated with rows of divine images:

un grand nombre de figures d’astres, de sphères, d’hommes et d’animaux. Les hommes y sont représentés dans des attitudes et des postures variées; les uns sont en place, les autres marchent; ceux-ci étendent les pieds, ceux-là les ont en repos; les uns ont leurs habits retroussés pour travailler, d’autres portent des matériaux; on en voit d’autres enfin qui donnent des ordres par rapport à leur emploi. (Stricker 1939: 216)

Such a description, long before the modern decipherment of hieroglyphs, suggests registers of gods, some seated, others standing, some holding divine attributes (described as ‘matériaux’).

Apries commissioned at least two such naoi for cult temples in the Delta (el-Baqlieh, Sais (?); a third is unprovenanced), with his successor continuing the tradition with three or four more

such shrines, all from Lower Egypt (Athribis, Memphis and two from Kom el-Ahmar). No such material is known from the subsequent 150 years (the 27th, 28th and 29th dynasties), though this reflects typical levels of preservation of temple monuments of this period. The decoration in the Hibis sanctuary, commenced by Darius I, indicates a degree of continuity; this is discussed further below. The respect directed towards Saite pharaohs during the 29th and 30th dynasty is well known, thus it is unsurprising that this naos type continued to find favour in the 4th century BC. The next preserved evidence of such a monument was found at Herakleopolis Magna (Petrie 1904: 2, 20, 28, pls. II, 28). This provenance is notable, as it represents the only example known from Upper Egypt. Described as 'green-black basalt' by Petrie (suggesting it may actually have been of greywacke or schist), a narrow segment of the outer decoration was discovered in trenches south-east of the temple proper, 'outside the *temenos*', in association with a limestone column base and stone chippings.

Two lines of dedication text ran along the top of the outer walls of the shrine, of which only parts of a cartouche and the royal titulary (?) survive. Below this were at least two registers of decoration. The preserved segment of the top register shows a kneeling king with simple bag-wig and the end of an accompanying cartouche featuring the signs *stp-n*. This is part of a standard form of epithet found in the names of many pharaohs, particularly of the Ramesside and Third Intermediate Periods, and the 4th century BC. On stylistic grounds, in particular the facial characteristics of pharaoh, this shrine fragment can be attributed to the 4th century. Thus the cartouche must be that of Psammuthis, Hakoris, Djedhor, Nekhthorheb, Khabbash, Alexander the Great, Phillip Arrhidæus or Alexander IV; Ptolemy I and Ptolemy III are also possibilities. The remnants of one sign recorded by Petrie in the cartouche of the dedicatory text do not fit with known writings of any of the above-mentioned pharaohs' names. In the lower surviving register is a lion-headed figure, seated upon a pedestal, facing the opposite direction to the king. The fragmentary remains of this monument preclude further description or interpretations, but the scale of the figures in the registers, with respect to the dedicatory texts,¹² is reminiscent of the shrine-type discussed here, rather than the naoi with single- or double-scenes of pharaoh offering to a god or triad.

The best known naos bearing such a decorative scheme is the grey granite naos from Saft el-Henna, Cairo Museum CG 70021 (Naville 1887; Roeder 1914: 58–99, pls. 17–31; Neuffer *et al.* 1932: 54–6, fig. 3, pl. 10). Commissioned in the reign of Nekhtnebef, this shrine is a rich source for the study of Late Period religious iconography, but has yet to be studied *in extenso*, despite the existence of Roeder's *Catalogue Général* publication.¹³ This is not a suitable place for such a study, but the architecture deserves comment in relation to the Bubastis naos, and some of the texts pertain directly to the depiction of gods in registers on the outside of naoi, and provide the clearest expression of *one role* that could be fulfilled by these shrines.

The mass of data contained in the decoration is overwhelming: over 122 gods are depicted on the right outer wall alone, which is not fully preserved. A generous estimate for the Bubastis naos as a whole, if featuring four registers per side, would amount to somewhere between 100 and 150 images. Three lines of dedicatory text are carved at the bottom of each exterior face of the Saft el-Henna shrine, above which were at least six registers of divine figures on the left, right and back walls. The

registers are 26cm high, compared to 43cm on the Bubastis naos. A further line of text is found above each register. Additional inscriptions identify many of the figures or groups depicted. This labelling is much more extensive on the right side of the shrine, perhaps as it had reached a further stage of completion? A figure of the king undertakes cult actions before each sufficiently preserved row, including on the back wall. The orderly scheme of registers is broken only on the outer right wall, where four registers of a different scale depict the king in various pious acts (Roeder 1914: pl. 28); such an arrangement may have been mirrored on the now-destroyed outer left wall. Above the registers was a frieze of cartouches flanked by falcons with outspread wings (Naville 1887: 6, pl. 1 [S.d]), echoing the arrangement on another naos from Bubastis (EA 1106, see Appendix 1). The interior is fully decorated, seemingly with the same general scheme, though with fewer lines of inscription. Naville states that the ceiling of the cavity was also decorated; one block bears rows of vultures with outspread wings (Naville 1887: 6, pl. 7 [Sc ab]), similar to the ceiling of the Edfu naos of Nekhthorheb (see *Edfu I*²: 11; Cauville 1997b: 219, fig. 61). Such ceiling decoration underlines the conception of monolithic naoi as temples in their own right, as this is a decorative scheme employed on the ceilings of other rooms in the temple (e.g. Junker and Winter 1965: 212–13, 422–7; for Bubastis see Chapter 6). Finally, the door-thicknesses at the front are decorated with symmetrically opposed figures of the king, wearing the crown of Upper and Lower Egypt, respectively. Both scenes are labelled: 'words spoken by Thoth, adoring the god four times', intimating this deity's role as provider of divine speech. Nine rows of hieroglyphs containing a hymn to Soped flank these figures, almost completely preserved on the right thickness.

The following translations are based on Schumacher's readings (1988: 160–79):

Right jamb

(Row)

Giving praise to Soped by the good god, lord of the Two Lands Kheperkara, son of Ra, lord of appearances [Nekhtnebef] ... this ... Thoth himself of the first time, adoring this august god ...

(Column 1) ... in his temple ... his great ... against his enemies of the day, in which he killed the Apepi-serpent, (thus) he opened a good year. The gods and goddesses develop jubilation and rejoicing in the great sanctuary (*st wrt*) because he captured the punished ones with his wings.

(2) ... divine falcon, the land of the East is in joy twice, once Ra (?) destroys his enemies, the West-land comes out in joy, after this power went and made content Ra in his horizon. His enemies were slaughtered. He crosses heaven with beautiful winds, he approaches the beautiful West. The Westerly Ones are in jubilation

(3) at seeing him, after he had approached them. They are the bodies who rejoice at seeing him. Behold, he (twice) is in their mouth, not one of their bodies awake, except him alone, it is one day not another, which goes (by?). Behold, he reaches *Bakhu*, he rises

(4) in that mountain, the animals of the mountain-lands frolic at his presence, when his light and brilliance is upon their faces. He brings midday in the fullness of time, the secret it is in heaven. The circumpolar stars and the unwearied stars, they develop no tiredness. Horus strong-of-arm, his arms carry the harpoon, he slayed the Apepi-serpent

(5) at the front of the barque. Horus carries the rudder, with it he steers in the great barque. Seshat the great, lady of writing, places the potent sayings in the god's barque. Ra has come, to kill his enemies in his manifestation as Ihty.

(6) He is prepared in his own body, in this his name of Horus-Soped. He is filled in his moment of truth in this his name of Mahes. He is prepared in his own limbs, in this his name of

(7) Horus-of-the-East. He subdued them as ashes in his forms, in his name of Horus strong-of-arm. He cuts the legs on one occasion. The corpses (stretch) to Asia of *Bakhu*, he destroyed them upon

(8) this Eastern mountain, the bodies consigned to the flame. The day is with wind every day, in his name of Horus lord-of-justification, prepared every day in your name of Horus-Soped. How pleasant are you to the limit of heaven! Soped-Ra-Horakhty, created in truth

(9) ... gods and goddesses in happiness, their hearts receive joy, every day is bound with happiness and jubilation, the power of the East, Horus of the East, Ra it is, foremost of *Bakhu*, he traverses heaven in his [own] body ... eastern ... they sail every day.

In synopsis, the hymn expounds Soped's mythological achievements (slaying enemies and the forces of chaos such as Apepi) and defines him in terms of a series of names (Ihty, Horus-Soped, Horus Strong-of-Arm, Horus-of-the-East, Mahes, Horus lord of justification, Soped-Ra-Horakhty, Ra on the right hymn). The left jamb also bears a hymn, with similar content, though only the bottom part of each column of inscription is preserved (Roeder 1914: 62). Thus the principal, axial, view of this monument, to those permitted to access the sanctuary, focused on pharaoh's relation to the main temple god, Soped, not the multitude of divinities which adorned the inner and outer walls of the shrine.

The textual content of the dedicatory text at the foot of each outer face provides hints towards the purpose of this monument. Beneath the entrance to the shrine are three symmetrically arranged renderings of the king's five names, with three 'beloved of' epithets invoking 'Soped lord of the East', 'the Might of the East' and 'Horus of the East'. The left side (Roeder 1914: 62–3; Naville 1887: 8–9) commences with a description of almighty pharaoh, emphasising his authority over foreign lands as set out below.

Dedicatory text, left wall

(1) The good god, lord of strength, strong of arm, who defeats the foreign lands, one of useful advice, who provides for Egypt, protector of the nomes, one who drives back the Asiatic countries, who destroys the place of their *rm*-fighting (?), imposing of heart, who seizes the moment without turning back, who pulls back his elbow for a bow of precision, one who gives the temples the greatness of his power, what is said is instantly created, like (that) which comes from the mouth of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkara, son of Ra, Nekhtnebef [may he live for eternity].

(2) This august god, Soped lord of the East, remembers the praised ones of His Majesty. All the gods rejoice for him for his *ka*, if he steps before them, for he protects the divine bodies (*ht-ntrw*) in his time and after many years. He asks (for) the glories of this god in the secret place, it is unknown to the inaugurated ones, (where) all the Enneads of the nome hide their bodies. The God placed it in the heart of the lord of the Two Lands, to let the beauty be known, his ...

(3) a great many years of the like not known to happen. One sees it accumulating because of their announcement in the *nmit*-room/bed. There is joy, and it is said: 'The ruler comes from the East, he illuminates the land with his glories. Your statue was erected as lord of triumph. The good god, by it he is called, makes ideal his throne in the *Imn-hprw* of the lord of the East, of his own body. The gods follow him on his right side, the Ennead on his left side, when he comes. The Ennead is in front of him, like Ra when he rises in the horizon, like when his sanctuary is established, the lord of the [days], he loves ...

Dedicatory text, rear wall

(1) ... the might of the East, strong of arm, who is issued from Horus of the East, the eldest son of the Horizon-god, the one and only, one who surrounds Egypt, who makes calm the enemies in the land and the confusion within, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Kheperkara, son of Ra Nekhtnebef, may he live eternally.

(2) ... the great god, ruler of the Ennead, the Horizon-god, who rises in the horizon, one of turquoise, one who shines with [light?], all men live when they see his brightness, Horus in *Bakhu*, whom the gods praise at seeing him.

(3) ... for you, your place as lord of justification. The Two Lands in their entirety are glad, since you rise in the horizon of *Bakhu* ... He overthrows the foreign lands in their valleys, it is he who makes prosperous Egypt, the eye of Ra, who protects the bodies of the gods. I endowed your domain with all beautiful things. You made as my reward valour and strength like Re eternally.

Dedicatory text, right wall

(1) The [King of Upper and] Lower Egypt, lord of the Two Lands Kheperkara, son of Ra Nekhtnebef, he made as his monument for his father Soped lord of the East, the shrine of black stone of granite, the doors of black copper (*hnty k3m*) adorned (*s3m*) in gold, the image(s) upon it (*snm hr.f*)¹⁴ ... sanctuary (*st*) ... together with that which is upon the book-roll (*3rt*), made as an excellent work for eternity. The rewards were a great kingship, all foreign lands under his soles, like Ra for eternity.

(2) [The] good [god], lord of the Two Lands, decreed according to his own desire to make prosperous the god's body in his shrine (*sw3d d[rt]-ntr m iwann-ntr*), after which His Majesty came to *Šsmt*, because he satisfied this august god, Soped lord of the East, upon his throne as lord of justification. After many years, they saw it ... His Majesty. He is pleased (with) his throne in the time of Kheperkara, his beloved son, Nekhtnebef may he live eternally.

(3) The order (*s3m*) of the king himself, was to set up these statues/images (*s3hr hntt ipt*) of these gods of *Šsmt*, upon this naos in the time of His Majesty. Each Ennead is in (its) place. They were like that written in the book roll (*3rt*), with all their glorious images (*sddw.sn nb [?h?]*). It indicates the manner of making correct offerings, not confused by it ... Thoth, like the astute one foremost of *Hsrt*, like these relief (?)-figures (*hprw*)¹⁵ in great festival, may he live like Ra eternally.

These dedicatory inscriptions are not to be read around the naos, as is often the case with such monuments. The texts can be understood as a set of three discrete statements on each outer face, which combine to present Nekhtnebef (through Soped) as defender of Egypt, one who protects and appeases the image of Soped and the accompanying gods and goddesses, particularly their bodies (*ht-ntrw*), images (*hntt*) and relief figures (*hprw*). Pharaoh is subsequently rewarded with kingship and control over foreign lands, and gains access to restricted knowledge concerning the gods. The upper line on the right side underlines that the naos, made of precious materials, was decorated on the basis of information in sacred papyrus rolls, while the lower line underlines how such rolls also provided the information for the images carved upon the naos, and a hint that these should act as a guide to correct rituals. These images form the focal point of the lines of text accompanying each register of divine forms. Each line of inscription contains different details, but do not seem to be specific descriptions of the gods shown on that particular register. Reading the registers from top to bottom:

Left wall, registers 1–3: not preserved

Left wall, register 4 (Roeder row 3)

... the shrines before Soped, their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown likewise, under the king of Upper and Lower Egypt

Kheperkara, son of Ra Nekhtnebef may he live for eternity, beloved of Soped lord of the East, may he live like Ra.

Left wall, register 5 (Roeder row 2)

... before Soped, their (divine) forms (*kdw.s[n]*) are shown likewise, under the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, lord of the Two Lands, who undertakes ritual, Kheperkara, son of Ra, of his body, his beloved, lord of appearances Nekhtnebef may he live for eternity, beloved of Soped lord of the East may he live, be prosperous and have all dominion like Ra for eternity.

Left wall, register 6 (Roeder row 1)

The rewards for these (actions) for their beloved son, the good god, lord of the Two Lands, Kheperkara, son of Ra lord of appearances Nekhtnebef, may he live for eternity, is the office of Ra [and many years on the throne of] Geb, his strength like their strength, all the Two Lands rejoicing at seeing him, like hearts rejoicing (*h^c-ib*) at seeing their beauty. His desire is to encompass the lands like Ra. He rises in *Bakhu*, terror of him is in the hearts of the Nine Bows like the terror of their (i.e. the divine forms') Majesties amongst the *Fenkhu*, by the greatness of his glories amongst all the gods, may he live like Ra.

Back wall, register 1 (Roeder row 6)

... book-roll, in another image (*sdd*),¹⁶ their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown (*in*), like that upon their sanctuaries/places (*st.sn*), without exception therein, under (*sic*) the king of Upper and Lower Egypt [Kheperka]ra ... in peaceful years of eternity, in stability, life and dominion; the Nine Bows are under his sandals, he repels the rulers of the *H3w-nbw* (with) his terror.

Back wall, register 2 (Roeder row 5)

... decree (*wpp*), that which is upon the book-roll (*sfd*), making their images (*smn*) upon this naos, their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown likewise, under the Majesty of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkara, after the course of the stars,¹⁷ the width of the land surrounding (*phrhr*) the foreign lands, seizing their arms, the Doers. He conceived for him ... illumination ... Nekhtnebef, he made the sacred barques (*wts-nfrw*) of all his fathers of *T3t-nbs*, may he live like Ra eternally.

Back wall, register 3 (Roeder row 4)

... destroying your enemies. The gods which are resting (*htp*) on the shrine of Wenut are upon its left and right side (lit. east and west). Set up on their places/sanctuaries in *Hwt-nbs*, their (divine) forms (*kdw.s[n]*) are shown likewise, under the Majesty of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkara, son of Ra Nekhtnebef may he live for eternity. The sand-mountains (*dw.w-s^cy*) are in bowing at his place, awe of him reaches into distant foreign lands, may he live like Ra for eternity.

Back wall, register 4 (Roeder row 3)

You are powerful and mighty, (through) your strength, your arms are strong so as to strike those who attack Egypt, the gods ... son of Ra, Nekhtnebef. The gods which are resting upon the shrine of Soped who strikes the Asiatics, on its right and left (lit. west and east) side, those set up in their place (*h^c hr st.sn*) in the temple of Soped, their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown likewise, under the Majesty of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkara, son of Ra Nekhtnebef may he live for eternity, beloved of Soped, lord of the East may he live, endure, have all dominion, all health, and all joy, and arise upon the throne of Horus, like Ra for eternity.

Back wall, register 5 (Roeder row 2)

The gods that are set up in their places (*st*), found in another secret sanctuary (*gm kt st s3*) in a sacred place (*bw-dsr*) in *Hwt-nbs*, their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown (*in*) likewise, under the Majesty of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkara, son of Ra

Nekhtnebef may he live for eternity. Made by His Majesty, seeking the glories of his fathers, (making) sacred the statues in their proper form (*dsr smn n km3.sn m3^c*), so that every god is at its place (*st.f*), their statues/images (*smn.sn*) upon this naos, to create this town, I place (?) ... before him, this town is established (to) protect the temples (*hwt.w-ntr.w*), the plants of the land flourish, the breath of life is placed in all of them, the horizon is at the head of it, may he live like Ra for eternity.

Back wall, register 6 (Roeder row 1):

Found in another secret sanctuary inside the temple (*Hwt-ntr*), except these. Their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown (*in*) likewise, under the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, lord of the Two Lands, Kheperkara ... brought to another book-roll (*rt*) of the temple from the book-roll (*sfd*) of divine speech. Showing (divine) forms (*in kd*) like that which is upon the book-roll (*sfd*) [under] the son of Ra, lord of appearances Nekhtnebef, may he live for eternity. His Majesty made these glorious thrones (*3ht.w*). He made (them) in the temple of his father Soped lord of the East, in setting up the gods in their places (*st.w.sn*), because they desired their position in his time. Establishing the throne of His Majesty, foremost of the living, like heaven and the throne of Ra endures, may he live like Ra for eternity.

Right wall, register 1 (Roeder row 6)

... His Majesty said as a decree of the lord of Upper and Lower Egypt, because at his desire, his words were created [his heart exalts at saying]: begin to (*w3r*) hack up (*fdk*) the blank rolls (*sww*),¹⁸ it is (now) found upon this shrine (*gm hr K3riw pn*) ... Leading to the place of appearance, in the great temple of electrum (*hwt-3 d^cm*) ...

Right wall, register 2 (Roeder row 5)

... [their] (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are [shown] likewise, under the Majesty of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, [Kheperkara], son of [Ra Nekhtnebef] ... these by his fathers, lords of *T3t-nbs*, the august tree prospers, its branches cause the green to grow well. The entire land, the sanctuary of this god prospers every day. The plants and all good things grew, *Ssm* is created prosperous, because all people of Egypt are in his time.

Right wall, register 3 (Roeder row 4)

So the ruler Kheperkara, it is the statue (*hnty*) of Ra, it is the heir of Horus of the East Soped-Shu, in the temples, it is great of monuments ... in these nomes, satisfying his fathers, lords of *T3t-nbs*, Egypt is made excellent in rites/ (divine) forms, *T3t-nbs* is made true, prospering in its entirety, the whole land in jubilation and everyone in correctness, since one made it (as) stated in the holy writings, Ra of the people (*rhyt*), the land of *Hwt-nbs* prospers.

Right wall, register 4 (Roeder row 3)

You (pl.) see these, which were made for you (by) your beloved son, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, son of Ra, Nekhtnebef, may he live for eternity. All the gods and goddesses ... Ra is satisfied because of them, the people (*rhyt*) admire the powers (*3hw*), which he made in the horizon of *Bakhu*. He made plentiful your offering tables with every beautiful thing, he presents the daily offering, no-one stops it, and the glorious fields cover your altars. May your reward for him for this be the rule of Upper and Lower Egypt, Upper and Lower Egypt are seized by (his) power like Ra for eternity.

Right wall, register 5 (Roeder row 2)

His Majesty made these thrones (*nst*) of the Glorious Ones. They see what he has made in their temple, their son that is on their throne (*nst.sn*), the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkara, son of Ra, Nekhtnebef, may he live for eternity in ... he [endowed] the domains (*hwwt*). *Sed*-festivals of Tatenen and appearances as ruler of the lands were given to him. The officials and people (*p^cwt rhyt*) were in adoration at his face, the whole land bowing to His Majesty, because of the greatness of his reputation before them, the water issues forth

at his time, glorious because of its perfection, because he satisfied their hearts in doing Maat, the land living on it every day.

Right wall, register 6 (Roeder row 1)

These that His Majesty made for your *ka*, lords of *Bt-nbs*, his rewards being the office of Atum and the lifetime of Ra, as ruler of the living. All hearts, they are united with him, all foreign-lands ... his staff (of office) is over their great ones (*wrw*), it is as protection for Egypt (*B3kt*), healing the eye of Ra to protect it, Kheperkara it is, who protects its pupil (that is) the offices of all the gods' temples in their entirety for eternity, because it is your beloved son, glorious of monuments (*3h-mmw*) in *Hwt-nbs*, the son of Ra Nekhtnebef, may he live like Ra for eternity.

The interior reliefs are partly preserved on the right wall. A line of inscription was carved above the five registers, while the second and fourth registers also featured a line of text. This was carved at small scale, and without a dividing line beneath it, unlike those on the exterior walls.

Interior, right wall, dedicatory text

The gods which are resting, all (divine) forms (*hprw*) are hidden, justified, on the left (lit. east) of this august god ... beloved of ... may he live like Ra.

Interior, right wall, register 2 (Roeder register 4)

The gods which rest on the northern sanctuaries (*st.w mhty*), their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown (*in*) likewise, under their son, whom they love ...

Interior, right wall, register 4 (Roeder register 2)

The gods which are set up in their sanctuaries (*st.w*), their (divine) forms (*kd[w].sn*) are shown (*in*) under the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt [Kheperka]ra ...

Hwt-nbs, since the time of the ancestors, the enemies come to fall on the two banks. The images (*smn*) are set up on account of ... in the time of Ra, the Majesty of ...

From these texts, it is clear the deities were carved upon the naos to ensure continued divine protection of both the temple and Egypt as a whole, and their continuing prosperity. The gods thus guaranteed that pharaoh would enjoy a prosperous kingship, *sed*-festivals and dominance over foreign lands. Again, the information, apparently of restricted access, seems to have been based on the images themselves (set up in their places in the sanctuary), or gleaned from papyrus rolls, the latter presumably kept in a temple library. These papyri are astonishingly viewed as expendable once the texts are set in stone. Unsurprisingly, there is also an emphasis on adhering to traditions, as Nekhtnebef is 'seeking the glories of his fathers, (making) sacred the statues in their proper form'.

The inscriptions above each register contain numerous references to the divine images depicted. The terms used for the images vary, including *hnty*, *sdd*, *smn* and particularly *kdw*. Such terms can be translated as 'statue', but equally as 'image' or 'form'. It seems clear that many were envisaged as depictions of existing statuary, as some of the images are accompanied by short inscriptions indicating they were made of sacred *nbs*-wood (Schumacher 1988: 175), and a few images include dorsal pillars (clearest on Naville 1887: pl.3 register 2, pl.4 register 5, pl.5 register 3 and pl.7 register 3). Dimensions are also given in some cases. The inscriptions above some registers, particularly on the rear exterior wall, include several references to the images as

representations of deities from various parts of the temple at Saft el-Henna. For example, images are identified as 'those set up in their place (*st.sn*) in the temple of Soped' (back wall, register 4), or 'the gods that are set up in their places (*st*), found in another secret sanctuary (*st šb*) in a sacred place (*bw-dsr*) in *Hwt-nbs*' (back wall, register 5) or simply 'found in another secret sanctuary inside the temple (*hwt-ntr*)' (back wall, register 6). In some cases, it seems the text above each register specifically refers to the deities beneath, whether described as associated with a shrine of Wenut (back wall, register 3), a 'secret sanctuary' (back wall, registers 5 and 6) or a sacred tree (right wall, register 2). In contrast, some of the inscriptions above registers contain rather generalised statements regarding Nekhtnebef (left wall, register 6). The second register on the right wall depicts two pairs of doorkeeper snakes (*iry-s3w*), who are associated with the *ḥr* and the *wsh*, presumably parts of the ancient temple. A preponderance of forms of Soped (Schumacher 1988: 177–8), and a number of divine barques, further support the view that the shrine is a representation of the sacred images found in the Saft el-Henna temple, set up in their appropriate sanctuaries. A number of gods hold weapons, perhaps reflecting the vulnerable location of the temple near Egypt's north-eastern frontier. Throughout, there is a striking lack of epithets relating deities to toponyms, other than those with a Saft el-Henna toponym (*Bt-nbs*, *Hwt-nbs*). Exceptions are 'universal' gods such as Wadjet lady of Pe and Dep (Roeder 1914: 70), Horus of Pe (Roeder 1914: 95), Amun-Ra *nb nswt t3wy* (Roeder 1914: 66), Amunemopet (Roeder 1914: 65) and 'Atum the *ka* of Heliopolis' (Roeder 1914: 82). There is also a 'Horus in *Hwt-ḥr*', but this is a term which can apply to many temples.

Deities are grouped through different methods. Several images can be enclosed in a large shrine (see the lower register of the right wall). Less explicitly, the Theban triad is grouped together, or several forms of the same deity are presented consecutively (e.g. Chenset: register 3, right wall). The lower register of the rear wall focuses on duality, with cobras and Meret-goddesses explicitly associated with Upper and Lower Egypt. This register, and the corresponding one on the inside right wall include labels for the northern and southern 'places/thrones' (*st.w mhty/rsy*), presumably shrines at Saft el-Henna in the southern or northern part of the temple.

The primary motivation behind the décor was clearly to represent divine images, principally statuary, housed elsewhere in the Saft el-Henna temple. The ancient Egyptians, however, may also have seen these relief representations of statuary as cult images in their own right.¹⁹ Above each register of gods, the text includes praise of pharaoh for the creation of these images upon the shrine rather than the statuary itself. Imagery depicted on temple walls must not always be assumed to be a faithful representation of an actual object (Willems *et al.* 2003: 39, n.79), and both the 'original' and its representation could be valued as cult *foci*.

The Saft el-Henna naos presents a vast amount of information, in the form of divine images but also the lengthy inscriptions, in which a large number of signs are fitted into the height of each band of text. Such a layout of text is reminiscent of Ptolemaic temple inscriptions, but also the list of statues from the Mahes temple at Bubastis, which dates to the time of Osorkon I (Naville 1891: pl.51 [G1–3]). The decoration lacks the restraint, even minimalism, so typical of royal temple monuments,

particularly in contrast to the Saite naoi discussed above, and indeed the Bubastis shrine. The decoration upon the Saft el-Henna shrine is more dense in content, representing a more ‘encyclopaedic’ presentation vis-à-vis its Saite predecessors, though the Hibis sanctuary reliefs do provide a similar wealth of material (see below). The sunk-relief carving lacks the finesse of the Bubastis naos, though the smaller scale of representation, dictated by the required mass of information, must have hindered the sculptors.

Another naos set up by Nectanebo I at Saft el-Henna featured textual and representational content apparently uncommon on such monuments, namely representations of the decans (Clère 1950; Habachi and Habachi 1952; Leitz 1995: 3–57, pls.1–23). Below the three main registers depicting the decans, there was a further section of scenes and texts, featuring rows of labelled deities, notably 37 vulture figures spread across four rows, protective figures and cartouches of gods. The fragmentary nature of the monument precludes detailed consideration of the motive behind this decoration (Habachi and Habachi 1952: 255–7). The rear interior wall of this shrine is decorated with a single scene of a lion upon a plinth, wearing a two-plumed head-dress. The accompanying inscription makes it clear that this represents the cult statue destined to be housed in the shrine: ‘Shu, lord of *Pr-wr*, who is in *Hwt-nbs*, of silver embellished with gold according to that which is upon the papyrus of the god’s words (*šfd n mdt-ntr*)’. A short inscription in front of the lion indicates the statue measured four palms in height. Again, the source of the textual and iconographical content is being emphasised. The two interior side walls of the naos are decorated with registers of divine images,²⁰ including sphinxes, a falcon-headed bull trampling a snake, a falcon-headed crocodile, a leonine figure, composite bird-human figures and an ithyphallic figure. The décor has been badly affected by water erosion, but at least some of the deities are identified by short vertical inscriptions, including one with the epithet ‘lord of *Ḥt-nbs*’. A similar naos bearing a depiction of a statue of ‘Tefnut lady of *Pr-nsr*, who is in *Hwt-Nbs*’, of the same scale, was apparently set up at the same site; it is known only through a drawing of an object published by Sharpe, ‘from an Arab’s house in Alexandria’ (Yoyotte 1954: 81–2, fig.1).

Of course, Shu and Tefnut are two central figures in certain ancient Egyptian cosmogonies, and feature in the inscription upon another naos from this site (Griffith in Naville 1890: 70–4, pls.23–6; Goyon 1936). This lengthy text relates events ascribed to the mythical reigns of Shu and Geb, without any representational illustrations. However, the interior side walls did feature five registers of divine images (serpent forms, a falcon-headed crocodile, and depictions of shrines), interspersed with lines of text, but these were very poorly preserved. At least some of the figures and symbols were labelled with epithets relating to *Ḥt-nbs* (cf. Griffith in Naville 1890: pl.23 [1–4]; Goyon 1936: 7, pls.1 and 5).

It is striking that the 30th dynasty saw an extensive series of naoi set up at the nearby sites of Bubastis and Saft el-Henna. This attests to how distinct approaches could be taken towards cult temples. While it is unclear if there were similar ambitions at other sites, it is evident that there could be very different approaches to temples at two major temple sites separated by only 10km. Some were monolithic naoi with inscriptions confined to the doorjambs, while others presented mythological

treatises or featured registers of divine forms.

Five further monuments conclude this survey of such naoi. A basalt fragment now in Verona (Clère 1973) features registers of divine images, with one figure of pharaoh offering preserved. The scale of the decoration is small, with registers of around 10cm in height, thus even smaller than those upon the Saft el-Henna naos. Some of the images are labelled, and accompanied by indications of dimension and material, and there are several examples of divinities housed within elaborate shrines. Part of a cartouche survives, presumably that of Nekhtnebef as it contains the elements *r* and *k3*. Frequent references to the toponym *ḥnh-Ḥwy* suggest a Memphite provenance. It is likely this comes from the front of a naos, in which case the door thicknesses were carved with divine figures, as found on some of the Saite shrines discussed above.

Thirtieth dynasty reliefs recovered from a mosque at Abu Sir el-Maleq (Möller 1926: 102, pl.77; Guglielmi 2003: 170–4), include blocks bearing typical large-scale offering scenes familiar from temple walls, but a fragment now in Essen is apparently of a smaller scale (assuming the original publication plate presents all the reliefs at the same scale, as no dimensions are given). It depicts a bull-headed figure (*dsr-tpw*) and a composite snake-body with human- and lion-heads (*s3k it.fnb*) beneath a star-filled extended *pt*-sign. As Guglielmi notes (2003: 172–3), the depiction of the former as a bull-headed figure is unusual. Again, the variety of divine iconography is apparent, and the difficulties in attempting to identify the gods in the absence of accompanying inscriptions. The thickness of this relief, 11cm, and the layout of its decoration are similar to the naoi discussed here. Limestone is not used for any of the known 30th dynasty naoi (see Appendix 4), though whether this reflects an ancient reality or uneven preservation is unknown, particularly as limestone is a less durable material.

There are no securely dated naoi of this type which post-date the 30th dynasty. In 1904, Ahmed Bey Kamal published three grey granite fragments from a monumental naos, re-used in a mosque at Mit Gharitah, near Simbellawein in the north-east Delta (Kamal 1904: 193–9). No drawings or photographs are included in his publication, but the descriptions and inscriptions (reproduced as typeset hieroglyphs) make it clear the naos featured at least six registers of divine forms, each topped with star-filled extended *pt*-signs and a line of hieroglyphs. Two *pt*-signs were carved at the very top of the naos, a repetition not found upon any of the other naoi discussed here. Several of the registers, not only the top one, featured falcons with outspread wings, presumably similar to those found on one of the naoi from Bubastis (EA 1106, Fig.12a, Pl.29; see Appendix 1). Although Kamal proposes a Ptolemaic date, the information presented in his article in no way precludes a somewhat earlier date.

The range of forms described by Kamal is rather familiar: baboons with arms raised in adoration, seated goddesses holding *ḥnh*-signs and *w3d*-sceptres, serpents (including a winged example), a winged ram and birds (human-headed and baboon-headed). Other composite creatures include serpent-, bird-, bull- and baboon-headed gods. As familiar from many of these naoi, there is a group featuring Osiris with the protective goddesses Isis and Nephthys. In this case, Osiris is not depicted but represented by a cartouche naming Osiris-Merty (Kamal’s ‘fragment 1’). Recall that this is the god to whom one of the naoi from Kom el-Ahmar was dedicated (Louvre D29, see above). Short inscriptions

give the names of some of the deities; apart from the frequent references to the ‘Great Bull of Shedenu’, none are provided with epithets relating to toponyms. A female personification of ‘the East’, and a form of Thoth (?) ‘in the *Hwt-ʿ3t*’ are included. Again, the latter designation can apply to many temples. Kamal does not record any inscriptions giving the material or dimensions of the divine images. Many of the divinities could be classified as guardian figures. The registers did also include columns of text, which may suggest a division of the divine forms, possibly on the basis of toponyms. One such column preserves the toponym *Ds-h3rt* (Kamal 1904: 196 [6]). Located somewhere around Mendes, this toponym is found inscribed on a naos from the site (De Meulenaere and Mackay 1976: pl.15). The dedicatory texts emphasise the ‘Great Bull lord of Shedenu’, and provide references to his divine attributes and role (*whm n Hr-mrty, b3 ʿnh n Rʿ-Hr-3hty*), particularly as one who illuminates the lands and causes ‘you (the gods?) to awake’. The emphasis on this god indicate Horbeit as a plausible original provenance. I am unaware of the present whereabouts of these fragments.

A monumental naos, probably about 5m in height, was recorded at Qaw el-Kebir in the early 19th century. The drawings and description in the *Description de l’Égypte* indicate a naos with pyramidal roof, inscribed with four columns of text on each jamb, and highly polished, but undecorated, on the other exterior faces (DE IV: pl.38 [2–9] and DE T IV: 95–8). Several scenes were recorded from the badly eroded walls of the shrine’s cavity. A frieze of cartouches alternate with winged scarabs at the top of the walls, with the scenes below topped with a broad band that may have been an extended *pt*-sign (DE IV: pl.38 [4, 6]). One scene depicts pharaoh offering to three divinities: a jackal and falcon on separate pedestals, followed by a standing female god wearing sun-disc and cow horns (DE IV: pl.38 [5]). It remains possible this is part of a decorative scheme with registers of gods, but the other scenes copied suggest we are dealing with more standard offering scenes: a kneeling king offers to two enthroned deities, and a sphinx offers a canopic vessel to a seated falcon-headed god (DE IV: pl.38 [7, 8]). This latter scene is flanked by two columns of hieroglyphs, whose length and position support their identification as offering scenes. The temple in which this naos was installed seems to have been constructed by Ptolemies IV and VI (Arnold 1999: 184). The length of the cartouches and the presence of a small sun-disc with uraei at the top of a column of hieroglyphs suggest the naos was of a similar date. Other post 30th dynasty naoi are not sufficiently preserved, or are insufficiently published, to ascertain whether they belong in this corpus. One such example is a doorjamb fragment found in Cairo, bearing the names of Alexander IV (Daressy 1912).

Finally, a relief noted at the White Monastery near Akhmim, bears an inscription including a reference to ‘the names of the gods and [their] images’ (Redford 1986: 216, n.52). It is possible this might come from a naos of a similar type.

Rows of divine forms, of varying scale, are of course found in other contexts, including temple reliefs, particularly crypts with depictions of statues, but also the representation of guardians and groupings such as the *chronocrates* around the naos at Dendera. In addition, many sarcophagi, situlae, hypocephali, healing statues and cippi bear decoration which feature parallels to the naoi decoration discussed above. Some of these media are considered in the following chapter (4). A consideration of the sanctuary decoration in the temple of Amun of Hibis, in el-Kharga

Oasis is appropriate here. The low-relief decoration amounted to at least 659 deities, divided into registers across all the interior walls, each topped with extended *pt*-signs (facsimile: Davies 1953: pls.2–6 [relies on earlier copies for destroyed areas]; translation: Cruz-Uribe 1988). There are no dedicatory texts, but an image of the king is featured at the start of most registers. Pharaoh does not appear in the lowest register, which is notably smaller in height and thus may be a later addition, or on the door reveals. The king is shown performing various cult actions, for example offering jars or linen, explicitly designated as being performed for the benefit of certain deities. Where the text is preserved, the recipient is a form of Amun (‘of *Hbt*’ or ‘lord of *Hbt*’), the great Ennead (in some cases qualified as *hry-ib Hbt*), or both. There is one exception, where the king is labelled as acting for ‘his father Osiris’; the first god depicted in that register is ‘Osiris lord of the two shrines’. The later reliefs on the doorway, probably added during the 30th dynasty, have room only for pharaoh offering to a single god in each register, and the labels simply give the name of that god. Thus ritual enacted in the sanctuary, in theory the preserve of pharaoh but in practice undertaken by priests, was principally directed at Amun of Hibis and his Ennead, rather than all the divinities represented. Similarly, the Bubastis naos was explicitly directed at Bastet rather than the gods depicted on the exterior surfaces.

Some of the gods depicted in the Hibis sanctuary are labelled with a short inscription. Others have small uninscribed raised panels above them, as if ready to receive a line or two of hieroglyphic inscription, which were never carved, or may originally have been painted. Several groups are set apart by dividing lines, and it is clear from those images that are labelled that we are dealing with a ‘geographical list’. The deities in each section all relate to a toponym or temple, according to the accompanying epithets. This geographical basis for the layout has been widely accepted, but thereafter interpretations differ (see Osing 1990; Sternberg el-Hotabi 1994a: 240, with references; Kessler 2003: 213–14). Are they linked to nomes or individual temples? The divine images seem to be grouped by nome, but may well invoke several temples within the same nome. Do they represent an attempt to illustrate the gods of all Egypt? No, it is evident that a comprehensive coverage of Egypt’s cult infrastructure was not being sought, as many areas of Lower Egypt are not represented (Cruz-Uribe 1988: 197, tables 1–4).

A key question in the context of this study of the Bubastis naos is whether the Hibis images depict actual statues.²¹ The lack of a dedicatory text or any other textual glosses in the decoration makes any such interpretations necessarily tentative. However, I would hesitate to interpret the décor as a representational catalogue of statues held within this temple, nor of statuary at other temples. The absence of dorsal pillars, the lack of plinths for most of the standing deities, and particularly the omission of any information on scale and material, suggest the images depict the gods themselves. One possible exception is the two seated goddesses who hold mummiform figures on their knees, in a section associated with Abydos (Davies 1953: pl.4 [III]). The first pair is labelled as ‘Osiris the statue, Nephthys’. The ambiguity of the term *twt*, alluded to above, should be borne in mind.

We should expect such densely formulated decoration, with its wonderful details, to be effective on various planes, whether presenting a multitude of deities, the cult topography of Egypt, or even cryptic allusions to myths, festivals and other aspects of

Egyptian religion.²² Kessler refutes the interpretation that the Hibis sanctuary decoration acted as a theological handbook or compilation of divinities associated with the cult of Amun religion (2003: 213–14, *contra* Osing 1990, Sternberg el-Hotabi 1994a). Rather, Kessler proposes the depiction of all of these gods, in an enclosed architectural context, represents the terrestrial union of the deities of Egypt with the sacred space of Hibis temple. Thus, the reliefs enact a daily procession of gods before Amun of Hibis, invoking aspects of creation and even enthronement through the attributes of the individual deities represented. In particular, the location of this decoration at the core of the temple, surrounding the statue of Amun, ensures the daily rebirth of the cult image at dawn.

Drawing on the theories of Kessler, one can envisage the gods in the Hibis sanctuary, so clearly anchored within Egypt's terrestrial cult topography (i.e. extant temples/nomes), as forming a mirror to the local cosmogony, i.e. Amun of Hibis and the company of gods specific to this temple. This interpretation provides a possible insight into one possible role for the decoration upon the Bubastis naos, which will be developed further in the following chapter.

The naoi discussed above make it clear that the Hibis sanctuary decorative scheme was not the result of a new approach to the divine world first conceived in the 27th dynasty (*contra* Sternberg el-Hotabi 1994a: 240, 246).²³ Centuries after the last known naoi to have borne such decoration, Roman temples in ed-Dakhla oasis attest to the continued use of such geographical/cosmological schemes. There, the gods represented in the sanctuaries emphasise deities explicitly associated with the oases, rather than invoking a wider geographical area (Kaper 1997).

Notes

- 1 Examples are known from the reign of Senwosret I onwards (Pillet 1923); a 30th dynasty shrine of this type is the Abydos naos which bears the names of both Nekhtnebef and Nekhtorheb (CG 70018). This type of decoration is still employed in Roman times: upon a shrine of Domitian, scenes of pharaoh interacting with up to four divine figures are carved in each register. In the latter case, each god is accompanied with text providing its name and responsive activity with respect to the king, Rondot 1990: 308–20. A Ptolemaic relief fragment in the Brooklyn Museum suggests even smaller-scale offering scenes could adorn the walls of a naos, Bothmer and Keith 1974: 84–5. Though not monolithic, the barque shrines of the New Kingdom at Karnak provide an example of shrines conceived with extensive exterior decoration, amounting to a true temple in miniature, bearing ritual, offering, and processional scenes. Most recently, see Arnaudès-Montélimard 2003.
- 2 The naos of Nekhtorheb at Edfu follows this model, but the cavity is embellished with heraldic plants on the walls, and a decorated ceiling (*Edfou I*²: 9–11, fig.2). The naos at Mendes is the most impressive surviving example of such naoi, cf. Soghor 1967: 16–23.
- 3 The following descriptions are based on photographs taken by Claus Jurman, postgraduate researcher at the University of Vienna, to whom I am grateful. The 'eastern room' in question is briefly described in PM II²: 203.
- 4 The latter toponym written with the seated calf-sign (*iw*) and the *nw*-jar (?) is otherwise unknown to me, and would seem unlikely to be a rare variant writing of Heliopolis.
- 5 The start of the vertical inscription upon the doorjamb is preserved (*Hr W3h-ib...*), above which are the remnants of an inscription located above the level of the cavity, as on the Bubastis naos. It thus seems likely that the uppermost (partly) preserved register on the Brussels fragment was in fact the topmost register of exterior decoration on the original naos.
- 6 I have not had the opportunity to study 22-11-55-1, which was found in the Harit er-Roum (no.7), Cairo; dimensions 1.78x0.29x0.28m (information from Journal d'Entrée volumes). However, the following observations can be made on the basis of images provided by Hélène Virenque (at proof stage). This block has the same 'flattened' frieze and cornice appearance, with parts of four registers preserved below. The uppermost preserved register features two seated gods, but the register below is better preserved: the king is shown offering, facing left, before a god of which only the front part of the body and one arm survives. Behind the king, a cobra sits upon a plinth, facing right. As the bottom register features two images of the king, facing away from each other, one can assume this is from the middle of the monument, possibly the exterior rear wall. The left king is identified by a cartouche, giving the date of the monument. Interestingly, the symmetry suggested by the second and fourth registers from the top is not adhered to in the other two registers (a vulture and a seated cat, both on plinths, are depicted in the register third from the top). All of the figures are labelled with short texts, as on the other blocks. Hélène Virenque has also brought to my attention a block now re-installed in the garden of the Cairo Museum, which she believes may be from the same monument. On the basis of her photographs, this preserves the remains of one register of divine images, all facing right. Four standing figures, including one labelled as 'Hathor lady of Dendera', precede a bull on a plinth, another standing female figure, and three seated deities, the last one wearing an *yt*-crown. Thereafter are depicted a standing female deity with cow-horns and sun-disc (labelled, but difficult to read in the photographs), an enthroned lioness-headed deity, a mummiform standing lioness-headed deity and a seated god. The 13 gods present in one register here suggest the number upon this whole monument, if it was a naos decorated with four registers of divinities on each exterior wall, may have been around 150.
- 7 These depictions suggest the possibility that such architectural forms could act as cult emblems; a relief from Bubastis shows a column with two cats at the base, as part of a row of gods associated with the temple of Thoth (Navielle 1891: pl. 45 [A-B]). An inventory stela attests to Hathoric emblems of this type existing at Heliopolis around the 25th dynasty (Ricke 1935: fig.1), while the Dendera crypts depict examples made of 'gold, ebony and all kinds of precious stone, face of turquoise' (Cauville 1987: 87, 108). A limestone column of the form shown on the Cairo fragment, with four Hathor faces forming the capital, the eyes prepared for inlays, and bearing the titulary of Nekhtnebef upon the shaft, is now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (28.9.7). It is unprovenanced, though the museum record card states it may be from the Delta (thanks are due to Jim Allen, for permitting study of this monument, in October 2001). Saite columns of this type, usually in hard black stone often identified as basalt but more probably schist or greywacke, were found re-used in Old Cairo (e.g. Wildung and Schoske 1985: no.90). The inscriptions include royal titulary and epithets invoking Neith and the *Hwt-bit*, strongly suggesting a provenance of Sais (British Museum EA 964, bearing the cartouche of *W3h-ib-r*, might also come from this group). The scale of these monuments indicates they are not part of a temple proper but rather a smaller chapel or portico, though none bear traces of having been engaged with (intercolumnar) walls. Ramesside reliefs at Karnak provide evidence of standards, some column-shaped and others supporting statuary, before shrines (Lauffray 1970: 159–64); such monuments are poorly understood as none have survived intact. Finally, an even smaller limestone Hathor column capital of this type has been interpreted as a sculptor's model, Chappaz 1993: 47–50.
- 8 The present-day appearance of this monument is rather misleading, due to the addition of modern red paint to 'improve' its readability (for this information, thanks are due to Maarten Raven, curator of Egyptian Antiquities at the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in Leiden).
- 9 With regards to these two naoi from Kom el-Ahmar, note Baines' plausible suggestion that the figures of Mwyt and Nekhtbet are actually copies of reliefs from the pyramid temple of Sahure (Baines 1973: 9–14). His proposal of a Memphite provenance is now untenable (see Yoyotte 200a: 66–72).
- 10 Sokar in *B[3]kt*, the Lord of *S3hb[w]*, the Lord of Ausim [*Hm*], Neith lady of Sais, Wadjet of Dep, Horus son of Isis of Coptos, Horus of the *Hwt-3t*, the Lord of *Hmnw*, and Sokar in *pr*, foremost of *Mfk3(t)*.
- 11 The Hermopolis Ogdoad, the Beneficent Gods (*3ht*), the Gods of the Two Caverns (*krty*) and the goddesses One-who-brings-you-gold (*nbw it.t*), Lady of *Htp-hm* and Lady of the sycamore.
- 12 Based on Petrie's I:4 drawing (1904: pl.28), the dedicatory bands are 7.2cm thick, with registers of just over 20cm in height. This does not

- imply a smaller monument than the Bubastis naos (corresponding measurements 8cm and 43cm respectively), as the decoration may have been laid out in a more dense format, such as upon the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: CG 70021) or the Brussels naos fragment discussed above (E.5818). These had at least 6 and 8 registers, respectively.
- 13 Hélène Virenque is writing a doctoral dissertation on this shrine: *The naos from Saft el-Henneh dedicated to Sopdou* (University of Montpellier III).
 - 14 Schumacher (1988: 165) reads 'the image of its face'.
 - 15 For this term, see Thiers 1998.
 - 16 Schumacher prefers 'tremble' (1988: 170).
 - 17 For *phryt*, cf. Wilson 1997: 370; Schumacher has 'Umlaufzeit' (1988: 170).
 - 18 cf. Wilson 1997: 995.
 - 19 Meskell questions whether sculptors wondered if they were creating gods, or merely earthly manifestations thereof, when producing statuary (2004: 106).
 - 20 Two blocks recovered from Abukir bay have recently been placed on top of the surviving base. I am grateful to Hélène Virenque for this information; a new publication is planned by Jean Yoyotte.
 - 21 Hill (2004: 132) sees the reliefs as being 'some stage between an inventory and a cult depiction'.
 - 22 Sternberg el-Hotabi (1994a) attempts to interpret the Herakleopolitan group, in light of our knowledge of the site's gods and temples known to us from other sources. Without accompanying texts, however, one must exercise caution in identifying the original motive in depicting a god in a certain manner. As ever, one should allow for ongoing ancient re-interpretations of such temple decoration. Interpreting religious décor in too specific terms, when not directly supported by ancient evidence (such as *in situ* texts) may produce theories that are little more than modern constructs.
 - 23 Assmann feels that a codification of religious knowledge was consciously attempted between the 6th and 4th centuries BC, beginning at Hibis (2002: 419). The 26th dynasty naoi suggest we should be cautious in attempting to identify a particular time or place for the beginning of such activities.

4. The Role of the Naos

The decision to commission a naos with extensive decoration, rather than a shrine simply inscribed with the royal titulary and epithets invoking the relevant deity or deities, implicitly acknowledges that a wider cult and ritual purpose was to be emphasised. It is also possible that such a wider emphasis was intended to encompass an extensive sacred landscape, beyond that of the temple in which the naos was installed. In relation to the naoi which bear registers of divine images, the following questions deserve consideration. Did the divinities depicted benefit directly from cult rituals in the sanctuary? Or did the decoration present episodes from, or allusions to, mythological narratives? Do the representations form a protective sphere around the cultic image? Are they simply relief depictions of three-dimensional cult statues housed elsewhere, whether in the same temple, city, nome or elsewhere in Egypt? We should not seek one solution: the survey of these naoi illustrates the variety of architectural forms, scene layout and accompanying textual content to be found in these naoi.

Egyptologists have often favoured interpreting the extensive depictions of divine forms upon naoi as faithful representations of cult statuary (e.g. el-Sayed 1975: 133; Zivie-Coche 1991: 234). The statuary depicted can be interpreted as that housed in the temple in which the naos was installed, or perhaps in other temples in the city or nome, or even elsewhere in Egypt. Indeed, the layout and iconography of these naoi has its most obvious parallel in the decoration of the crypts in Ptolemaic temples.

Crypts, rooms or series of interconnecting rooms built into the thickness of wall masonry, or into the foundation levels, were locations of very restricted access in which cult statues could be stored. There is widespread use of terms for 'hidden' or 'secret' in the accompanying texts (*imn*, *stt*, *sdg*, *šb*, *thn*; Cauville 2004: 4). However, these crypts were not simply a sacred storage space for statues when not in use. Some of the statues depicted at Dendera were of a scale which precluded them from passing through the opening to the crypt, so that the statues must have been 'entombed' there at the time of building (Cauville 2004: 56). Through being housed within the temple, such statues continued to benefit magically from cult ritual. At Dendera, the Hermopolis Ogdoad are depicted between two crypt rooms, with the inscription stating their role towards the statuary housed within: to rejoice, unite with the statues, dance, recite protection rituals, and exalt their *kas* (Cauville 2004: 123–5, pl.13). Similarly, whether the naoi bear representations of statuary or not, the figures depicted could be beneficiaries of ritual as cult objects in themselves. The New Year rites recorded on a papyrus now in Brooklyn includes a series of episodes in which offerings are made to divinities, including 'offering to the gods who are upon their emblems (and stand) at the left/right of the *st-wrt*' (Goyon 1972: 67–8). *St-wrt* was a term frequently employed to refer to the sanctuary or a shrine set up within it. The Brooklyn papyrus' emphasis on a range of deities

surrounding the central chapel recalls the texts upon the Saft el-Henna naos, which contain several references to gods on the right and left of a naos. The emblems invoked in the Brooklyn text include animal forms (e.g. 'the falcon of Horus'), Meret-goddesses and symbols such as the *twmy*-pillar, in addition to gods who are not further qualified. This is very reminiscent of the range of iconography upon the Bubastis naos and shrines with similar decorative schemes.

The statues depicted in temple crypts encompass a wide range of deities, including multiple examples of some forms. Accompanying inscriptions usually provide the name of the deity, the material out of which the its statue was fashioned, its dimensions, and sometimes further information on the shrine in which it is housed. The divine forms, like those upon the naoi, typically included anthropomorphic, theriform and emblematic representations, some housed within their own shrines, often with a figure of the king offering to each row (e.g. Thiers 2003a: 202–19; 2003b: 284 [I–V]). Statues of considerable antiquity at the time of the décor being undertaken are often depicted, including those of ancient pharaohs as well as older images of deities. For example, in one of the crypts at Dendera, a statue of Hapy bears a cartouche of Amenhotep III (*Dendara V*: pl.323). This historical aspect is conspicuously absent from the Saft el-Henna naos, though one can reasonably assume that a number of older statues were housed in the temple.¹ This absence hints that even if this naos did bear a 'catalogue' of some of the divine statues in the temple of Soped, it was not an exhaustive catalogue. The relief representations chosen were clearly thought to have a role to play in their own right. A system seems to underlie the distribution of statuary in temple crypts. The various crypts at Dendera have different emphases, such as festival statues stored in the basement rooms, or protective emblems in the first floor crypts (Cauville 2004: 2). Few 30th dynasty temples are sufficiently preserved to allow study of crypt decoration at this period; crypts were built into the foundations of the Khnum temple at Elephantine, but no relief decoration has survived (Niederberger 1999: 30–3). This is unfortunate, as the elaborate decor upon the Saft el-Henna naos suggests considerable attention was given to how temple statuary was arranged and housed in the 30th dynasty.

Statues were not only depicted in temple crypts and monolithic naoi, of course. I will not consider here representations of statuary as part of an architectural scene, such as the two statues depicted before a pylon in a Tuthmoside relief at Karnak (Traunecker 1989: 100, fig.6). Rather, I am interested here in depictions of series of statues, which are to be found in various contexts. Upon the east and south wall of the corridor at Dendera, the king and queen are shown adoring 19 figures, composed of six groups of three identical guardians, and a final figure (*Dendara II*: 24–5, pls.88, 94, 98 = Cauville 1999: 46–9). Each figure is enthroned within a naos, and identified by

a label which specifies the material (usually bronze) and dimensions of each statue, and states that it was housed in a stone naos. A similar scheme is shown on the opposite side of the sanctuary corridor, though here the statues include representations of unspecified kings of Upper Egypt, kings of Lower Egypt, king's mothers, wives and royal sons, and three statues of Hathor (*Dendara II*: 54–5, pls.94, 98 = Cauville 1999: 90–3). The accompanying inscription reveals that pharaoh was making offerings to these gods' images: they inhabit the core ritual sphere of the temple. Statues were a key component of the large festivals, particularly the *sed*-festival. Rows of divine statues, housed in individual shrines also containing a small figure of a kneeling king performing offerings, are shown in the Osorkon II reliefs from Bubastis (Naville 1892: pls.7, 8, 12). Rows of divine symbols, brought from all over Egypt, were also a key component in the *sed*-festival (Naville 1892: pl. 14 [1]). The latter relief includes a reference to 'the divine standards upon the West side of the king upon the *st-wrt*'; the top register of this block shows a row of standards preceded by deities depicted as a falcon, cow and female figure. These depictions of multiple statues clearly record in stone the participation of such images in cult and ritual, whether in regular daily rituals or during particular festivals.

Representations of several statues are also known from contexts that appear more practical, less associated with ritual. Inventories of temple equipment are sometimes accompanied by depictions of the statuary which formed the subject of these lists. In the Late Period, ordered rows of temple statuary were inscribed on stone stelae, usually at very small scale. These feature a similar range of divine forms to those found on the naoi, and bear short inscriptions identifying the god and giving the material and scale of the statues (Ricke 1935; Helck 1958: 92–3). Though ostensibly fulfilling a more practical purpose, such monuments evidently had sacred connotations. The information was being carved on high-quality stone (Vernus identifies them as a 'le support sacralisant des archives', 1984: 705; the stela ascribed to Khufu's daughter may also reflect an inventory, Zivie-Coche 1991: 218–46, pls.39–40). The original lists were undoubtedly recorded upon papyrus or wooden tablets, without illustration of the statues. Examples include the Abu Sir papyri (Posener-Kriéger 1976), the statue lists contained in papyri from Lahun (statues of royalty and officials, Borchardt 1899: 95–7), and a wooden tablet relating to the temple of Maat at Karnak, from the reign of an Alexander (Varille 1942). The inventory stelae cited above date to the 25th dynasty, and as such could be viewed as antecedents to the naoi which bear depictions of divine statuary, such as the naos of Nectanebo I from Saft el-Henna. However, stone inventory bears a prominent inscription which states that His Majesty ordered an inventory (*sipy*) of '(the temple) of his mother Hathor-Nebethetepet', but also emphasises the names of the two priests who undertook the project, as well as giving their parentage (Ricke 1935: 112–13). The monuments in question is thus different from, say, a royal stela which enumerates sacred objects donated to a temple (e.g. Macadam 1949: 4–14, pls.5–6). Clearly, the dedicants of the inventory tablet were hoping for rewards, spiritual or material, from the setting up of such a monument recording their efforts. This should serve as a reminder that these inventory stelae are to be distinguished from the naoi, despite the similarity in iconography.

Unfortunately, we have no evidence to suggest where such stelae were set up. Interestingly, an early Ptolemaic text suggests such 'inventories' could form the basis for temple reliefs: 'I made an enclosure wall of fine, sturdy limestone, carved with the inventory/register (*sipy*) of gods and goddesses' (British Museum EA 1668; unpublished but cited in Redford 1986: 216, n.52 who prefers to translate *sipy* as 'roster').

In the case of those naoi where the divine images can confidently be interpreted as depictions of statuary, such as the Saft el-Henna naos, the naos of Apries partly preserved in Brussels (both of which include depictions of divine barques) and the fragment in Verona, it is also very clear that the naos is not acting as the repository for these statues, in contrast to the primary purpose of the temple crypts. These naoi were generally designed to house one cult image, perhaps made of several constituent figures or elements. The cult image was presumably a representation of the deity alluded to in the dedication texts (see Chapter 1). Thus it is clear that the decoration upon the walls of these naoi invokes a wider space than the architectural chapel housing the god's image, as it refers to other deities housed elsewhere in the temple, city, nome or country. When one considers more cosmogonical interpretations of the representations on other naoi, this can of course be extended beyond the confines of terrestrial Egypt to the cosmos as a whole.

If material and dimensions are not given for the divine images depicted on these naoi, I see no *a priori* reason to interpret them as representations of statues. The use of dorsal pillars does support such an identification. Conversely, the supports (plinths, platforms) beneath some deities are not necessarily indicative of a cult statue (*contra* Sourouzian 1993; see Eaton-Krauss 1984: 202). Thrones and plinths were often needed to aid the aesthetic formulation of a scene, such as the need for a standing vulture or hippopotamus to be on a similar level to a standing anthropomorphic figure (Figs.7–9). While depictions of temple statuary within crypts provide a good iconographical parallel for this type of naos decoration, and thus one possible means of interpreting the shrines, there is a wealth of other temple reliefs featuring extensive rows of deities, alerting the modern viewer to possible alternative functions.

Osiride complexes are often located upon the roof of temples of the Late and Ptolemaic Periods. One of the rooms upon the roof of the Hibis temple bears decoration with many similarities to the Bubastis naos: registers of divinities, including falcons, nursing goddesses but particularly various stages in the transformation of Osiris (Davies 1953: pl.20; Cruz-Urbe 1988: 86–90). Two texts carved in this room allude to the repulsion of Seth from Osiris' body. The Osiride chapels in Ptolemaic and Roman temples further echo this content and iconography, with significant variations between various temples (for references, see Cauville 1997b: 265–76). There are a small number of statues shown, explicitly identified as such by the accompanying inscriptions which provide their dimensions. There is no suggestion that the other deities in the reliefs in these Osiride chapels are all depictions of statuary. Rather, it is the various stages of transformation of the god which are depicted. As stated previously, it is very clear that the Bubastis naos features allusions to episodes in the transformation of Osiris, though lacking any textual glosses.

Depictions of series of deities could also represent divisions

of time. A 30th dynasty example, featuring two registers of gods, can be found in the contra-temple built against the back wall of the Khonsu temple at Karnak (Traunecker and Laroche 1980: 184–9). This decoration, on the interior walls, is executed at a similar scale to that upon the naoi (35cm register); the west wall also features creation gods. Representations of the decans, found in funerary monuments from the 18th dynasty onwards, but also in Ptolemaic and Roman temple decoration, often include attendant deities, typically embellished with stars across their bodies (Neugebauer and Parker 1969). Similar divine images appear on small statues (Daressy 1908: 231–4, pl.46; Shorter 1932) and upon a small stela from Bubastis (Kamal 1908). These divine embodiments of divisions of time can be rather extensive: 59 deities are depicted in the roof-chapel at the Hibis temple, representing the ‘decades of the dual year’ (Davies 1953: pl.15; Cruz-Urbe 1988: 185–91). Reliefs in the mammisi at Kom Ombo feature registers of deities, particularly forms based on Taweret, associated with months and epagomenal days (LD IV: 34). In addition, the *chronocrates*, deities who protect months of the year, adorn the outer walls of the Dendera sanctuary (*Dendara I*: pls.75–7, text Cauville 1998: 119–22, 152–5) and the opposite wall in the corridor which surrounds the sanctuary (*Dendara II*: 29–31, 59–61, pls.87–8, 94, 98, text Cauville 1999: 53–7, 96–9);² the architraves of the outer areas of Ptolemaic and Roman temples often feature similar schemes (e.g. Bénédite 1893: 137–42, pls. 51–8; Junker and Winter 1965: 206–11). The cyclical and eternal nature of time, in the orderly universe ensured by the gods’ actions and pharaoh’s continuing pious activity in their favour, was being emphasised through these divine personifications of time. One of the naoi from Saft el-Henna features rows of divine images beneath the explicit representation of the decans (Habachi and Habachi 1952: 255–7). However, there is nothing to suggest a primary association between divisions of time and the divine images on the Bubastis naos.

Lengthy rows of divine figures are, of course, frequently used to personify aspects of terrestrial cult topography, most notably in the processions of gods embodying the nomes of Egypt (Beinlich 1977). Dado reliefs, unfortunately not found *in situ*, have survived from several 30th dynasty temples (Hall 1931; Steindorff 1945: figs.6–7; Spencer, N.A. 1999: 58, fig.2, pl.7 [2]); none are known from Bubastis at present. Further examples, where temples rather than nomes are depicted, are the Nekhthorheb reliefs from Bubastis (Naville 1891: pls.45–6), and the earlier Hibis sanctuary decoration. Topographical data can be embedded in other types of scenes. At Edfu, the first court features a lengthy series of offering scenes, in which can be detected a geographical progression through Upper and Lower Egypt, on the east and west walls respectively (Derchain 1962). That temples could be conceived as reflecting the cult landscape is clear from the *Book of the Fayum*, in which the topographical layout of the area is presented in the form of an idealised temple. Deities line a body of water leading up to the sanctuary of Sobek (Beinlich 1991; Derchain 1994).

The juxtaposition of terrestrial lists of gods, and those representing a more cosmic sphere, is particularly relevant to the Bubastis context, as discussed below. Interestingly, the exterior of the Dendera sanctuary features the *chronocrates* at the very top of the decorated surface, with nome gods depicted at a lower register (*Dendara I*: 97–9, 129–31, cf. Cauville 1998: 9).

The height of the temple walls thus encompasses the cosmic and the terrestrial. Some of the rooms at Edfu display similar rows of divine images at small scale in the upper registers, such as in the first part of the Sokar chapel (*Edfou I*: pl.24b). The presence of a lengthy frieze of divinities, mostly associated with earthly toponyms, high up on the architraves of the outer hypostyle hall (*Edfou III*: pls.78–80), indicate that terrestrial representations could also be placed high up temple walls at this period. The variety of temple decoration and architecture should not be underestimated, particularly regional variations evident within a short time-span. On the Bubastis naos, there is no clear evidence that a terrestrial topography was being evoked through the registers of gods on the exterior walls.

The actions undertaken by each deity in depictions of rows of deities may well have a significance which the modern viewer will find difficult to interpret. When textual glosses are lacking, any interpretation is made more difficult. I have already referred to the problems in interpreting parts of the Hibis sanctuary decoration as invoking specific mythical events (see p. 28–9 n. 22), but it is possible that in such registers deities were conceived of as performing specific roles, whether ritual or mythological. A text listing gods upon a doorway into one of the ancillary rooms adjacent to the Dendera sanctuary describes these gods as those who ‘follow her (Hathor) on account of the greatness of her *numen* (*b3w*)’ (*Dendara II*: 65–6 = Cauville 1999: 107–9). Each god, or pair of gods, is described as performing a significant action on behalf of Hathor, whether offering objects, crowning her, making music, etc. The relationship of the gods shown on the Bubastis naos to the goddess housed within, Bastet, may have encompassed an element of such divine support and interaction. However, this is not explicit in the imagery upon the naos: the divine images are rather passive, with the exception of the adoring Maat, the goddess nursing the child and two who hold weapons (the Goddess of Thebes and the baboon) (Figs.7–9). In several Roman temples in ed-Dakhla and el-Kharga oases, figures of the king are omitted from offering scenes, but the texts clearly indicate that these are to be considered as offering scenes, though with clear cult topographical allusions too (Kaper 1997: 205–7).

But with many such representations of deities, allusions to the cycle of creation are present, and I believe this is one of the key roles of the exterior decoration on the Bubastis naos (creation is also a feature of the superficially more pragmatic crypt scenes of statuary, Cauville 2004: 67–71). An emphasis on the creative cycle is also found on the naos of Amasis from Kom el-Ahmar (Louvre D29); the other shrine from this site is dedicated to a stage in the rebirth of Osiris, namely Osiris-Hemag (Leiden IM.107). It seems neither of the naoi bear representations of statuary. The former features texts which state that the king received rewards from the gods for creating the naos with the divine depictions upon it. While the Hibis reliefs are grounded in terrestrial temples, through the clear topographical layout of the divinities, Kessler’s comments on how creation and the cosmic cycle were of paramount importance in this decoration (2003; see Chapter 3) are of particular relevance here. A group of scenes at Karnak suggests such depictions of divine forms could relate to creative aspects of divinity. The inner door-jamb of the small sanctuary immediately north of the central barque-chapel at Karnak

features two preserved registers of decoration. Each register is topped with an extended *pt*-sign, below which are depicted two divine forms in the guise of animals. The first register shows a baboon and bull, while that below depicts two falcons (Medinet Habu IV: pl.217 [B]). Other texts in this small room suggest an emphasis on Kamutef-forms of the creator god (PM II²: 91, 99), which is evidently closely associated with creation.³

Bearing in mind that such registers of gods can allude to creation, now consider the decoration upon the naos from Bubastis. The extant parts are difficult to provide an interpretative synthesis for, though creative and Osiride deities are clearly prominent. However, when one considers the other reliefs from the Nekhthorheb temple at the site, one possible purpose underlying the naos decoration becomes apparent.

Naville's publication indicates that he saw a distinction between the fragments of the 'shrine of polished granite' and these other fragments from 'the walls of the hall' (1891: 56–7). The latter may be from the temple sanctuary, and lack the high polish so distinctive of the naos fragments (see Rosenow, Chapter 6). These reliefs are iconographically similar to those upon the naos, featuring registers of divine images (Naville 1891: pls. 45–6).⁴ In these reliefs, however, the deities are grouped, with each group preceded by a column of text: 'temple (*hwt-ntr*) of (deity) X', the god being qualified as 'lord/lady of' or simply 'of' a toponym.⁵ Preserved examples include 'Hathor lady of *Mfk(3)l*', 'Hathor lady of ...', 'Thoth lord of ...', 'Thoth ... *wpr-rhwy*',⁶ a reference to the '*pr-Shmt m st-Bwy*',⁷ 'Horus of Lower Egypt', 'Teb lord of Antaeopolis', 'Hathor lady of Qus', 'Heryshef lord of Herakleopolis', 'Ra (*p3 R*)'-of-Ramses in *p3 mw-R* (the Pelusiac branch of the Nile)', 'Ptah-Tanen of Ramses *hr spt itrw* (?)' and 'Amun of the Northern City (Tell el-Balamun)'. The first deity shown after the label is depicted in a manner consistent with the god whose temple is mentioned. Thus the inscription 'temple of Amun of the northern city' is followed by a seated male deity wearing a head-dress with two long feathers.⁸ These reliefs were framed with a *hkr*-frieze and dedicatory text at the top, a combination not found upon the naos fragments from Bubastis. At least part of the 'temple list' scene is divided by an extended figure of a serpent form, stretching across the five preserved registers (Naville 1891: pl.46 [D–E]), with the figures facing away from it. Could this be from the back wall of the sanctuary which housed the naos?

The deities depicted in these reliefs cover a similar variety of form to those shown on the naos, though some examples feature dorsal pillars (Naville 1891: pl.46 [A]) and a number of small royal figures kneeling before divine images (Naville 1891: pl.46 [D]). As such, it seems reasonable to identify these as cult images associated with those temples. The kneeling royal figures recall the groupings alluded to in *P. Harris I* (Grandet 1989: n.128). The reliefs are not sufficiently preserved to analyse in any great detail, but it is clear that temples from throughout Egypt were represented, and that the sanctuaries of Upper and Lower Egypt were not separated, for example, onto the southern and northern walls of the sanctuary. For example, Herakleopolis Magna and Tell el-Balamun are represented on the same block (Naville 1891: pl.46 [C]).⁹

Despite considerable similarities in layout and iconography, there is a clear difference between these reliefs and the naos decoration, in that the sanctuary reliefs are explicitly associated with earthly temples through the accompanying inscriptions. No

labels exist on the preserved parts of the naos, and the survey of unfinished areas reveal that only small details remained to be added to the main registers, or were missed during the checking process (see Chapter 2). In addition, there are no clearly defined groupings on the naos, which are usually indicated by inscriptions or vertical dividing lines; of course, each register presents an implicit division in itself. The ancient priest/artist who designed the decoration may have been aware that the lack of accompanying inscriptions identifying the deities could lead to differing interpretations, and this may have been intended. Consider how important the name, whether of person or deity, was in Egyptian religion. Without it, some of these images are extremely ambiguous to the modern viewer, and perhaps even to the ancient viewer.¹⁰ A traditional depiction of a falcon could be interpreted as one of hundreds of particular manifestations of gods. Implicitly, it cannot relate to cult statues in the Bubastis temple. Redford describes the Bubastis naos as 'listing the divine denizens of a particular locality' (1986: 216, n.52), but then where are the depictions of Bastet? Many of the other naos feature a notable concentration of images of the god to whom the shrine is dedicated. This is particularly striking on the Saft el-Henna shrine, with its many images of Soped. There are no clear depictions of Bastet in the preserved parts of the decoration. Two depictions *may* represent the goddess (Fig.7b, third register; Fig.9, upper register), though both could also be one of a number of other deities, and are not positioned in a particularly prominent place within their respective registers. Furthermore, there is not anywhere near enough images, or divine barques, for the shrine to represent a catalogue of statuary housed in the temple.

Why would a degree of ambiguity, in terms of the deities depicted, be sought, in stark contrast to the surrounding reliefs? The naos' decoration was primarily cosmogonical, divorced from explicit earthly associations, and focused on the cycles of creation, death and rebirth, so crucial to the continued existence of the universe. The cosmogony implicit in the shrine featured divine characters familiar from creation myths, such as the Hermopolis Ogdoad. However, it seems reasonable to suspect that there was a distinctly local formulation of the creation, specific to Bubastis and presumably casting Bastet as a central protagonist in the creative process, even as the principal creator god. Such local codifications are evident at sites with better preservation of temple reliefs. For example, the 'Khonsu cosmogony' at Thebes casts the Ogdoad as descendants of Amun-Ra, and claims they were buried in *Djeme* (Lesko and Parker 1988). The cult image housed in a naos was, of course, the focal point of the morning ritual which reaffirmed the daily process of creation through the rising sun:

Revealing the face. Adoring the face. Saying: Arise upon the land, as you emerged from Nun. May your rays illuminate the world. May the gods who raise your beauty live: (they are) as (your) sons, in the (horizon of the) East. (Alliott 1949: 78)

As such, an external decoration with primarily cosmogonical content would be appropriate on the principal naos in a temple. The deities depicted on the naos, surrounding the image of Bastet, would have been protagonists alongside Bastet in the daily cycle of re-creation, as (re-) interpreted at Bubastis.

Phases of cosmogonical processes embodied by divinities thus surrounded Bastet (naos), and a subsequent layer of deities grounded in extant temples throughout Egypt ('temple list'

reliefs) completed the core of the temple. The decoration upon the naos was not intended to provide an exhaustive catalogue of Egyptian gods, but rather to ensure the continuity of cosmic cycles.

Two other naoi provide examples of a ‘universal’ representation of the divine world. A naos of Ptolemy II bears a frieze of vultures and uraei above the entrance cavity, plausibly interpreted by Thiers as a reference to the gods of Upper and Lower Egypt, respectively (Thiers 1997: 258–9, fig.7). The naos of Amasis from Athribis, discussed above, depicts a series of gods above the cornice, receiving offerings from the king. These are rather general groupings of three seated anthropomorphic deities each associated with a toponym. The toponyms seem to refer to parts of a temple, though perhaps not specific to Athribis. The accompanying texts make it clear that these depictions could represent all of the gods who fall into the various categories, obviating the need for showing the individual gods.

At Hibis, the specific deities depicted in the sanctuary are clearly arranged topographically, grouped by temple/place (a term for temples, such as *hwt-ntr* or *pr*, is not explicitly mentioned). The Bubastis ‘temple-list’ reliefs clearly performed a similar function. Could an inner shrine at Hibis, a counterpart to the Bubastis naos, have contained décor featuring a cosmogonical depiction of deities?¹¹ Alternatively, the Hibis sanctuary itself could be seen as a substitute for the naos (Cruz Uribe 1988: 197): the decoration synthesised content relating to creation and cult landscape into one series of reliefs (see Kessler 2003). Though at Bubastis these elements were seemingly separated into two distinct groups: cosmogony (naos) and cult landscape (‘temple list’ reliefs, perhaps in the sanctuary), there were undoubtedly notions of creation cycles inherent in the ‘temple list’ at Bubastis, as the principal god in each temple would have been the creator god in that temple.

What was the purpose of highlighting the processes of creation on the shrine which housed Bastet’s principal cult image? A network of divinity, cosmogonical and terrestrial, physically surrounded the cult image of Bastet. The sparse textual content upon the Bubastis naos underlines that Bastet was the focal point of the shrine; it is her alone mentioned in the dedicatory inscriptions, and pharaoh offers to her on the threshold of the naos (Pls.2, 21). The surrounding divinities, embodying the processes of creation, can be interpreted as a further layer of protection, a symbolic enclosure to strengthen the physical protection afforded by the shrine’s architecture. Pharaoh commissioned a shrine to house and protect the divine image; as the Saft el-Henna naos states, he was one who ‘protects the divine bodies in his time and for many years’ (Roeder 1914: 63) through building the naos. This link is even more explicit in texts inscribed around the walls of the Dendera sanctuary:

He (the king) completed the *st-wrt* in its mysterious forms, the name of which is the Temple of the Sistrum, to protect her body in the naos of her *ka*,¹² to protect her image (*sšm*). (Dendara I: 33)

The Hermopolis Ogdoad, embodying a phase in the creative process and present on several of the naoi discussed in Chapter 3,¹³ are explicitly given a protective role towards other gods as early as the *Pyramid Texts* (Lesko 1991: 94).

Thirtieth dynasty temples are not sufficiently preserved to gauge whether the type of decoration found at Bubastis was

employed elsewhere, but the central tenet of protecting the god’s image runs through the architecture of the nationwide building programme (see Chapter 7). Only small fragments of wall reliefs survive at Elephantine (Jenni 1998), none of which feature content of this type, and Upper Egyptian temples may not have included such forms of décor either. It is worth recalling that none of the ten 30th dynasty naoi from south of Memphis bear decoration of the type found upon the Bubastis shrine. At Behbeit el-Hagar, the only other Delta temple with significant areas of 30th dynasty reliefs preserved, a different conception behind the wall reliefs is evident. Indeed, the role of this temple seems rather unusual, being explicitly associated with Osiris-Hemag and the rejuvenation of royal powers (Favard-Meeks 1991). Its proximity to such sites as Samanud (Spencer, N.A. 1999) and Busiris (linked to Behbeit by a canal in the reign of Nekhtnebef, De Meulenaere 1958: 230–3 [2]) suggests we should consider Behbeit’s role in a different light, perhaps similar to the role of Luxor with respect to Karnak.

Moving outwards from the cult statue, the protective relief scheme at Bubastis could be represented schematically, with the help of evidence from other sites with better preserved temples:

Principal subject	Form
Bastet	Cult statue
Cosmogony	Naos decoration
Terrestrial cult	‘Temple list’ reliefs
King and temple	Hypostyle hall reliefs (foundation ceremonies, offering scenes; nome <i>dadoes</i> likely here)
Egypt and its world	Pylon, courtyards, approach (tribute and smiting scenes, decrees, private statuary)
The outside world (chaos)	Beyond the enclosure wall

The use of concentrically arranged spheres of divinity is well attested in the better preserved Ptolemaic temples of Upper Egypt. A range of methods were deployed to heighten protection of the divine element, particularly around vulnerable areas. Finnestad’s summary of architectural elements performing symbolic functions (1997: 203–26) can also be applied to temples of the 4th century BC. In addition to architectural barriers and divisions, reliefs doubled as prophylactic elements. While the sanctuary evidently received much attention, as it housed the cult image, doorways and sacred avenues were also key zones. The guardian gods upon the entrance to the Sokar chapel at Dendera are described as:

The guardian-gods (*sšw-n.sn*), the Great Ones who protect (*swdš*) the place of the Prince of the White Crown, who ensure the protection of its environs (*ir sš m swšw.s*), the lords of vigilance watch the *Duat* without sleeping at night, in the process of eliminating Hemty (i.e. Seth) from his chapel, the 77 gods united in the course of making distant the enemies of the place of Ra, to protect his place, to preserve his body (*hr hn h^c.f*), to defend his *ka* in his naos (*hr mkt kš.f m kšr.f*). (Dendara II: 6 = Cauville 1999: 21)

Statues (*s^chw*) of Sokar were housed in this chapel (frieze dedicatory text, Dendara II: 3 = Cauville 1999: 17). Clearly, the relief décor was envisaged as providing protection to the chapel and its contents. Even apparently pragmatic reliefs, such as nome representations, were also fulfilling a crucial protective role. At Dendera, the texts accompanying such representations on the exterior walls of the sanctuary refer to the protective role these nomes and nome gods performed for the resident god, including the repulsion of chaos (Cauville 1998: 143–9, 185–91). The *Book of the Fayum* depicts gods linked to terrestrial

toponyms of Upper and Lower Egypt in the outer area of the idealised temple, before the sanctuary of Sobek (Derchain 1994: 46–7). Processional barques were particularly vulnerable, as they could leave the secure confines of the temple enclosure. Hill feels that the secondary statuary upon these sacred barques could have performed a protective function similar to that of the wall decoration inside the temples (2004: 139).

The consideration of the priorities evident in the 30th dynasty temple-building programme reveals that the monolithic naos (and its décor) is simply one method of providing architectural and ritual protection around the sacred cult statue of Bastet. Presumably similar naoi were set up at some other sites, as with other forms of architectural protection encountered in the nationwide temple building programme (Chapter 7). The immediate setting of the great naos, within temple and city, is considered first, in Chapters 5 and 6.

In describing the decoration upon the Bubastis naos, and some of its parallels, I have commented that the divine iconography seems quite unusual for traditional, formal temple contexts. Some further thoughts on possible sources for such iconography are appropriate here.

The variety of the naoi set up at Saft el-Henna is a precursor to the slightly later situation at Bubastis, and hints at a sense of experimentation amongst the priests of Saft el-Henna in the early part of the 30th dynasty, whether in terms of the actual compositions or simply the architectural projection of these themes.¹⁴ One of the Bubastis naoi did contain a significant religious text, but without a narrative structure (Rondot 1989). The Saft el-Henna naos, not the earliest naos featuring this type of iconography, but by far the most dense and encyclopaedic, contains several references to the use of papyrus-rolls in carving the divine figures on the walls of the naos. This is not surprising in itself, as temple and tomb decoration is often thought to have been based on layouts and content recorded, or at least outlined, upon, papyrus. However, in cases where a new form of iconography is introduced, what sources were being used?

Cult manuals, in which mythologies associated with certain localities were developed upon, would be an obvious place to feature depictions of divine forms. These would have been stored and consulted in temple libraries, including the much-discussed House of Life. References to the types of texts housed in these ‘institutions’ include ‘the annals (*gnwt*) of the gods and goddesses in the House of Life’ (Gardiner 1938: 161) and ‘that which contains the gods’ (*imi ntr.w*: Derchain 1964: 101). Did these hold information that could have been used as a background or source for naos decoration? Several surviving papyri, principally of the Ptolemaic or Roman periods, may have also fulfilled such a role. The *Delta Cult Manual* is still unpublished (see Meeks 1989), but the *Tanis Geographical Papyri* (Petrie 1889) and *Papyrus Jumilhac* (Vandier 1962) both list or evoke specifics for various sanctuaries, including myths, rituals, festivals, the names and dimensions of sacred images, emblems, trees and lakes. Each locality is afforded varying amounts of information, presumably reflecting its ancient importance, at least in the context of the aims of each papyrus. *P.Jumilhac* does feature depictions of gods in a style reminiscent of the naoi decoration (Vandier 1962, particularly pls.1–3, 19–21), though a relatively small number in relation to the amount of textual content. It seems likely that some of these papyri were compiled from several original compositions. The bringing of

divine images from other temples to a particular festival would act as a visual reminder of the vast array of divine iconography found in images throughout Egypt (e.g. during the *Khoiak* festival: Sauneron 1962: 47–67).

Magical or prophylactic monuments for individuals, including stelae, cippi and healing-statues, can feature several registers of protective deities, often carved in a very summary fashion, and without names.¹⁵ The style of representation and the lack of labels is partly due to the scale of most of these monuments. Nonetheless, the range of poses and forms of the deities echoes that of temple reliefs, and it is possible that some of the more unusual forms upon the naoi, such as the fantastical creature on the Bubastis shrine (Fig. 9), developed out of compositions in this less formal sphere. However, many of the depictions on the cippi and healing statues are shown attacking snakes and scorpions with weapons, and there are a profusion of reptiles and insects illustrated, echoing the concerns voiced in the accompanying texts. The crypts at Tod suggest statuary housed in temples could also take these forms (Thiers 2003b). These prophylactic objects were evidently intended to provide protection through the depictions upon them. Of course, the beneficiary of this protective envelope was to be the dedicant of the stela or healing statue, as well as those who would seek benefits from these monuments.

There is a clear distinction between this type of divine iconography and that found in temple reliefs, which are more restrained in terms of iconography. The Bubastis naos and its parallels seem to occupy a zone somewhere in between, within a traditional framework but including divine images more familiar from contexts other than formal temple reliefs, especially if one considers only temples likely to have been extant at the time. Of course, these naoi were set up in sanctuaries or chapels, generally at some distance from the public areas of the temple, whereas the healing statues would be set up in the courtyards and outer halls of the temple (for examples of healing statues and cippi set up in temples, see Ritner 1989: 105–6).

Furthermore, it is interesting that elements of the divine iconography upon these naoi are found in other contexts, particularly in the funerary arena. Guardian figures common on Late Period sarcophagi (e.g. Goyon 1985: 236–43, pls.35–7)¹⁶ are also found in temples (e.g. Junker and Winter 1965: 112–13). The lengthy rows of gods in the Ain el-Muftella chapel of Djedkhonsuefankh provide a more distant iconographic parallel to the temple reliefs and naos decoration discussed here. The purpose of the gods in this tomb is far from clear, though there are overtly protective entities such as Bastet and Mahes, and a sense of Egypt-wide geographical references embedded in local cult space (Labrique 2004). Much later, Roman, tombs in ed-Dakhla oasis also feature divine imagery (Osing *et al.* 1982: 71–96, pls.20–33), in some cases mirroring the arrangement found in temples in the same oasis (Kaper 1997: 208). Though some of these tomb scenes are familiar from New Kingdom tombs and the *Book of the Dead*, there are parallels to the iconography of the monolithic temple naoi (compare the baboon with bow, **Colour Pl. 4** and Osing *et al.* 1982: pl.20 [b]), particularly with depictions of the phases of Osiride resurrection (e.g. Petrie 1908: pls.40–1). The fantastical creature on the Bubastis naos (Fig. 9) also recalls vignettes in the *Book of the Dead*.

Of course, there is no clear dividing line between the spheres

of temple and tomb. The iconography and texts found in these two contexts are, to a large degree, manifestations of the same belief systems, and there are clear examples where iconography and texts derived from funerary contexts were employed in temples, particularly from the Late Period onwards (Kákosy 1982) and in the Osiris complexes of these temples (for example at Dendera, see Cauville 1997b).

Such naoi, like all new developments in the decoration of monuments in the formal religious sphere, must have been developed as a result of a degree of theological discussion between priests at the relevant temple (on the stylistic aspects of such experimentation, see Derchain 1996). Of course, it is also important to recall that these naoi were housed in the temple sanctuaries, with very restricted access. Thus the unusual iconography of the deities would be visible to few people, in contrast to the (more traditional?) reliefs visible in the outer areas of temples.

Was the Saft el-Henna an experiment, not developed further when Nekhthorheb commissioned the Bubastis shrine? Nothing of the same ambition survives from before, or afterwards, though there is an impressive density of *textual* material in temples such as Edfu and Dendera. Ptolemaic statue crypts do feature some unusual or dynamic forms.¹⁷ Here we should allow for some degree of experimentation and indeed priestly creativity: is it a coincidence that all these naoi come from the Delta, with the exception of the Herakleopolis shrine mentioned above?¹⁸ Did the artist feel the need to introduce visual variation, particularly where there might be several forms of Osiris depicted in close proximity? Note the comments on the unusual forms found upon naoi and temple reliefs in Chapter 2 (p.15). Derchain refers to an ‘infinite variety’ of compositions, especially texts accompanying the offering tableaux, in Ptolemaic temples (1996: 357–8). Of course, we must bear in mind that the vast majority of temple sanctuary decoration from the 1st millennium BC does not survive.

It is interesting that healing statues are, it seems, closely associated with sites in the Delta, and apparently not attested in the Ptolemaic or Roman eras (Kákosy 1999: 29). This is similar to the currently known geographical and chronological distribution of the naoi with registers of divinities, and further underlines that the Delta seems to have been a centre of theological discussion and speculation in the Late Period.¹⁹

Notes

- 1 Naville did find Ramesside material at the site (1887), though this may have been transported here in later times. ‘The chief of the Ma Patjenef in Per-Soped’ is mentioned on the Piye stela (Grimal 1981: 150–1, n.468); one can assume that such a seat of political power would have had a functioning cult temple.
- 2 All these figures are labelled, and take the form of seated anthropomorphic figures, with a few exceptions, such as Taweret figures, a uraeus upon a throne and one figure in a shrine. The *chronocrates* on the sanctuary’s exterior walls are arranged symmetrically about a Hathor/pylon emblem (only on the exterior of the sanctuary, windows pierce the opposite walls), itself flanked by four gods. The king is depicted kneeling, offering Maat to each row of deities.
- 3 If this relief dates to the time of Tuthmosis III, it would be the earliest example of this type of temple iconography known (see Chapter 3). Despite the presence of his cartouche in the discussed relief, the decoration can be ascribed to the Macedonian or early Ptolemaic Period, on account of the form of the standing goddess in the lower registers and the winged sun-disc. Of course, this area of the temple of Amun-Ra at Karnak was extensively re-modelled and renovated in the 4th century BC (PM II²: 98–102).
- 4 A pink granite relief seen at auction should be considered for inclusion with this group (Sotheby’s 1986: 52 [161]); the preserved face depicts a falcon atop a low pedestal, followed by another divine image on a pedestal, with two horizontal lines of large-scale text beneath. The surface has been cut back, and the form of the block itself is not clear from the catalogue. These comments rely on the published photograph and measurements, which suggests the height of the upper line of inscription is c. 19.5cm, thus very similar to that found upon the reliefs published by Naville (1891: pl. 45 [C–H]).
- 5 Further fragments of this decoration were identified at Bubastis in 2005, in addition to others with depictions of divine statues, labelled with dimensions and material (Rosenow, pers. comm.). These will be presented in Rosenow’s doctoral dissertation (see Chapter 6).
- 6 This form of Thoth is usually associated with el-Baqlieh; see Zivie 1975.
- 7 This is probably in the Memphite or Letopolite area, as a Ptolemaic stela includes, in a list of priestly titles from this area, a *ḥm-ntr Šhmt st-ḥ* (Wreszinski 1906: 97).
- 8 The scope for mistakes when divine images and accompanying inscriptions are being copied from papyri onto the temple walls should not be underestimated. *P. Jumilhac* includes an instance of incorrect labelling, as an image of a mummiform Nephthys is identified by a later demotic label as ‘the statue, the *w3d*-sceptre and the *ḥnh*-sign in her hand’, seemingly a description intended for another representation (Vandier 1962: 20).
- 9 Vandier believed that there was a degree of geographic ordering in these reliefs (1962: 68–9).
- 10 The use of ambiguity is not unattested in Egyptian religion. Though from a later period and somewhat different architectural context, the process of *antonomasia*, in which the epithets and roles of deities take precedence over their actual name, provides an example of abstraction (summary and criticisms in Willems *et al.* 2003: 17–23). Though from a more humble and domestic setting, one is reminded of the unnamed ancestor bust, which may well have fulfilled the role of different ancestors for different persons or occasions (Meskell 2004: 74–5).
- 11 The sanctuary is only c. 2.50m wide (Davies 1953: pl.1) which leaves little room for a significantly sized naos: the Elephantine sanctuary was 5.74m wide, and housed a naos 2.27m wide (Niederberger 1999: 21, 86).
- 12 Cauville (1998: 58–9) prefers ‘reliquaire’ (*hd*) but the translation ‘naos’ (possibly read *k3r*) seems appropriate in light of the context of the inscription around the inner walls of the sanctuary in which the naos would have been housed. Whether this was the monolithic naos or a portable barque shrine, both of which may have been stored within the Dendera sanctuary (Colin 1996: 118–19), is unknown.
- 13 It may be significant that the Saft el-Henna and Brussels (E.5818) naoi, which clearly represent statuary, may not have featured depictions of the Ogdoad.
- 14 We know little about how such decorative schemes were initially conceived, in particular the degree to which priests from a temple would collaborate and exchange material with those from nearby temples. *P. Jumilhac* (Vandier 1962) certainly suggests that the codification and re-working of sacred knowledge could be entertained across a significant geographical area.
- 15 For the magical stela, a preliminary catalogue is Sternberg el-Hotabi 1994b, a good range can be seen in Hodjash and Berlev 1982: 244–75 and Gasse and Étienne 2004; the finest example is undoubtedly the *Metternich Stela* (New York, MMA 50.85: Golenischeff 1887, Sander-Hansen 1956). Kákosy (1999) published several healing statues now in Italian museums, accompanied by a discussion on this type of statuary and its role.
- 16 This is a suitable place to mention the pink granite relief fragment, Brussels Musées royaux d’Art et d’Histoire E.6622 (partially published in Derchain 1972: pl.1; other details Limme, personal communication, August 1st 2003). The relief is unprovenanced, purchased in 1932. A four-faced Hathor is shown, body facing left, behind a male figure holding a sceptre, who faces in the same direction. The style and scale of this fragment does not preclude it being from a naos such as the Bubastis shrine, but the working of the other four faces indicates this is probably from a different type of monument. The upper thickness is highly polished in the same manner as the decorated face, suggesting it is an ancient edge; the rear face is smoothed but not polished. The Brussels piece is only 3.8cm thick. These observations strongly suggest the fragment comes from a sarcophagus, not a temple relief or naos.

- 17 For example, at Tod, a sphinx trampling a bound male figure (Thiers 2003b: 284, I); a falcon-headed crocodile with trees behind it and a multi-headed hippopotamus, at least three of which are depicted in a single shrine (Thiers 2003b: 284, II); several examples of figures harpooning small-scale serpents.
- 18 Significant temple building did take place in Upper Egypt during the 30th dynasty (see Spencer 2000: Appendices A–D), so it was not a case of the programme favouring the Delta alone, nor of an imbalance in the preserved evidence. Nine 30th dynasty naoi are preserved from south of Herakleopolis Magna, all without this type of decoration (see Appendix 4).
- 19 The findspots of provenanced 'sculptors' models' seem to be clustered in Lower Egypt (Tomoum 2005: 20–2). As a great proportion of these are of unknown provenance, this may be a misleading distribution.

The Naos in Context

5. The City and Temples of Bubastis

The purpose of these naoi should not be divorced from their archaeological, architectural and historical setting, and the following chapters aim to place the great naos of Nekhthorheb in context. Firstly, the immediate architectural setting of the naos in the temple at Bubastis is considered, in particular the position and purpose of the other shrines known to have been set up in the temple(s). Subsequently, the broad aims and results of the 30th dynasty temple-construction programme are considered.

On the outskirts of the modern city of Zagazig lie the ruins of the town and temples of ancient *Pr-B3st*, known to the Greeks as Bubastis, and now referred to as Tell Basta (Fig.2). The site is still dominated by a mass of scattered granite blocks (Colour Pl.1), though this was not the case in the early 1880s.¹ Settlement mounds rise to the east of the temple proper; as elsewhere in the Delta, these have suffered as a result of *sebakhin* activity, local farmers and urban expansion (see Naville 1891: 1–4; Habachi 1957: 3–4; Bakr 1992: 13–14). The north-western part of Bubastis, across the modern road from the temple, is an area principally known for the late Old Kingdom *ka*-chapels of Teti and Pepi I, but later re-used as a cemetery in the New Kingdom and 26th dynasty (Habachi 1957: 11–43; el-Sawi 1979: 75–6); two hoards of precious metal vessels were discovered near the train tracks in 1906 (Habachi 1957: 6–7; most recently, Seipel 2001: 97–9). Additional tombs were excavated further to the north, in the ‘western cemetery’ (Bakr 1992), ranging in date from the First Intermediate Period to the Late Period. A large Middle Kingdom ‘palace’ complex was found further to the north-east, with associated *sed*-festival reliefs of Amenemhat III (Farid 1964; el-Sawi 1979: 9). Egyptian Antiquities Organisation (EAO) excavations in the 1960s and 1970s cleared other cemetery areas around the *ka*-chapels, revealing mostly New Kingdom material (el-Sawi 1989: 13–74, 81–98). Another cemetery is located to the north-east of the temple; the burial of a 20th dynasty Viceroy of Kush was discovered here (Gauthier 1928). In addition, a modest brick chapel erected in the reign of Amenhotep III was discovered 150m south of the Pepi I temple (Habachi 1957: 102–4). Naville recorded finding significant numbers of cat mummies and bronze figurines in the western part of the site (1891: 52–5), later worked on by the EAO (el-Sawi 1979: 77).

Our impression of the topography of ancient Bubastis is often influenced by the lengthy description in Herodotus, which is worth quoting in full here:

In this town there is a temple of Bubastis (i.e. Bastet), and it is a building most worthy of note. Other temples are greater and more costly, but none more pleasing to the eye than this. Bubastis is, in the Greek language, Artemis.

I will show now the form of her temple: save for the entrance, it stands on an island; two separate channels approach it from the Nile, running in contrary directions as far as the entry of the temple; each of them is a hundred feet wide and overshadowed by trees.

The outer court has a height of ten fathoms (60 feet), and is adorned with notable figures six cubits high. The temple is in the midst of the city, the whole circuit of which commands a view down into it; for the city’s level has been raised, but that of the temple has been left as it was from the first, so that it can be seen into from without.

A stone wall, carved with figures, runs around it; within is a grove of very tall trees growing around a great shrine wherein is the image of the goddess; the temple is a square, each side measuring a furlong (eighth of a mile). A paved road of about three furlongs’ length leads to the entrance, running eastward through the marketplace, towards the temple of Hermes; this road is about 400 feet wide, and bordered by trees reaching to heaven. Such is this temple. (Herodotus II: 138, after Godley 1920)

Herodotus’ observations concern Bubastis over a century before the 30th dynasty building activity took place, but fit well with the excavated remains of the city (Lloyd 1988: 94–6). Modern descriptions and reconstructions of the city’s plan have sought to correlate standing remains with this description (e.g. Wilkinson 1843: 427–30; Kitchen 1973: 318, fig.3). Early European visitors to the site describe a situation familiar to visitors today, at least in terms of the topography and confusing array of ruins (e.g. Van Siclen 1987).

Naville, who sought a permit to work on behalf of the EEF around Bubastis in early 1887, seemed to think Bubastis did not deserve extensive investigation:

I have just written asking for permission to dig anywhere in the triangle between Zagazig, Tell el-Kebir and Cairo. I have there a certain number of *tells* to explore and to see whether there is anything to be done. As for Tell Basta I believe it is hopeless to do anything there, at least on a large scale . . . (Letter of Naville to Amelia Edwards, January 2nd 1887 [EES Archive Ve])

In contrast, subsequent letters from the first season at the site, which ran from mid-January to mid-May 1887, indicate he was satisfied with the results. Discoveries in that first season included inscriptions of the 12th dynasty, Ramses II and Osorkon II, prompting him to ask the EEF to finance a further two-month season at the site.² This request was heeded, and he arrived in Egypt on 9 February 1888 to prepare for the second season, having heard reports that there was ‘a good deal of water in the space of the festival hall’ a fortnight before (Letter of Naville to [], 12 February 1888 [EES Archive Vf]). The low-lying temple areas of Delta sites are prone to being partly flooded with water in the winter and spring. Much of the correspondence from Naville that season concentrates on the discovery of the ‘Hyksos’ statues, i.e. the colossal statues of Amenemhat III now in the British Museum and Cairo (see Appendix 3). However, he had started clearing parts of the western ends of the temple, and had discovered parts of the great naos by mid-April 1888:

It is clear that the entire Western part was under the XXXth dynasty the sanctuary of the temple; there are fragments of a beautiful shrine in polished red granite made by Nekhthorheb, and of the most exquisite workmanship. (Letter of Naville to Poole, 15 April 1888 [EES Archive Vf])

A subsequent letter notes that one of the blocks from the naos was to be sent back to England in the division of finds at the end of the season.³ Excavations in the 30th dynasty area continued during the final season:

we dig also in the Western part; but at present except (for) the name of Nekhthorheb it proves most uninteresting. (Letter of Naville to Edwards, February 10th 1889 [EES Archive Vg])

Later in that last season, Naville relates:

all the blocks of the two first halls have been rolled without one exception. We shall roll a few in the hall of Nectanebo, but as they are most of them without any exception, it will not give much results. We can say now with certainty, nothing remains at Bubastis. (Letter of Naville to Edwards, 24 March 1889 [EES Archive Vg])

Excavations in the latter part of this final season were concentrated in the cat cemetery. The subsequent work of the Egyptian and German archaeologists in the temple area revealed that Naville did not discover all of the decorated blocks (see Chapter 6).

It is easy to criticise early archaeologists for their methodology, and Naville's excavations did not yield the necessary information to understand the structural and chronological relationships between the different areas of the temple. The investigation of a temple's foundations would normally answer such questions, but the situation at Bubastis is made difficult by the mass of granite blocks which cover the temple area. One must also remember that the EEF needed to satisfy its subscribers with sculpture and other objects worthy of display. Naville refers to Edward's and Poole's desire to return with impressive objects: 'I see you want me to take away as many large monuments as possible' (Letter of Naville to Poole, 15 April 1888 [EES Archive Vf]). In the immediate aftermath of the excavations, Naville wrote from Geneva to urge the EEF to ensure as many monuments as possible were removed:

I have been much impressed by the fact that the considerable works of sculpture which have been unearthed at Bubastis are doomed to a certain destruction whether by the salt and water or by the hands of the Greeks and the *fellahs*. Under such circumstances it would be much better to remove as much as possible and to distribute it between the European museums than to let it decay and be ruined ... I know the Berlin Museum is desirous to have some. (Letter of Naville to Edwards, 30 April, 1889 [EES Archive Vg])

However, a letter from Naville, written before the start of the third and final season, reveals he was aware of the shortcomings of the excavations:

I am ready to go again to Tell Basta, though I believe that we found the most interesting monuments, and that we are not to expect much more. A great deal of what you describe in your letter is next to impossible. Foundation deposits exist perhaps in an outward pavilion; but as to the temple itself no trace has been discovered ever of the foundation wall, and it is doubtful whether it was built on the same principle as other temples considering the nature of the soil. I wish I was mistaken; and I should be only too happy if Griffith's somewhat startling theories about levels and ... (?) should prove correct; but I cannot help thinking that we got to the very bottom of the temple in most of its area and that there is nothing to be looked for low down. (Letter of Naville to Edwards, 31 December, 1888 [EES Archive Vf])

Thus the layout and chronological phases of the main temple area at Bubastis are very unclear at present. Naville confidently assigned the small cluster of ruins north-west of the 30th dynasty area to a 'small temple' (1891: 60–2), since interpreted as a structure dedicated to the god Mahes (Habachi 1957: 45–57). These remains bear the cartouches of Osorkon II; no evidence of

30th dynasty activity in these structures is as yet known, though the area would probably repay systematic investigation.

In the main temple region, an area of 200m x 60m laid out on a roughly east-west axis, over 3,000 fragments of granite are visible on the surface (Tietze 2000: 208). Textual evidence suggests the temple complex featured a crescent-shaped *išrw*-lake (Geßler-Löhr 1983: 404–8). A massive mud brick enclosure wall was noted by Naville (1891: 60), though he offers no information which would help date the structure (see Chapter 7 for temple enclosure walls constructed in the 30th dynasty). There is clear textual evidence for a House of Life at the site (Habachi and Ghalioungui 1971), as one would expect in such a large temple. Partly due to the priority of Naville to recover inscribed stonework with the aim of reconstructing the temple's history, little of the mass of statuary and architectural fragments recovered between 1887 and 1889 can be securely assigned to a contemporary architectural context.⁴ As such, it has been suggested that much of this sculpture was moved from other sites at a later period, particularly from Memphite pyramid complexes (Uphill 1984: 230–2), but this theory is untenable (Arnold 1996). In further support of significant building activity in the Middle Kingdom is the presence of inscriptions bearing dedications to Bastet lady of Bubastis (e.g. Naville 1891: pl.33 [A]). The statues found by Farid also reveal the activity of elite officials at the site during the Middle Kingdom (one is inscribed for a *h3ty-ꜥ Nhb hry-tp m pr-wr imy-r hm.w-ntr n B3stt*; Farid 1964: 92–3, pls.4–6).

The late Bubastis temple was constructed principally of limestone, as significant numbers of chippings are still visible in the temple area (Tietze 2000: 208). However, a substantial proportion of the decorated surfaces were in pink granite. These have survived better than the limestone, not being subject to burning from late Roman times onwards. Basalt, quartzite and sandstone were also used (Tietze 2004: 49; see Chapter 6). Two copper alloy dovetail cramps, now in Toronto, bear a column of hieroglyphs with the titulary of Nekhthorheb, and are said to be from Bubastis (Pls.35–36).⁵ However, one of the cramps bears an epithet which refers to a deity who is described as 'lord/lady of *Hbyt*'. This points towards a provenance of Behbeit el-Hagar, a suggestion that is further supported by the forms of the royal cartouche on the other cramp: *Sndm-ib-rꜥ stp-n-3st* and *Nht-hr-hb mry-3st* (see Jenni 1998: 77, n.530), and the purchase of a similar object at the site in the early 19th century (Valentia 1811: 426 and unnumbered plate).⁶ A very similar object, of slightly smaller dimensions, was discovered in the royal necropolis at Tanis (Tanis 1987: 190–1 [53]); it bears the titulary of Psusennes I and Mutnodjmet. Yoyotte, in the just-cited catalogue entry, underlines how such cramps, made of fine material, must have acted as statements of a particular's king's piety expressed through construction work, directed at the divine world, much like foundation deposits.

Present knowledge suggests the late temple was commenced by Osorkon I, with significant additions under Osorkon II. The former is thought to have built a hall and forecourt, while the latter is responsible for a pillared hall with monumental Hathor-head capitals, and the *sed*-festival gate (Barta 1978; Tietze and Omar 1996; Arnold 1999: 36–9).⁷ Daressy recovered a part of a red-granite naos of Osorkon II, which he first saw buried in the ground some 60m east of the temple area at Bubastis. It is inscribed for 'his mother Bastet, lady of heaven, mistress of the

Two Lands' (CG 70006, Daressy 1901: 132; Roeder 1914: 24–5, pl.65a). The king is depicted on the door-thicknesses, with his hands upon a chest or small shrine (Roeder 1914: 24; Daressy 1901).

Almost no evidence of construction activity in the temple between the time of Osorkon II and the 30th dynasty has yet been identified, though this is typical of the preserved evidence throughout Egypt and is unlikely to reflect a lack of temple building during the 7th and 6th centuries BC. The city was recognised as part of a political entity under the authority of Osorkon (IV) in the victory stela of Piye (Grimal 1981: 13*, 42*, 154). The EEF excavations did include fragments of three private statues which may be ascribed to the 26th dynasty (Naville 1891: pl.43 [A, C, D]), and part of a limestone statue of Hakoris (British Museum EA 1825; Naville 1891: pl.43 [B]). Unsurprisingly, statuary from uncontrolled excavations attests to the ongoing functioning of the temple at the site (e.g. that of a late Saite priest, O'Rourke 1990).

The principal problem with our present knowledge of the 30th dynasty temple is not knowing exactly how it related to, or incorporated, the 22nd dynasty structures. The remains could be interpreted as the extension of an existing temple, a replacement of the extant temple core or as a completely separate temple; examples of all three models are known elsewhere (see Chapter 7). Until new evidence from excavations is forthcoming, it is not possible to ascertain which, if any, of these interpretations is correct. Tietze presently favours an open court between the two structures, with statues fronting both building's facades (2004: 51). The western area of the temple ruins is dominated by fragments of columns, as one would expect if a series of columned halls or colonnades was located near the front of a temple. In contrast, few column remains are yet known from the 30th dynasty area. When considered alongside the nature of the decoration, and the number of shrines found in the western area (see Chapter 6), it seems the 30th dynasty structure was effectively the sanctuary complex, presumably replacing an earlier structure with a somewhat similar purpose. There is nothing in the preserved 30th dynasty reliefs to suggest a mammisiac structure, despite evident contemporary interest in erecting such buildings at other sites.

The construction of a new temple, or a significant addition to an existing structure, would be accompanied by the installation of royal and divine statuary, to be complemented in time with private statuary. Fragments of several statues survive from such a programme. One is a fragment from the base of a statue bearing depictions of two registers of divinities, which the excavator thought was part of a seated statue flanked by a smaller figure (Naville 1891: pl.43 [F-F']). The inscription gives the name of Nekhthorheb and refers to the day of 'fashioning the living images (*ms šsp-ḥnh*)' and invokes the royal *ka*. The other is a statue of Bastet 'of beautiful workmanship', which Naville assigned to the reign of Nekhthorheb (1891: 58, pl.43 [G]). The present whereabouts of these two fragments are unknown to me. One other statue fragment, of grey granite, found by Naville is now in the Cairo Museum (Naville 1891: 56, pl.43 [E]; Borchardt 1934: 50).

What is immediately striking for a temple of this size is the number of monolithic shrines dedicated by Nekhthorheb at Bubastis, at least two of which were excavated by Naville in this western temple area (the naos studied here, and the other naos

studied in Appendix 1). Seven further naoi were not found during controlled excavations, thus we cannot state for which part of the site they were originally intended. In the 1950s, Habachi noted remains of shrines, both in pink and grey granite, in the western area of the ruins (1957: 81), and Rosenow notes the recent discovery of further shrine fragments (see p.44–5, ns.7–8; **Pls.38, 42–3**). The basalt fragment is the first attested example of this stone in a naos of this period (see Appendix 4).

These naoi obviously fulfilled different functions. It is clear from the preserved shrines that at least four types existed:

- 1) walls decorated with rows of gods, similar to the Saft el-Henna naos (the naos studied here, presumably the principal naos in the temple complex);
- 2) 'simple' shrines with no decoration apart from royal titulary on jambs, as familiar from many sites in the 30th dynasty (Habachi 1957: 82–4, fig.23; Roeder 1914: CG 70013), often dedicated to subsidiary deities;
- 3) barque (?) shrine (EA 1106, see Appendix 1);
- 4) granodiorite shrines containing mythological text (Rondot 1989).

Habachi's reconstruction of the fragments found at Bilbeis (2) leaves no doubt that there were four separate shrines; it does remain possible that (4), a right wall segment, may originally have come from one of these monuments. In total, there were between nine and twelve 30th dynasty naoi set up at Bubastis, if not more.

The granodiorite shrine (Rondot 1989) is the most unusual. Only the right side wall survives, indicating no decoration within the shrine, and jambs bearing the titulary of Nekhthorheb. The dedicatory text indicates this naos was dedicated to 'Khonsu-Horus lord of joy, son of Bastet', with the remainder of the decorated surface invoking one of the seven arrows of Bastet, and the protective god who ensures its terrifying powers are not brought to bear on the king. Various unguents, plants and substances are listed to facilitate the suppression of these malevolent powers. Rondot's study cites parallels which show that each of the seven arrows was associated with a particular deity: Bastet lady of Bubastis (first arrow), Nefertum son of Bastet (second), Horhekenu (third) and Wenut eye-of-Ra (sixth); the others are unknown (Rondot 1989: 267). Rondot plausibly suggests either seven naoi formed a protective group invoking the deities of the seven arrows, or possibly four shrines each contained dedications to two of the gods (with the 'leader of the troop, Tutu' making up the numbers, though this role for Tutu is only attested in later sources). Could some of the naoi reconstructed by Habachi fall into this group (Horhekenu may be mentioned on one of the naoi, Habachi 1957: 82–3, 128, fig.23)? This is an unusual text to feature upon a monolithic temple naos, though somewhat similar content is invoked upon a Roman shrine (Rondot 1990), and some of the Saft el-Henna naoi bear lengthy mythological texts (see Chapter 3).

Archaeological investigation of sites in Egypt has yet to reveal evidence of this number of contemporary monolithic naoi being set up in one temple complex. While this may partly reflect the unevenness of preservation, the variety of shrine types and the nature of the decoration does underline how the Delta was the setting for vibrant theological speculation and codification at this period.

The naos studied here presumably housed the principal

image of Bastet at Bubastis, as its monumentality dwarfs other elements of the contemporary temple. But where, and how, were the other naoi arranged?

The uraei hanging from the sun-disc above the doorway in the principal shrine are adorned with the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, suggesting that the left side of the naos was associated with the south; the goddess of Thebes also appears on this side. The temple is orientated on a roughly east-west axis, thus the naos presumably faced east, towards the entrance. In addition, one must consider Rondot's (1989: 269) proposal of either seven naoi dedicated to each of the gods of the seven arrows of Bubastis (one of which is described on the fragment published by him), or four naoi to create a sacred quadrant based on the cardinal points. The latter arrangement would echo that known from Mendes. Though an arrangement of 7, 8, 9 or even 10 naoi in the core of the temple is possible, as the Abydos temple of Seti I featured seven adjacent sanctuaries, it seems more likely that secondary naoi were situated in and around the sanctuary area, as has been proposed for Tell Tebilleh (Mumford 2004a: 274–6, fig.5), and/or within smaller temples elsewhere in the enclosure.⁸ For further comments on how the shrines may have been arranged within the temple, see the contribution by Rosenow (Chapter 6). Placing secondary chapels around the central shrine would also fit well with the apparent aims of 30th dynasty temple architecture, particularly affording temple sanctuaries greater physical protection from the profane world.

Unfortunately, parallels from other sites shed little light on this problem. Though many well-preserved naoi survive from the 30th dynasty (far more than from any other period), few have a secure provenance beyond a site name. Of those listed in Appendix 4, only those from Tell el-Balamun, Bubastis, Saft el-Henna (CG 70021, for position cf. Naville 1887: 2, pl.10) and Abydos come from a recognised temple area. The Elephantine trio of shrines are the only contemporary examples to have survived *in situ* within the tripartite sanctuary at the back of the Khnum temple. The Edfu naos is not considered here, as this shrine of Nekhthorheb was re-positioned in a structure dating entirely to the Ptolemaic period.⁹

The construction programme of the 30th dynasty seems to have come to an abrupt end at Bubastis, with parts of the naos only polished in preparation for carving, and hieroglyphic signs and figures left incomplete (see Chapter 2). At least one of the other shrines was also left unfinished, as the last column of text is incised but not fully carved (Rondot 1989: 250, pl.32). The invading Persian troops, who entered Egypt via the Nile Delta, are likely to have been responsible for the abrupt end to work at Bubastis. Unfinished monuments from the reign of Nekhthorheb are known from many other sites, notably in the Delta, but also as far south as Elephantine (unfinished naoi, Niederberger 1999: 19, 86–91, figs.51–5, pls.32–3). Interestingly, there is little evidence for the intentional defacement of the inscriptions and scenes, a notable exception being the figure upon the bier (Pl.13). The later history of Bubastis is less well understood, though the temple was clearly still functioning in the reign of Ptolemy III, as a bilingual decree was found at the site in 2004.

Greek and Roman-style statues were also set up in the temple area (Habachi 1957: 59–60).¹⁰

The principal deities represented in the 30th dynasty temple all reflect a protective or warlike character, suggesting that the sanctuary was viewed as an ideological fortress against the Persian threat, which often attacked via the Pelusiac branch of the Nile (Jenni 1998: 91). The naos, however, emphasised the positive process of creation.

Notes

- 1 Edouard Naville first visited the site in 1882, and in a letter to R.S. Poole soon after relates that 'except a few stones nothing is visible of the large temple the structure of which is indicated by the undulating soil, and which lies buried under the Nile mud several metres deep ... but there is no doubt that two trenches opened crosswise through the axe of the temple would lead to its substructures'. (EES archive V.e)
- 2 Letters of Naville to Poole, 1 May 1887; and Naville to Edwards, 16 May 1887 (the latter from Alexandria after the end of the season) [EES Archive Ve].
- 3 Letter of Naville to Poole, 21 April 1888 [EES Archive Vf]. In fact, three of the fragments were registered at the British Museum on 13 April 1889, thus were probably sent back together (there is no record of EA 1005 being registered). In contrast, EA 1106 was registered on 16 October 1891 (see Appendix 1).
- 4 The emphasis on finding inscriptions during the excavation is clear in one of Naville's preliminary reports (1888: 59–60). He resorted to employing a contractor to excavate many of the blocks, who supervised the work during times when Naville was back in Cairo (Drower 1982: 25).
- 5 Toronto Royal Ontario Museum 909.80.303 (pl.35): length 28.5cm, depth 4cm, width at ends 11.5cm, width at narrowest point 5.5cm; Toronto Royal Ontario Museum 909.80.304 (pl.36): length 20.3cm, depth 3.3cm, width at ends 8.5cm, width at narrowest point 4.1cm. There are no acquisition records for these objects, but the Museum's catalogue cards state that the objects are from Naville's excavations. It is clear they were purchased by C.T. Currelly between 1907 and 1909. Thanks are due to Roberta Shaw, Curator in the Near Eastern and Asian Civilisations Department at the Royal Ontario Museum, for this information, and permission for publication.
- 6 It is possible this cramp is actually the same as Toronto ROM 909.80.304, and the areas of inscription not recorded by Valentia were obscured by corrosion when the drawing was made.
- 7 Fragments of an inscription of Osorkon I found by Naville at Bubastis (1891: pls.51–2), in an area later identified as a Mahes temple (Habachi 1957: 47–57), records the donation of a wide variety of statuary to sanctuaries throughout Egypt, including Bubastis, with dimensions and materials listed. The layout of the hieroglyphs is very similar to that in the dedicatory inscriptions upon the Saft el-Henna naos (Roeder 1914: CG 70021).
- 8 A monolithic naos of Ptolemy IV, dedicated to Neferhotep, was set up along the dromos of the Khonsu temple at Karnak (PM II²: 224–5), and smaller naoi were installed elsewhere in temple precincts, e.g. Laskowska-Kusztal 1995, Jaritz 1980: 22–4 (naoi on the cult terrace at Elephantine). For small-scale naoi housed in the *wsh-t-psdt* of the Edfu temple see Alliott 1949: 99; the crypts of Graeco-Roman temples attest to the number of shrines which could be housed within one temple. Private individuals also set up naoi, such as the shrine and statue dedicated by Pabasa to Taweret (Daressy 1906: 284, pl.55; Roeder 1914: 106–9, pls.37, 56a). Painted wooden shrines may have been used in a variety of contexts (e.g. Messiha and el-Hitta 1979: pl.16 [200]).
- 9 The suggestion that the naos was to be set up in the rear left corner of the sanctuary, as shown in early photographs (Fitzenreiter 2003: 128, n.27) is unconvincing; conceived as a temple in miniature, the naos would have stood upon the temple axis. In cases where the exterior walls of a naos bear decoration, a central emplacement is even more logical.
- 10 For an overview of the cult of Bastet in Ptolemaic and Roman times, see Quagebeur 1991.

6. The Nekhthorheb Temple

Daniela Rosenow¹

Introduction: recent fieldwork at Tell Basta

In February–March 2001, during the 13th season of the Egyptian-German Joint Mission to Tell Basta, research was initiated in the temple complex of Nekhthorheb.² All the visible decorated blocks were numbered, measured and briefly described (Rosenow 2001). The extant grid of 10m x 10m squares, created in 1991, was used as a basis for the registration of all decorated blocks, resulting in a 1:50 scale map, which recorded the exact position of each block within the grid. Additional information on the material, function, dimensions and other relevant features of the blocks were recorded. In total, 117 decorated blocks were recorded in 26 squares during the 2001 season. Six of these are quartzite, the remainder being of red granite. Basalt blocks were found on the northern, western and southern side of the complex, all of them anepigraphic.

In February–March 2002, the work continued in the temple of Nekhthorheb, with epigraphic copies made of all the decorated blocks. After this epigraphic work was finished, the previously published drawings of Naville and Habachi were collated. In addition, 13 new reliefs were discovered and recorded.³

Building materials

Three different types of stone are found in the Nekhthorheb temple area: red and grey granite, quartzite and basalt. The majority of the blocks are of red granite, whereas decorated quartzite blocks are rare. All the basalt blocks, with one exception, come from the pavement levels. Habachi additionally mentions fragments of limestone, the present whereabouts of which are unknown.

The red granite employed in the Nekhthorheb complex is not of uniform appearance. With regards to a possible reconstruction and analysis of the temple's architecture, but also to aid reconstructing fragmentary scenes, it seemed worthwhile to record the exact colour of every granite block. Thus it should be possible to exclude certain joins between fragments. As a result four groups of granite could be classified: grey granite, dark red granite, light red granite and a type of granite with the same portion of grey and red particles. Furthermore, the present condition of each block was noted, the majority being in a good, or at least moderate, state of preservation.

The majority of surviving red granite blocks are from walls or ceilings; only a few fragments of columns and capitals were encountered. Some blocks seem to be parts of shrines or chapels, on the basis of their form or sculptural style and context, which will be discussed below.

In addition to countless chips of quartzite found across the whole area of the Nekhthorheb complex, nine decorated blocks of this material were recorded in grid squares H/7, G/6, F/8, F/4, F/3, D/9 and C/6. Six of them feature one or more parts of Nekhthorheb's titulary.

The basalt blocks found in the Nekhthorheb complex were all discovered on the northern, western and southern edge of the temple area. This basalt seems to come from Abu Zabal, the closest basalt quarry in this region.⁴ The majority of these blocks functioned as paving stones, with red granite wall blocks placed on top of them. Some basalt blocks show incisions, which can be interpreted as building guidelines (Pl.37). These lines thus marked the exact position of the wall fragments, which were placed on top of the basalt blocks. Architectural elements which stand proud of the wall, such as doorjambs or torus mouldings, were indicated in these incisions. In contrast to these blocks, one basalt fragment clearly represents the remains of the upper, right corner of a shrine (Pl.38). No decoration is preserved on this block, but it is highly polished. As it is situated at the eastern limits of the Nekhthorheb complex, it remains possible that this shrine was originally set up in the structure of Osorkon II.

Architecture of the Nekhthorheb structure

The ruins of the Nekhthorheb area, encompassing an area of 60m x 60m, are situated to the west of the temple complex built by Osorkon I and II. The discovery of five blocks (each c.1m high) with uraei sculpted in high relief, in grid squares G/4 and G/5, implies that the temple's eastern entrance area was adorned, at least partly, with such a frieze.⁵ The outer walls on the northern and southern sides were decorated with a cavetto cornice; seven of these fragments were found in grid squares B/4 and B/8, D/4 and D/8 and F/3. These blocks all bear the same decoration, with a row of cartouches, each topped with a sun-disk and two feathers (Pl.39). The cartouches alternate between the king's *nsw.t-bjty* and *s3-R'*-title. Some of the cornice fragments found in the eastern part of the complex were undecorated (grid squares G/6, G/7 and H/7), where most of the fragments with uraei were discovered. Thus this side of the complex presented a decorated entrance façade with a frieze of uraei, probably only above the entrance(s), and an undecorated cornice above the remaining parts of the wall. The wall fragments were of red or grey granite, quartzite, and probably limestone.

The temple's ceiling was decorated with a typical motif of stars (Pl.40), of which 35 fragments were recorded.⁶ They are scattered over the whole area, with no notable concentration in their distribution, though there was an absence of such blocks in the eastern-middle sector E; this may support Habachi's placement of an open court in this area. But in general, it seems the smaller rooms were roofed, as was typical in granite temple buildings.

While 28 of these ceiling fragments only bear stars, seven of the blocks feature a column of inscription, bearing the name of Nekhthorheb and the toponym Bubastis. Judging from the orientation of the stars, it is possible to reconstruct two axial lines of inscription which completed the ceiling's decoration.

Unfortunately it is impossible to say whether these two columns of inscription joined each other in places, as only small parts have been recovered.

In the eastern part of the complex three blocks were found that represent fragments of lintels. Two of them have already been published by Naville (Naville 1891: pl.54 [A, O]), and another by Habachi (Habachi 1957: 75, fig.18). The latter block (F/6.1) shows the remaining part of a winged sun-disk below a *hkr*-frieze, as well as fragments of an inscription and, on the right side, an offering-bearer in the form of Hapy, accompanied by an ox. Before him stands a shrine topped with a falcon wearing the double crown (Fig.14). The second, adjoining, face (F/6.1b, Fig.15) of this block bears an inscription that gives Nekhthorheb's *nsw.t-bit.y*-name *Sndm-ib-R^c stp-n-In-Ḥr*. To the left of this column fragments of a wing and a horizontal line of inscription are partly preserved. The second lintel fragment (G/6.2 = Naville 1891: pl.54 [A]) is also decorated on two sides. One side shows a winged sun-disk below a *hkr*-frieze, with a falcon wearing a double crown and a cobra with the white crown of Upper Egypt below the left wing of the sun-disc. Another falcon with a composite crown and a cobra wearing the red crown of Lower Egypt are depicted on the other side, all with accompanying labels (Fig.16). Additional fragments of an inscription can be seen on the upper part of the block's left side. The second decorated side of this block (Fig.17) shows two vultures with outstretched wings, holding feathers in their claws. Here the remainders of a horizontal line of inscription can be seen too. The third lintel (G/6.4 = Naville 1891: pl.54 [O]) bears a relief showing the pharaoh kneeling and offering (Fig.18). The upper part gives a line of inscription: *Bḥd.tj ntr ʕ3, nb p.t, s3b šw.tj pr(j) m...*. 'The Behdedite, the great god, lord of heaven, with coloured feathers, who emerges from...' Below, a vertical column of text states: 'words spoken by Horus, lord of protection...'. The ceiling side of this lintel bears Nekhthorheb's *nsw.t-bit.y*-name: *ntr nfr nb ʔ3wy Sndm-ib-R^c [stp-n-Inḥr]* (Fig.19).

Blocks G/6.2 and G/6.4 evidently join, with a horizontal inscription on the front face: 'The Behdedite, the great god, lord of heaven, with coloured feathers, who emerges from the horizon' (Figs.16, 18). Both blocks thus represent fragments of one and the same lintel, probably from the south-eastern part of the temple. The front side of this lintel was decorated with a winged sun-disk, above a depiction of pharaoh kneeling, giving offerings to 'Horus lord of protection'. Wadjit and Nekhbet are shown as cobras with respective hieroglyphic labels, all below a large-scale *hkr*-frieze.

It is also rewarding to study the other decorated faces of the lintel fragments. These faces evidently represent the ceiling of these doorways. Two additional reliefs, discovered in 2001 and 2004, help with the reconstruction of the gateways' decoration. The blocks depict fragments of three wings grouped one above the other and inscriptions invoking Nekhbet and Wadjit from Pe and Dep, lady of the *pr-nw*, and parts of Nekhthorheb's *nsw.t-bit.y*-, and *s3-R^c*-name (Figs.20–1). Thus these doorways were evidently decorated with a line of inscription on either side, presenting the titulary of Nekhthorheb and with alternate representations of Wadjit and Nekhbet in between, depicted as vultures with outstretched wings. The heavily damaged fragments of the accompanying inscription read:

W3d.t P Dp [nb.t pr-nw] ḥn.t pr-nsr.t di.s ʕnh dd w3s n s3-R^c Nh.t-ḥr-ḥb.t mry-In-Ḥr s3- B3st.t mry B3st ʕ3.t ḥn.t B3s.t

Wadjit of Pe and Dep [mistress of the *pr-nw*], lady of the *pr-nsr.t*, may she give life, stability and dominion to the son of Ra, Nekhthorheb, beloved of Onuris, son of Bastet, beloved of Bastet, the Great, lady of Bubastis.

Nḥb.t ḥd.t Nḥn, 3w.t-ʕ, [nb(t) ʕh-šmʕ, d=s ʕnh dd w3s n nsw.t-bit.y Sndm-jb-R^c stp-n-In-Ḥr, s3-R^c Nh.t-ḥr-ḥb mry-In-Ḥr s3-B3st.t mry B3st.t ʕ3.t ḥn.t B3s.t

Nekhbet, the white One of Nekhen, wide of arm, mistress of the Upper Egyptian palace, may she give life, stability and dominion to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt *Sndm-jb-R^c*, chosen by Onuris, son of Ra, Nekhthorheb, beloved of Onuris, son of Bastet, beloved of Bastet, lady of Bubastis.

Three blocks found in the southern part of the Nekhthorheb area are of special interest. Also decorated with a cavetto cornice and torus moulding (Pl.41), study of these fragments revealed that they represent the upper corner of a smaller building within the temple area. These fragments are probably the corner blocks of doorways into smaller side chapels, which have therefore been decorated with a cavetto cornice, a torus moulding, inscriptions and a winged sun-disk; a cobra atop a blossom of papyrus flanks the torus moulding to the right. Judging from their place of discovery these side chapels were located in the middle southern part of the temple area, and it seems reasonable to posit similar side chapels on the northern side too. These side chapels probably housed the shrines for those gods which were worshipped alongside Bastet at Bubastis: Atum, Horhekenu, Mahes and Heryshef (Habachi 1957: 82–4, fig. 23), whereas the principal naos for Bastet (presented in this volume) was probably situated along the main axis of the complex.

In the middle part of the ruins, approximately in sectors D and E, a significant number of large scale scenes depicted pharaoh offering, with an extended star-filled *pt*-sign above the scene. Each register shows representations of the king offering different objects (e.g. *nw*-pots or a figure of Maat) to Bastet, who promises him blessings in return. Perhaps these representations adorned the walls of the sanctuary which contained the great naos of Bastet.

At the western edge of this middle part (within grid squares C/6 and C/7), six blocks with parts of a tall *hkr*-frieze were discovered. Three of them also bear two lines of inscription with large hieroglyphs below this motif (Naville 1891: pl.54 [C–D]; Habachi 1957: 80, fig. 22). These inscriptions mention the dedication of the temple to the goddess Bastet. As both right- and left-orientated hieroglyphs are found, it can be suggested that there were two lines of inscription, beginning in the middle and running in opposite directions.

Furthermore two blocks which name the kings Amenemhat I and Amenhotep II were found within this middle part of the ruins (Habachi 1957: 90, fig.26), including a dedicatory inscription of the temple to the goddess Bastet. They were obviously reused by Nekhthorheb; as there is no evidence for usurpation, this may have been a pious gesture towards his ancestors.

At the western limit of the complex, Nekhthorheb erected an unknown number of naoi (see Chapter 5). Two of them were discovered by Naville, fragments of which are now in Cairo and London, published fully in this volume (Chapters 1–2, Appendix 2). A further shrine was found reused in a modern building in Cairo (Roeder 1914: CG 70013), its original provenance is suggested by the texts upon the door thicknesses. Rondot published a further fragment of a shrine; the inscription

suggests that it comes from Bubastis (1989). Furthermore five fragments of naoi were discovered in the Nekhthorheb area during the 13th season of the Tell Basta Project in 2001. They were found in grid squares B/4 and C/6; the majority are inscribed with parts of Nekhthorheb's titles and are in an excellent state of preservation (Pls.42–3).⁷ It is not yet clear if the newly recorded blocks represent fragments of already known naoi, or of even more shrines.⁸ Finally, Habachi discovered ten blocks at Bilbeis that can probably be regarded as fragments of shrines. These are inscribed with parts of Nekhthorheb's titulary, and invoke the deities Sekhmet, Montu, Horhekenu and Shesemet (Habachi 1957: 83, fig.23).

For a correct understanding of the temple complex it is necessary to distinguish between the main naos of the goddess Bastet and smaller naoi for various 'guest-deities' who were worshipped at Bubastis (*ntr X, hrj-jb B3s.t*). While the principal naos of Bastet was probably erected in the central part of the sanctuary and showed an elaborate decorative scheme, the majority of the smaller naoi were very simply decorated, typically with only an inscription on the door jambs, naming Nekhthorheb and the god to whom that specific shrine was dedicated.⁹

The original arrangement of these naoi is very problematic. As there have not been any systematic excavations in the area of the Nekhthorheb building, no definite conclusions can be drawn concerning the layout of these naoi. Arnold supposes that the principal naos dedicated to Bastet was housed in the central part on the western edge of the complex, with the remaining six shrines arranged in two groups of three on either side of the great naos or around the great naos (Fig. 22). He also does not exclude the possibility of an open court that held all seven naoi, a hypaethral building known to have existed in the Delta during the Late Period (Arnold 1994: 110).

A second reconstruction given by Arnold (1999: 37 fig.10, 129 = Fig.23) shows seven naoi standing in separate sanctuaries. These sanctuaries could have been built directly against the rear wall of the Nekhthorheb complex, with the dedicatory inscriptions and the *hkr*-frieze, similar to the layout of the temple of Seti I at Abydos. Alternatively, a single, central, sanctuary may have been surrounded by a corridor leading into separate smaller chapels, as at Edfu or Dendera. Such an idea is taken up by Van Siclen (1994: 321–4 = Fig.24), though there is no evidence to suggest these subsidiary chapels were preceded by antechambers.

Beside these fragments of naoi, door lintels and the façade of the building, various other decorated blocks exist, which seem to be parts of the walls of sanctuaries, on account of the decorative content, scale of relief, architectural form and state of preservation. These representations bear rows of gods, often identified by columns of inscriptions, providing an association with a toponym. The different scenes of these blocks were divided into at least four registers, vertically separated by a huge serpent. Each column of inscription belonging to a certain deity starts with the formula '*hw.t-ntr n.t of*' god/goddess and continues with the epithet '*nb/nb.t of*' that special place of worship. But as already mentioned, it is not yet possible to prove the architectural context of these blocks (see Spencer, Chapter 4).

Decoration

In addition to those blocks which can be inserted into the architectural context of the whole complex comparatively easily, there are various blocks whose exact position within the temple cannot be ascertained. The decoration is, unsurprisingly, dominated by relatively typical scenes for Egyptian temples: a kneeling or standing pharaoh offering to a deity, or the king performing the ancient *Ruderlauf* ritual (Pl.44). Such reliefs bear inscriptions with the titulary of Nekhthorheb or standardised phrases such as *dj-n=j n=k ʿnh dd w3s*.

In addition, more unusual reliefs, newly discovered or known from Naville's excavations, formed part of the temple décor. One of these reliefs has already been published by Naville (1891: pl.46 [A]). It shows a cartouche containing six seated deities (Fig.25). The positions of Onuris and Bastet, in the upper part of the cartouche, suggest this is a cryptographical cartouche of Nekhthorheb's nomen, *Nh.t-hr-hb.t mry-In-Hr s3-B3st.t*. Two further blocks, recently discovered, seem to represent further fragments of these cryptographical cartouches (one block preserves parts of two cartouches. Fig.27, while the other has remnants of one). The lower one depicts the head of a cat in the upper right corner. Presumably this feline figure also represents the name Bastet: it would be the only representation of Bastet in the whole temple as a cat, rather than as a lion. The upper part of the cartouche is lost. The second cartouche is so heavily damaged that only Thoth, in the middle on the left hand side, can be definitively identified, as in the example published by Naville. The preserved part features a goddess in the middle on the left hand side, possibly Neith. To the left of this cartouche is a figure of a kneeling king, presenting offerings. A further cryptographical cartouche of this king can be found on a block which is now in Berlin (No. 2099, Fig.26). Here the deities Bastet, Montu, Horus with the *hb*-sign in his hand, Onuris, Meret and a small child (for *s3* 'son?') are shown, perhaps again a writing of the name *Nh.t-hr-hb.t mry-In-Hr s3-B3st.t*.

Many of the reliefs feature representations of animals, which have to be regarded as manifestations of gods (Kessler 1989). One such relief features a lion attacking a bound captive from behind (Pl.45). On account of his beard, the captive can be identified as a Libyan or Asiatic. The lion wears the symbol of the god Nefertum on his head. It is known that Nefertum, as the son of Bastet, can adopt dangerous and aggressive features. Moreover an epithet of this god describes him as 'the one who devours the enemies as a lion' (Naville 1885: pl.3 [3]). Similar scenes can be found in the temple of Hibis in el-Kharga oasis or on the naos of Saft el-Henna, where the lion is identified by the accompanying hieroglyphs as Mahes. Another interesting relief shows an ichneumon in the waters of Nun (Naville 1891: pl. 45 [F]). The ichneumon is the holy animal of the god Atum, who forms a holy triad with his spouse Bastet and his son Horhekenu or Mahes. A hybrid creature, consisting of the body of a cobra and the head and wings of a vulture is annotated as *ntr.w*. As a vulture and a cobra, this creature can probably be set in the context of dualism given that the two crown goddesses of Upper and Lower Egypt are combined.

One last interesting aspect to be discussed here are the long rows of deities, which can be found on various blocks coming from the western part of the ruins. Noteworthy depictions include the Syrian-Palestinian gods Astarte and Reshep, and cats flanking a huge sistrum (Naville 1891: pl. 45 [A]). A last

block shows, among others, an *Isis lactans*, two *ba*-birds, a fertility figure or the four sons of Horus. These long rows of gods appear earlier in the first millennium upon naoi, and in the temple of Hibis in el-Kharga Oasis, where both Nekhtnebef and Nekhtorheb carried out restorations (see this volume, Chapter 3). Some of these blocks belong to the great naos of Bastet (see Chapters 1–2), as has already been recognized by Van Siclen (1994: 330, fig.6 and 331, fig.7). Other blocks seem to form parts of the sanctuary walls (Neville 1891: pls.45 [A-B], 46 [B, C, E] and the recently discovered block B/5.1). Decorative schemes such as that in the Hibis sanctuary are evidently motivated by religious and cult topographical ideas, invoking cult centres of a region, their main deities and their local manifestations, but perhaps also myths, festivals and rituals (Sternberg el-Hotabi 1994a). A similar scheme, to some extent, is found in the temple of Nekhtorheb at Bubastis.

In addition, parts of the decoration were orientated towards the earlier building of Osorkon II, where the *sed*-festival is depicted, immediately to the west of the 30th dynasty structure. There are a lot of iconographical elements in the complex of Nekhtorheb, like the ‘souls of Hierakonpolis’ (*b3.w Nhn*, Fig.27), a few standards, representations of sacred animals or the *k3* of the king, which may fit within a *sed*-festival context. In particular, those scenes showing a procession, a festival in the broadest sense, could represent a continuation or embellishment of the *sed*-festival decoration. Such a procedure, the continuation of a decorative programme of an earlier pharaoh, is altogether possible, although it does not imply that Nekhtorheb himself celebrated a *sed*-festival.

It should be stressed that, in the absence of new archaeological data, no conclusive reconstruction of the architecture of the sanctuary is presently possible. It is to be hoped that, through a precise analysis of the position, material and state of preservation of individual diagnostic blocks, or through the relief’s scale and depth of carving, various assertions can be made, which will aid future reconstructions. There are many problems yet to be resolved: the question of the number, decoration and arrangement of the naoi, the construction and decoration of the ceiling, the possible

existence of a contra-temple and the location of an enclosure wall. A dedicated study of the sanctuary’s decorative programme would provide new insights into Late Period religious iconography, particularly during the 30th dynasty. Further research on the Bubastis temple, both in architectural and iconographical terms, has the potential to be of crucial importance for modern understanding of the sacred architecture of the Late Period, particularly in the Nile Delta.

Notes

- 1 Humboldt-University of Berlin, Institute für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte Nordostafrikas. I would like to thank my field director Dr. Christian Tietze, University of Potsdam, for the opportunity to work at Tell Basta, and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for their financial support through many years.
- 2 Excavations in the area of Nekhtorheb had already been undertaken by Dr. Abel Abd el-Moneim (Institute of Near-Eastern Studies, University of Zagazig) in the early 1990s. Unfortunately, the results of this work have never been published.
- 3 In February/ March 2004 (the 18th season), further decorated blocks were discovered. These will be published in Rosenow (forthcoming). A comprehensive publication will follow, as part of my doctoral dissertation at the Humboldt University, Berlin: *Das Sanktuar des Großen Bastet-Tempels in Bubastis*.
- 4 I am grateful to Rosemarie and Dietrich Klemm for this information.
- 5 Tietze and Omar 1996: 61.
- 6 Including the ceiling blocks discovered during the 2004 season.
- 7 Further blocks belonging to one or more shrines may have been discovered in the 2004 season. Three of them are decorated; seven fragments do not feature any decoration, but are polished. In the light of their architectural form and surface finish, these should be interpreted as naos fragments too. See my forthcoming doctoral dissertation at the Humboldt University, Berlin: *Das Sanktuar des Großen Bastet-Tempels in Bubastis*.
- 8 B/4.3 (pl.48): the form of the cartouches upon the cavetto cornice differ from those upon the sides of the naos (the rear cornice is not preserved on EA 1079, but is likely to have followed the scheme found upon the left and right wall rather than the rear), except those on the front (EA 1080). B/4.3 cannot be part of the front due to the presence of a dedicatory text.
C/6.8: this fragment measures 98cm in width, 81cm in height and is preserved to 57cm in depth. Parts of Nekhtorheb’s titulary are preserved in the dedicatory text. It is possible that this may fit the rear right corner of the principal naos presented in this volume.
- 9 It is possible some shrines were not decorated, but simply polished and carved with a cavetto cornice and a torus moulding.

7. Temple Building in the 30th Dynasty: A Consideration of Broad Themes

Having considered the purpose of the great naos through comparison with related monuments, and the place of the naos within its immediate architectural setting, it is now appropriate to consider how the naos fits into the wider building programme of the 30th dynasty. The subject of temple-building during the reigns of Nekhtnebef and Nekthorheb formed the core of my doctoral thesis (Spencer 2000). This chapter serves as a précis of some of the principal themes of the subject, rather than providing exhaustive references to all building remains. In particular, I consider some of the broad themes of temple construction in relation to space and an Egyptian sense of identity.¹

In 380 BC, Nekhtnebef acceded to the throne of Egypt, apparently usurping Nephertites II, whose reign lasted a matter of months.² The relatively short-lived 29th dynasty seems to have been undermined by competition over the throne, but a Persian invasion was repelled between 385 and 382 BC, and there is evidence that significant temple building was planned (Traunecker 1979). It is quite possible that much of the cultural renaissance so evident in the 30th dynasty may represent a flourishing of trends nascent in the previous dynasty. Nekhtnebef was crowned at Sais and took the throne name Kheperkara (identical to that of Senwosret I); both undoubtedly conscious decisions designed to evoke the perceived grandeur of his 12th- and 26th dynasty predecessors. The key political event in his reign was the defeat of Persian forces attempting to invade via the Mendesian branch in 373 BC. Few dated texts survive from the reign, but it is clear that temple building had begun by year 3 and continued throughout the reign.³ A co-regency of two years preceded Djedhor's accession to sole rule; and his reign was short-lived. During an ill-fated campaign into Palestine, his nephew Nekthorheb claimed the throne (for a possible rival claimant see Von Känel 1980). A fascinating Greek papyrus suggests temple funds were re-directed to fund the Palestinian campaign of Djedhor (Will 1960). Nonetheless, in his short reign, building work took place at Tanis (Von Känel 1987: 52), Heliopolis (Edgar 1914: 277), Athribis (Sharpe 1855: 43 [1]) and Karnak (PM II²: 243; Traunecker and Laroche 1980), while quarrying was taking place at Tura in the third regnal year (Brugsch 1855: 45–6). Nekthorheb continued the extensive building programme of Nekhtnebef; the only dated evidence is a year 2 stela describing work at Memphis and Saqqara (Daressy 1908). Following two failed attempts, in 359 and 351–350 BC, the armies of Artaxerxes III reached Memphis in 343 BC, seemingly signalling the end of Nekthorheb's reign. A later tradition suggests his reign continued in Upper Egypt, followed by an escape to Nubia (Sherman 1952: 381, and see De Meulenaere 1986).

During the 37 years in which these three pharaohs ruled, Egypt witnessed one of the most extensive temple building programmes in dynastic history. Construction work is known at

nearly all of the major sites, from Philae to the northern limits of the Delta, but also encompassing the oases (Hibis, Siwa and the newly discovered temple of Nekhtnebef in Bahrein, east of Siwa: el-Aref 2003).⁴ Of course, such a programme requires expeditions to extract stone for building. Quarry inscriptions of the reign are known from three sites (see n.3), but the range of different stone employed necessitated the exploitation of many other quarries. In addition to a profusion of limestone, sandstone and granitoid monuments, it is evident that quartzite (De Meulenaere and Mackay 1976: 191, pls.8b–d, 9b), breccia (DE V: pls.40–1; Fraser 1972: 39–40 [2]),⁵ green serpentine (Mackay and Petrie 1915: 7, pl.8 [12]) and alabaster (Coptos 2000: 129 [96]) were being quarried too. The presence of green serpentine is interesting: quarries have been identified in several places in the Eastern Desert, but none securely dated to before the Ptolemaic period (Klemm and Klemm 1993: 376–8). Millennia of previous constructions, debris and ruins awaited the 30th dynasty builders at most sites, a 'palimpsest of construction and experience' (Alcock 2002: 4). This situation should be borne in mind, in contrast to the phase-specific view more typical of much Egyptology. The nature of the evidence for these 30th dynasty temples is rarely spectacular, often consisting of foundations levels alone or reliefs and statuary removed from their original context, with few instances where temple plans can be recovered. Inscriptions relating to building work are rare, though the lengthy *Hermopolis Stela* provides a wealth of detail on activity at that site under Nekhtnebef (Roeder 1954: 375–416, pls.7–13).

Nonetheless, it is still clear that new, and sometimes radical, approaches were envisaged for sites. The most striking examples consisted of dismantling and levelling existing temple structures, or their ruins, and building new temples in their place. There is clear evidence of this at Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1996: 36–42), el-Ashmunein (Spencer 1989: 42–4, 71–3), Tanis (Lézine 1951, Brissaud *et al.* 1998: 87) and Elephantine (Niederberger 1999). Other candidates include Behbeit el-Hagar and Samanud (Spencer, N.A. 1999), but insufficient evidence survives of the earlier buildings at these two sites. At Behbeit, the temple was constructed under Nekthorheb (Favard-Meeks 1991) but texts indicate an earlier temple existed here (De Meulenaere 1958: 230–3). The rear part of the Bubastis temple may also fall into the category of complete renewal (see Chapters 5–6).

It is possible that the existing temples at these sites were beyond repair, as a result of damage or neglect during the preceding 150 years, including the Persian occupation. At Balamun, kilns had intruded on the temple area (Spencer, N. 1996: 39–40; Spencer, A.J. 1999a: 25). Preparatory work before the construction of a new temple is alluded to in a biographical text dating to the time of Ptolemy II: Esnun 'dug the ground in the place of the debris, to (a depth of) 6 cubits, to raise (*sh*) the

ground in the whole temple' (Guermeur 2003: 286). The 'raising' presumably refers to the method of building a 'sand-box' above which the temple superstructure was erected. At Tanis, the situation in the Khonsu temple is less clear: reliefs bearing inscriptions of Sheshonq V and Psamtek I, presumably from a temple (or successive temples in the same location), were used to line the adjacent sacred lake (Montet 1966). In contrast, at Elephantine and el-Ashmunein, there is clear evidence that a working temple was still in place when the decision was taken to erect a new structure. Papyri indicate the functioning of the Khnum temple during the First Persian Period (Porten 1996: 289–97), and a gateway inscribed for Nekhtnebef (Junge 1987: 68–72, pls.41–3) must have been an addition to the existing temple, perhaps a sizeable New Kingdom or Saite structure.

The *Hermopolis Stela* of Nekhtnebef records the founding of the new temple, four months after the inauguration of a new temple of Nehmetawy:

Year 8, third month of winter, the time of His Majesty founding a temple for his father Thoth, twice great, lord of *Hmmw*, great god, who issued forth from the nose of Re, the creator of beauty, in beautiful white stone and its floor in *kis*-stone. Its length is 220 cubits, its width 110, in excellent work of eternity. The like had not been done since ancient times. His Majesty undertook work on it every day and night, and he completed it in joy. He saw that his father Thoth was at peace in it. (Roeder 1954: 410–11)

But earlier in his reign, or in the period shortly before the 30th dynasty, a gate had been added to the existing temple, which dated to the New Kingdom (Spencer 1989: 71). The possibility that royal building policy could be modified within a short time span must be considered.

The Elephantine temple is the only one from which an internal plan of rooms can be extracted. The new temples may have been significantly larger than their predecessors. This is clearly the case at Elephantine, where a housing area behind the temple was levelled and a wall erected to indicate the new building area (Kaiser *et al.* 1993: 179–81, fig.17). At both Elephantine (Von Pilgrim 2001: figs. 5, 7, 8) and el-Ashmunein (Spencer 1989: pl.92), the main temple was 'moved back' in relation to its predecessor. In the case of the latter site, this move preserved the central position of the main temple within the newly enlarged enclosure. All four sites provide evidence that the temple remained unfinished at the end of the 30th dynasty (el-Ashmunein: Snape and Bailey 1988; Tell el-Balamun: Spencer 1996: 45; Elephantine: Niederberger 1999: 19, 86–91, figs.51–5, pls.32–3; at Tanis, decoration continued in subsequent reigns, but it is possible the temple's core was complete: Von Känel 1987).

Once a programme had been instigated, why were certain temples completely renewed, while others were simply embellished? Ruin and/or squatting and reoccupation was clearly a significant reason at some sites, such as Tell el-Balamun, but at other sites, there must have been other motives, perhaps dictated by royal ideology. Renewal of existing sacred structures is known from other cultures and periods. It could be seen as a purifying device (in Japan, Knipe 1988: 116), which may be pertinent for the 30th dynasty activity given the preceding Persian occupation. In Mayan cultures, renewals have been interpreted as a repeat of creation (Rivera Dorado 1997); recall that Egyptian temple histories were projected back into mythological time (Reymond 1969). These mythological temples went through phases of creation and destruction, much

like their historical counterparts, and thus each new historical temple could also be seen as dating to a time of creation: the new temple of Nehmetawy at el-Ashmunein is described as 'the residence of the Ogdoad of the First Time' (Roeder 1954: 403–4).

Pharaonic sources also provide possible interpretations. Building texts underline the notion of improvement on past structures: 'built in stone what was in brick...', 'more beautiful than what was before...', 'strengthen what was in ruin' (Björkman 1971: 29–31). It is notable that the new 30th dynasty temples often featured a significantly expanded area compared to their predecessors (one is reminded of Hornung's 'extension of the existing' interpretation of New Kingdom royal tomb architecture, 1978). The emblematic role of Elephantine as Egypt's southern border may well have had a bearing on the decision to instigate a temple renewal at that site.

Many temples did not experience renewal on this scale, but remains do reveal a focus on the temple approach, through additions of, or renovations to, gateways and ancillary structures in the forecourt. Three cases will suffice to illustrate this point. At el-Kab, a temple dedicated to Nekhbet had been built during the reigns of Darius I and Hakoris (Gilbert 1954: 88; Capart 1940: 20–1). By the end of the latter's reign, at least part of the hypostyle hall was decorated. Cartouches of Nekhthorheb on the cavetto cornice of the temple façade provide evidence for embellishment of the temple in his reign (PM V: 172–173); Nekhtnebef may also have carried out work in this part of the temple (Capart 1954: 75). But it is the temple approach that receives most attention in the 30th dynasty. The gate set into the temple enclosure wall (Capart 1940: 21, pls.7–8 [B]) and those in the 'town wall' (Somers Clarke 1921: 67–9, pl.12) are probably Late Period structures, but the portico before the south pylon is securely dated to the reign of Nekhtnebef (Capart 1940: 21, pls.7–8 [E]). Two small structures before the temple of Nekhbet lie at right angles to the main axis: 'temple R' of Somers Clarke (Stiénon 1940: 35, pls.7–8 [K], 36), which may have been a mammisi, and a brick platform to the south (Stiénon 1940: 35, 39–40, pls.7–8 [D], 37), probably the foundations for a chapel. Both of these may well date to the 30th dynasty.

In el-Kharga oasis, the temple of Amun of Hibis was largely built in the reign of Darius I, and later embellished by Hakoris. Significant construction work then took place in the 30th dynasty. New reliefs were added in the sanctuary (see Chapter 3) and hypostyle hall (Davies 1953: 31–2, pls.1, 61–2, 63 [upper right, lower left], 79), and minor modifications were made in some of the side rooms (Cruz-Urbe 1987: 217–20). The appearance of the temple was significantly modified, however, by the addition of a *h3yt*-portico at the front, whose decoration was completed under Nekhthorheb (Winlock 1941: 26–32, pls.4–8, 10–11, 30, 33, 35, 40–1, 46–7; Davies 1953: 31–3, pls.1, 63–70, 80 [A]). Two obelisk bases before the portico may well have been installed at this time (Winlock 1941: 34–5, pls.4–6, 30). Arnold has also assigned the stone enclosing wall to the 30th dynasty (1999: 77–9).

There is a similar focus on the approach to temples evident at Thebes. Standing structures, principally buildings with New Kingdom cores which were provided with new gates, include the Opet temple (PM II²: 245; the date of the temple which preceded the still standing Ptolemaic structure is unknown), and the Maat temple in the Montu enclosure (PM II²: 11–12). An entrance portico was added to the Harpre temple (PM II²: 10–11), while

inscriptions were added to existing gates and porticoes (Barguet and Leclant 1954: 6, n.4, 72, n.7, 89; PM II²: 20; Epigraphic Survey 1981: 12–14, 62–3, pls.127–31, 193). Of course, the unscribed first pylon at Karnak is likely to be a 30th dynasty structure, though it is unknown if a monumental entrance to the first court existed beforehand (Golvin *et al.* 1990: 940–2). The East Gate dates to the reign of Nekhtnebef (PM II²: 208): this provided access to the rear-chapel which also received new reliefs (PM II²: 217–8). On the West Bank, the small temple at Medinet Habu was provided with new gateways during the 30th dynasty (PM II²: 464, 474), as well as processional statuary during the reign of Nekhtnebef.⁶ A monolithic red granite naos was inserted into the sanctuary of this temple by removing the existing west wall; the demotic numbering of blocks from this wall suggests this occurred during the 4th century BC or later (Hölscher 1939: 15, fig.15).

Building, or adding decoration to, a gateway, is often portrayed in a somewhat negative light by Egyptologists, as an easy way to appropriate a monument and subsequently receive the divine and worldly benefits through being associated with the temple in question. However, such activity deserves consideration in another way. Indeed, few of the gateways described above are associated with temples in which Nekhtnebef or Nekhtorheb have recut cartouches or added texts within the temple proper. In fact, only two clear examples where 30th dynasty names are inserted into existing cartouches are known to me: the above-mentioned Taharqa portico in the Harpre temple at Karnak (Barguet and Leclant 1954: 6 n.4, 72 n.7, 89) and the 29th Dynasty Medinet Habu portico (Traunecker *et al.* 1981: 16, pls.F1–2). Crucially, there are no known examples of attempts to recarve cartouches of Darius I at Hibis or el-Kab. There are more instances of adding decoration to existing walls, as noted above, or re-using older blocks in foundations (one example is the New Kingdom material used in the rear-chapel of the Khonsu temple at Karnak; Traunecker and Laroche 1980). Instead, the focus on gateways should be seen as a positive programme, to improve the vulnerable points of temples. Gateways were zones where the temple interacted with the less sacred space beyond. This vulnerability is underlined by the frequent depiction of guardian figures on temple doorways (e.g. Goyon 1985: 129–48). Clearly, constructing or decorating gateways also provided the most instant visual expression of a king's piety. Being an area of less restricted access, and thus more visible, there may have been a preference for modifying or embellishing this part of a temple's decoration first.⁷ A group of New Kingdom votive stelae underline this point, as they bear depictions of the scenes upon temple pylons. The towering pylon facade was the *de facto* appearance of a temple for those restricted from entering the inner areas (Devauchelle 1994: 38–50). Non-royal inscriptions in formal temples often cluster around doorways too, also partly dictated by restrictions on access to more sacred areas (for the Third Intermediate Period, see Pyke 1998: 107).

The attention to approach was also applied to processional routes, both inside temples, and projecting from temples through adjacent settlement areas. The best-known sacred avenue is that linking Karnak and Luxor. The extant incarnation is the work of Nekhtnebef (Cabrol 2001: 35–7, 145–9, 283–96), and it is likely that other sacred avenues in the Theban areas were embellished, renovated or remodelled during the 30th

dynasty, such as that leading north from the Montu *temenos* (Cabrol 2001: 179–84, pls.19–20), and one extending westward (towards the riverbank?) from the Mut temple (Cabrol 2001: 143–5). Processional avenues of the 30th dynasty have also been identified at Tell el-Balamun (Spencer, A.J. 2003: 31–2, pl.44), and the Serapeum (Smith 1981: 334; for discussion of the sphinxes, see Lembke 1998) and sphinxes have been recovered from a number of other sites.

As with doorways, the processional avenues that extended from temples through the urban sprawl presented another point of ritual weakness. Sphinxes evidently played both a protective role and proclaimed the king's benefactions to the temple(s) in question.⁸ Brick walls delimited these avenues, while trees would provide an atmosphere more suitable to the divine than the urban squalor rising on either side. A fascinating glimpse at this interaction between sacred space and urban reality can be seen at Thebes, immediately outside the East gate at Karnak. Unpublished excavations revealed a 4th century BC phase during which brick buildings were removed from the south side of the east-west axis which extends from the East gate, and brick walls were erected to emphasise the division between the route and the surrounding built-up area (Pirritano 1979: 8–9, figs.3 [a, b]). The ceramics suggested this remodelling of the urban space dates to the 30th dynasty. This correlates well with construction activity at this side of the Amun enclosure at Karnak: the East gate that leads to this avenue was erected in the reign of Nekhtnebef (PM II²: 208), as was the temple enclosure wall into which it was set. A ritual counterpart to this physical separation of sacred and profane would be necessary for constant re-purification of such avenues (Cabrol 2001: 164–9).

The provision of new temple enclosure walls, creating significantly larger sacred areas, remains the most lasting legacy of 30th dynasty construction work. Dating these brick walls is often difficult, as foundation trenches have rarely been investigated for ceramic evidence. Instead, secondary evidence is often used to support dating, such as the date of relevantly positioned structures within the *temenos*, the inscriptions upon gateways within the wall, or even the use of brick-sizes. As such, many walls are presently dated to wider date ranges such as 'Late Period' or '4th century BC'. Textual evidence indicate walls at Karnak were built during the reign of Nekhtnebef, in year 10 (Habachi 1970, Abd er-Raziq 1978), and in his year 16 at Koptos (Maspero 1885: 4–5 [lxii]). Other walls that can be reasonably attributed to the period on archaeological evidence include those at el-Kab (Gilbert 1954: 89, but see below), Karnak (Golvin, *et al.* 1990), Luxor (Abd er-Raziq 1968), Abydos (O'Connor 1969: 39), el-Ashmunin (Spencer 1989: 72, pls.92, 99), Tanis (Brissaud 1995: 19–21), Mendes (Redford 1996: 80), Tell Tebilleh (Mumford 2003) and Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1996: 26, 32–5, colour pl.2a, pls.1, 3, 6). Walls at other sites could be attributed to the 30th dynasty following further investigation.⁹

Two of these enclosures merit further comment here – firstly, the el-Kab 'town wall'. This encloses a massive area, within which lies the temple complex, itself provided with two brick enclosure walls (Depuydt *et al.* 1989: map 'Elkab'). It is built in the same manner as other 30th dynasty temple enclosure walls, with alternating sections of brickwork laid in concave or convex courses ('panbedded'), enclosed an area similar to that of the Amun precinct at Karnak, and was

provided with ramps against its inner face, seemingly to enable access to the top.¹⁰ On the basis of an inscription of a general Psamtek, who states that he ‘established (*grg*) a double gate (*sb3wy*) before his enclosure (*inb*), all its routes being lined with many trees’, De Meulenaere (1986: 209) has suggested this wall represents fortifications ordered by Nekhthorheb after withdrawing from the Delta in 343 BC. While this conjecture may seem an appealing marriage of text and archaeology, the inscription does not allow us to identify which of three walls are referred to, and the presence of a tree-lined avenue is more reminiscent of sacred architecture than a defensive structure. The south-west corner of the enclosure has been badly affected by the shifting Nile. A large pylon structure may have been set into the enclosure wall here, as found at Mendes and Naukratis (Leclère 1997: 219). Without intensive investigations of the vast area enclosed, it is impossible to identify this wall as a ‘town wall’ or ‘temple wall’; settlement remains thus far discovered within the precinct are of the Old Kingdom, First Intermediate Period and Graeco-Roman era (Depuydt *et al.* 1989: 11 [18, 20]).

The wall identified at Tell Tebilleh is buttressed on its outer face (Mumford 2003), a feature thus far not found with the other walls of this era.¹¹ As riverine access is available immediately west of the temple enclosure, Mumford has proposed the enclosure at Tell Tebilleh actually represents one of the lines of forts placed at the mouths of the Nile, to repel Persian attacks (2004b). Given the amount of the Tell Tebilleh which has been destroyed, it is possible the true nature of this enclosure will never be understood: a temple enclosure, fort, or fortified settlement containing a modest temple?

While Mumford’s interpretation of Tell Tebilleh deserves consideration and the purpose of the ‘town wall’ at el-Kab is as yet unclear, the majority of temple enclosures should be interpreted as sacred structures with no practical defensive purpose intended at the time of construction (*contra* Thiers 1995: 508–9; Arnold 1999: 93). Bastions and heavily protected entrances, familiar from forts throughout Egyptian history, are not a feature of these enclosures, and the elevated town mounds which abutted, and rose above, temple complexes would have diminished the strategic advantages of enclosure walls. Instead, these temple enclosures should be seen as a monumental re-affirmation of sacred space, extended beyond anything encountered previously (as was the case with some of the new temple structures). Again, there is a consistent approach discernible in the archaeological record, though occasionally modified to take account of local conditions. Thus existing structures could dictate deviations from an orthogonal plan for an enclosure wall, as with the precinct of Amun at Karnak (Golvin and el-Hegazy 1993: 146). Topography may also have determined the form and extent of enclosures, particularly on an island sites such as Elephantine. The preference for laying down courses in alternately convex and concave segments could have had welcome implications on the resources and time required to erect such walls (Golvin *et al.* 1990: 917–19, 929–34; Golvin 1995: 41).¹² A sacred motivation has also been proposed for this construction method (Spencer 1979: 114–15; Pirelli 1999), but it is possible such an interpretation was one developed subsequently by Egyptian priests. Examples of a ‘skin’ of brickwork in panbedded courses being added to existing walls with bricks laid in level courses suggest such an appearance became important in itself (Dendera, Zignani 2001: 431,

figs.32–3; Zawyet es-Sultan: Barry Kemp, pers. comm.).

Egyptologists have traditionally conceived of such enclosures as following the model of the Ramesseum, with its well-preserved complex of mudbrick storerooms, chapels and royal palace around the stone temple, effectively filling the surface area of the *temenos*. In fact, archaeological evidence suggests these enclosures presented a rather different appearance.¹³ Alongside the main temples, one encounters peripteral chapels,¹⁴ mammisis (e.g. Daumas 1958: 81–6, 167–489), sacred lakes (e.g. Montet 1966: 15–36, 95–6, pls.1–2, 38–41), installations for sacred animals (e.g. Davies and Smith 1997), gardens (cited on the *Hermopolis Stela*, Roeder 1954: 394–5) and sacred storehouses (Traunecker 1987b). The latter type of monument seems particularly relevant, as it represents a distillation of practical storage facilities into a streamlined, ritual-orientated space. Where are the extensive storage facilities which these temples must be responsible for? The existence of temple granaries is evident from Late Period textual sources (Vercoutter 1950: 85–100; Otto 1954: 162–4; Lichtheim 1980: 33–6, 46), but their archaeological counterparts are yet to be found within a 4th century BC enclosure.

The creation of these new enclosures caused areas previously dense in settlement to then be within the sacred *temenos*. Ideally, these profane structures would be levelled (e.g. Tell el-Balamun, Spencer 1996: 33). Private texts of the 4th century BC prove such clearances of houses could be undertaken expressly to create a pure space (Jelinkova-Reymond 1956: 101–5; Thiers 1995: 502–3). This interpretation is necessarily tentative, given the unevenness of archaeological investigation within temple enclosures,¹⁵ but it appears one of the key aims of the building programme was to create an expansion of sacred space.

Of course, the temple enclosure wall, often measuring over 10m thick, provided a significant degree of protection to the god(s) within, by partially restricting access. At the heart of a 30th dynasty temple, a monolithic stone naos formed the innermost level of protection around the god (see Appendix 4 for a list of 30th dynasty naoi). In the case of Bubastis, the naos was decorated with divine forms, further developed through the listing of temples upon nearby walls. Niederberger has noted several other elements of the Elephantine temple plan which could be interpreted as layers of protection (1999; caution is required in positing a typical ‘temple-plan’ of the 30th dynasty, cf. Spencer 2003). These are the provision of a free-standing sanctuary, a corridor around the sanctuary, and rooms to either side and behind the sanctuary (thus removing contact with the rear wall of the temple proper). A later text, on the façade of the sanctuary at Dendera, summarises the roles of these chapels: ‘Awake in peace, the chapels of the gods of the Ennead of your Majesty, they act as a screen (*itry*) for your *ka*. You are awoken in peace’ (*Dendara I*: 8 = Cauville 1998: 22–3). That such chapels were thought necessary in later temples is clear from the description of an ideal temple in *Book of the Temple*, in which the central naos is surrounded by secondary chapels (Quack 2003: 13–14).

Evidently, this remodelling of sacred space not only affected kings, priests and gods: there would have been a significant psychological effect on inhabitants of the settlement, besides the physical disruption of a large-scale building site and the possible relocation of homes. The imposing appearance of New Kingdom

temple enclosures is evident from representational evidence (Kemp 1989: 189–90). The remains of Late Period *temenoi* suggest they were no less imposing.

Identifying a building programme, rather than merely cataloguing a series of monuments bearing the names of particular kings or dynasties of rulers, is a rather elusive task for the Egyptologist. Caution is needed, so as not to attribute building programmes merely to those with long reigns (Tuthmosis III, Amenhotep III and Ramses II are oft-cited) at the expense of kings less well-represented in the preserved data. Further research in this area is undermined by the unevenness of preservation and exploration. Nonetheless, in the 30th dynasty there is a consistent, but far from monotonous, approach to the existing cult infrastructure of Egypt. Sacred space was expanded, enclosed and protected through architectural devices. This suggests a certain centrally-driven momentum. Interestingly, there is also a profusion of monuments which reveal an interest in the cult infrastructure of Egypt, or large parts thereof. The Bubastis temple list, the additions to the decoration in the Hibis sanctuary and, of course, the naos bearing depictions of divine forms have been considered in previous chapters. A granodiorite circular altar from Athribis (Habachi 1977: 92–105, 157–61 and Vernus 1978: 120–35) may also fall into this category, though it is unclear how extensive a geographical space was being invoked. It is notable that the falcon statues of Nekhtorheb are inscribed with references to local gods,¹⁶ illustrating how a statue type could be used in temples throughout Egypt, but invoke divinities particularly associated with the town in which the statue was dedicated.

Such monuments, implying consideration of a wider cult topography, are in no way unique to the 30th dynasty. However, the number and distribution of such sources, when combined with the archaeological evidence, support the existence of a ‘temple construction programme’ that would have been recognised by contemporaries, however few and elite.

Alas, not a single ancient Egyptian text represents a record of temple building policy. Nonetheless, a literary text set at the court of Senwosret I describes pharaoh planning construction projects with his courtiers (Shirun-Grumach 1993: 147–73). The undertaking of temple inspections (*sipt wr*), often on a grand scale (e.g. Legrain 1900; Kitchen 1968: 26; Redford 1981: 92; *P.Harris I* contains information which may have been collected in such an inspection, Grandet 1994), hints at the desire to have a somewhat centralised record of the state of principal temples. A passage upon a 30th dynasty naos from Saft el-Henna, set in the mythological reign of Geb, reflects this interest in ‘cataloguing’:

Readings from the divine books were undertaken in the presence of the majesty of Geb. Thousands of foundations (*dt*) and millions of mounds (*ist*) which the majesty of Ra named, in the nomes which the majesty of Shu founded, were brought in writings from the time of the majesty of Atum, when he was upon earth, until the coronation of Shu [upon] the throne of his father Ra, and until the coronation of Geb upon the throne of his father Shu. (Goyon 1936: 40)

A list of 33 earthly toponyms follows, the majority of which do preserve evidence of temple building under Nekhtnebef or Nekhtorheb. The pervasive nature of Egyptian bureaucracy makes the actual compilation of such information rather likely. A number of Late Period statue inscriptions refer to officials

reporting back to the king on construction activity in temples (e.g. Jelinkova-Reymond 1957: 275–87).

This leads onto the topic of agency. While this is not the place to discuss private involvement in temple building (see Spencer 2000: Part B), it is evident that the royal court was not in a position to instigate, let alone closely supervise, construction work at all of Egypt’s formal cult temples, which must have numbered in the hundreds.¹⁷ Privately instigated work would naturally fit into the royal programmes, through the use of the traditional architectural forms and the inclusion of the king’s name in significant texts. There is evidence for consulting texts to ensure the correct forms were produced (e.g. Jelinkova-Reymond 1956: 133). Standing and partly ruined monuments must also have been a useful ‘source-book’ for new buildings (Baines 1997: 226–7). It is interesting that one of the priests from el-Baqieh temple was actually involved in the quarrying expedition aimed at extracting stone for its construction during the 30th dynasty (Zivie 1975: 136–44). In view of the historical context, non-royal involvement in temple building was probably one of the main reasons the traditional forms of Egyptian cult places persisted through periods of foreign occupation, military threats and a fragmented political landscape.

The temple complexes of the Late Period, and more specifically those of the 30th dynasty, should be seen as emblems of Egyptian culture. They embody the sense of identity of elite Egyptians and, as such, are key components in Nekhtnebef’s and Nekhtorheb’s policy of preserving Egypt’s independence. While Egypt’s armies repelled the Persians (with help from hired foreign mercenaries), the newly invigorated cult temples were emblems of another battlefield, at an ideological and ritual level. These temples are effectively ‘symbols of the “past”, mythically infused with timelessness ... [that] attain particular effectiveness during periods of intensive social changes when communities have to drop their heaviest cultural anchor in order to resist the currents of transformation’ (Cohen 1985: 102).

Did ancient Egyptians of this period, at least those in the elite sphere, recognise the temple in such a manner? Unsurprisingly, no ancient Egyptian has recorded his or her thoughts on this matter for our benefit, but secondary evidence can be called upon. Temple enclosures dominated towns, and large areas of housing had been removed to pave the way for these new structures. Many of a town’s inhabitants worked for the temple, whether directly or indirectly, and the truly elite aspired to a burial within the enclosure, or at least the erection of their principal cult image (usually a statue) within the precinct. And this temple, through the ritual practised and particularly through the (seemingly) timeless architectural forms, was thoroughly Egyptian. Within more restricted spheres, late texts hint at the temple as a focal point for intellectual activity (evident in contemporary literature, cf. Loprieno 2003a: 59–60), and it is significant that classical historians often open their discussions of kings with an enumeration of building achievements (Loprieno 2003b: 151). Tait (2003a: 2–6) suggests the periods of Libyan and Kushite rule may have prompted Egyptians into a more conscious appraisal of what it meant to be Egyptian. Although Tait downplays the possibilities of a similar effect with Persian occupation, the period must have had an impact on the life of elite officials, particularly as administrative re-organisation is

known to have taken place (Briant 1988), perhaps also provoking a degree of (re)consideration of 'Egyptian' identity.

This importance attached to temples continued through the ensuing periods of Greek and Roman rule. Even with the decline in funding and building at temples, and the spread of Christianity, the old temple enclosures remained focal points within settlements (Alston 2002: 218). In fact, it is not wholly surprising that the Greek names for ancient Egyptian cities often refer to the principal god worshipped in the city's temples, as the ancient Egyptian name often did (e.g. Bubastis from *Pr-B3stt*).

The later flowering of temple culture, best represented by the textually dense monuments of Edfu and Dendera (and presumably others, now lost, particularly in the Delta), owes much to the efforts of Nekhtnebef and Nekthorheb, transmitted through to the Macedonian and early Ptolemaic periods. In the century following the Second Persian Period, temples were constructed following the forms and layout of 30th dynasty monuments. It is unsurprising that the best-preserved, standing, temples should provide the model. The style of relief-carving employed within these temples also echoes that found upon 30th dynasty monuments. In addition to new temples, many 30th dynasty temples were completed or extended in the late 4th and 3rd centuries BC, a move which must have dampened debates over the Greek rulers' legitimacy. The influence of 30th dynasty temple plans on later buildings has been covered by Niederberger (1999: 121–7, again, see reservations in Spencer 2003). Literary sources of the period make it clear that 30th dynasty pharaohs were seen as 'good kings' in many ways, particularly for the successful preservation of Egypt's frontiers, at least initially (Johnson 1983: 66–7). The wide-ranging temple construction programme must also have added to their reputation. Of course, Nekthorheb achieved even more enduring fame through compositions such as the *Somnium Nectanebi* and the *Alexander Romance*.¹⁸

Notes

- 1 Discussion of other key features, such as the architectural codification of mummies, the royal statuary programme and the cult of sacred animals, are not warranted here. These are discussed in Spencer 2000, currently being revised for publication.
- 2 Sources for the following historical summary are covered by Kienitz 1953: 76–126; see also De Meulenaere 1986; Kuhlmann 1998; Mysliwiec 1998: 206–28.
- 3 Datable temple building activity is attested at el-Ashmunein (between years 4 and 8, Roeder 1954: 375–416, pls.7–13), Luxor (year 10, Abd er-Raziq 1978) and Koptos (year 16, Maspero 1885: 4–5 [lxii]). Dated quarry inscriptions are known from Tura (years 3 and 4, Spiegelberg 1906: 223 [5–6], 224 [21], 225 [25]), Wadi en-Nakhleh near Deir el-Bersheh (years 6 and 9, Spiegelberg 1904: 159–61; for recent work in the quarries see Willems 2003: 9–10) and year 3 in the Wadi Hammammat (Cuyat and Montet 1912: 43 [26], pl.8).
- 4 For a comprehensive catalogue see Spencer 2000: Appendices A–D. The basic published source is still Kienitz 1953: 199–230; Jenni (1998: 87–100) provides a brief, incomplete, survey, while an illustrated survey can be found in Arnold 1999: 93–134.
- 5 The sarcophagus of Nekthorheb (British Museum EA 10) has yet to be published *in extenso*. Aspects of the decoration are covered by Jenni 1986; Colleen Manassa (Yale University) is to publish the sarcophagus' inscriptions.
- 6 Fragment of a sandstone lion statue: Hölscher 1954: 37, pl.23 [C]. Companion pieces may have included Cairo Museum CG 661 (Borchardt 1930: 9, pl.121), Berlin Museum 2280 (ascribed to Karnak by Lepsius, LD III: 286d–g, but the inscription suggests an original provenance of Medinet Habu) and British Museum EA 1230 (see Spencer, forthcoming).

- 7 It is interesting that Roman modifications to the Athenian acropolis also attest to a focus on entrances and facades: Alcock 2002: 58–61.
- 8 The inscriptions upon the Luxor sphinxes of Nekhtnebef are an invaluable source for contemporary conceptions of the city's sacred space; unfortunately few have been published, see Abd er-Raziq 1968.
- 9 The following walls have also been ascribed a 30th dynasty date by Arnold (1999): Armant, el-Baqlieh, Naukratis, Dendera, Tukh el-Garamus, Tell el-Farama, Saft el-Henna, Behbeit el-Hagar and the Anubieion. One of the enclosures at Medamud may well date to this period (cf. Revez 2004: 496; Golvin *et al.* 1990: 945). A number of other sites included in the EES Delta Survey feature remnants of massive enclosure walls that may well be Late Period constructions; relatively few have been properly investigated (www.ees.ac.uk/fieldwork/deltasurvey.htm).
- 10 The suggestion that such ramps could be for constructing stone gateways set into the enclosure wall (Goyon *et al.* 2004: 209, fig. 226) is not convincing. Parts of three ramps are preserved, only one of which is adjacent to a break in the wall where a gateway could have been located, on the inner face of the north stretch of the wall.
- 11 The Puseennes wall at Tanis was buttressed (Brissaud 2001b: 6–7, fig. 3, pl.4 [a]), and the New Kingdom wall at Memphis seems to have featured towers at intervals (Kemp 1989: 188–90).
- 12 There is evidence for earlier walls of this type, notably the Saite enclosure at Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1996: 26–32), but they are particularly characteristic of the 30th dynasty. In relation to work methods, Tomoum suggests the profusion of 'sculptors' models' from the 30th dynasty may reflect new methods in training craftsmen, as part of the extensive building programme (Tomoum 2005: 205).
- 13 Architectural similarity does not prove an identical purpose and contemporary interpretation for buildings of different periods. Consider the reinterpretation of sacred space in northern European churches of the Middle Ages to create a purer environment (Hayes 2001).
- 14 A Late Period offering table from Heliopolis (Ricke 1935) bears an inventory list but also a temple plan which includes a small building reached by steps, set in a courtyard. The building is labelled as the *Pr-Itm nht*, thus must have been some form of chapel. Archaeological investigations continue to reveal rectangular casemate foundations for elevated structures of Late Period date, but one cannot assume they are all for buildings of the same function. Examples include Tell el-Balamun (Spencer, A.J. 1999a: 45–56 and the results of magnetometry survey in April 2005 [pers. comm.]), Saqqara (Leahy and Mathieson 2002), Buto (Hartung *et al.* 2003: 211–16, 263–6, fig. 5, pls.42–3), and Tell Belim (Spencer 2002: 49, fig. 3). On the still enigmatic, somewhat larger, casemate platforms in Delta temple enclosures, see Spencer, A.J. 1999b.
- 15 We should not imagine the programme was entirely successful either. A 'production area' has been identified in 30th dynasty levels at Tanis (Brissaud 1995: 22–3) while centuries-old settlement remains were left in place within the precinct at Abydos (Petrie 1902: 9–10). It is noteworthy that evidence for settlement remains within these temple enclosures reappears in Ptolemaic levels: Elephantine (Kaiser *et al.* 1970: 199–33), el-Kab (De Meulenaere *et al.* 1970: 27), Karnak (Christophe 1951: 59, n.2; Lauffray 1995b), Medinet Habu (Teeter 2002: 1), Koptos (Herbert and Berlin 2002), Tanis (Montet 1933: pl.87; Brissaud 1998: 46; Brissaud 2001a: 34), Tell el-Balamun (Spencer 1996: 74) and the Bubasteion at Saqqara (Smith and Jeffreys 1981: 22).
- 16 Seven such statues are known. One was excavated at Tanis (Montet 1952: 48, 76, pl.11; invokes Horus of Mesen); others can be attributed to Behbeit el-Hagar (Barguet 1954: 89–91; Osiris-Anedjty and Isis the great), Heliopolis (Fazzini *et al.* 1988: 94–6 [8]; Osiris-Mnevis), the Memphite area (Grimm *et al.* 1997: 166–7 [124]; Imhotep son of Ptah) and Bilifya (Habachi 1963: 47, pl.8; Wadjet lady of Nebu). Two anepigraphic statues undoubtedly belong to this group: Louvre Museum E11152 (Coptos 2000: 129 [95]) and Cairo Museum JE 33262 (Hornung and Bryan 2002: 171–2 [80]).
- 17 *P. Wilbour*, dating to the reign of Ramses V, provides the most in-depth analysis of land-holding patterns over a significant area, in this case a portion of Middle Egypt (Gardiner 1948, Caminos 1952). Between 31 and 70 temples or shrines in this area alone are recorded as land-owning institutions, in addition to a number outside the region (the upper figure includes those which cannot be assigned to a geographical location, and thus could lie outside the area).
- 18 On the *Alexander Romance* see Burnett 2003: 78–81; for a sequel to the *Somnium* see Ryholt 2002 (both with references to editions of these texts).

Appendix 1

Yet another Naos from Bubastis ...

The pink granite architectural relief fragment British Museum EA 1106 has long been associated with the blocks that formed part of the great naos of Nekhthorheb set up at Bubastis (Pls. 29–30; Naville 1891: pl. 47 [G, G', G''], Van Siclen 1994). Discovered broken into two fragments,¹ it clearly represents the left wall of a naos or chapel. The exterior left wall is decorated with continuous scenes (some now partly lost), framed with a vertical torus-moulding to the left, i.e. near the back of the chapel (Pls. 31–2). The interior wall surface is polished but undecorated, while the narrow decorated front face preserves some heraldic decoration and the edge of the entrance to the shrine's cavity (Fig. 13, Pls. 33–4). The back wall of the shrine, as far as can be ascertained from the small area preserved on EA 1106, was left smoothed but undecorated. The dimensions of this cavity can be recovered from the adjoining face (Fig. 11).

Study of the relief style, inscriptional details and particularly the architectural form and dimensions of the monument, make it clear that EA 1106 never formed part of the great naos, and must come from another shrine (*contra* Van Siclen 1994). The carving on EA 1106 seems much shallower, particularly the inscriptions, which are much smaller than those on the large naos. Furthermore, the cartouches are distinct from those on the principal naos: *Sndm-ib-rꜥ stp-n-In-Hr* and *Nht-hr-hb mry-In-Hr* (Fig. 12), without the 'son of Bastet' epithet typical to Bubastis monuments and found on the great naos (Figs. 6, 7a, 9). This shorter *nomen* cartouche is found on monuments from other sites throughout Egypt: Qantir (Grimm 1995: 125–6 [27]), the Serapeum (Fazzini *et al.* 1988: 97 [10]; Desti 2004: 124–5 [61]), el-Ashmunein (Iversen 1972: 43–4) and upon a naos from Abydos (Roeder 1914: CG 70018).² On this other naos (EA 1106), the *stp-* sign in the *prenomen* cartouches is orientated differently in the falcon frieze and lower register than in the middle registers (Fig. 12). The thickness of the fragment EA 1106 also indicates it cannot have formed part of the great naos, as the left wall thickness is 45cm at the level of the shrine cavity. The large naos has more slender walls: the side walls are only 26cm (around the outer cavity) or 40cm thick (near the back of the naos, to create the inner chapel), while the rear wall is only 8cm thick (see Chapter 1).

Naville gives few details of the position in which he found the blocks from the large naos (see Chapter 5). However, it is notable that EA 1106 was registered on 16 October 1891, along with other granite reliefs from the site (EA 1097–1107, mostly re-used Old Kingdom and New Kingdom blocks, and some material of Osorkon II). Thus 30 months elapsed between the arrival of the fragments from the large naos (registered 13 April 1889) and those from this subsidiary chapel (EA 1106). This may well reflect the development of excavations at Bubastis, though the publication (Naville 1891) and correspondence offer no further information. Alternatively, it could reflect a delay in distribution by the EEF.

The surviving fragment EA 1106 indicates that a decorated doorway was set into a larger structure, with battered side walls and a torus moulding, within which was cut an undecorated small shrine, measuring 76cm deep, 84cm high and of unknown

width (Fig. 11). The lack of any door sockets on the floor of the inner shrine suggest that this part was not provided with doors. The floor is more or less smoothed, but the bottom of the preserved inner walls is only roughly chiselled into shape, suggesting an unfinished monument, further supported by the unfinished nature of some of the relief decoration. The rear end of the left wall, was provided with a vertical torus-moulding, presumably repeated towards the front of this face, and on the right wall.³ At present, there is no evidence to suggest the nature of this shrine's roof.

Front

EA 1106 (Fig. 13, Pls. 33–4)

Below a star-filled *pt*-sign, an emblematic representation of Nekhbet as a snake, identified in the accompanying hieroglyphs, dominates the front of the naos, presumably matched by an image of Wadjet on the now lost right jamb. The figure of Nekhbet, wearing the white crown, is coiled around the symbolic lotus plant of Upper Egypt. The bent outer stalks of this motif are unfinished, with that on the right left at a more advanced stage of carving. A large-scale hieroglyphic label flanks the plant stems ('she gives life and dominion'). Underneath the level of the cavity is a separate register of decoration, topped with an unfinished line of stars featuring a representation of a Meret-goddess, wearing a heraldic lotus-plant as head-dress. She is depicted in a familiar pose, with arms seen together in profile, held up with palms upwards. The initial carving for the label *Mrt Šmꜣt* is just visible. The sculptural style is much closer to later Ptolemaic examples than typical 4th century BC reliefs, with her breasts modelled in very high relief, and a somewhat fleshier face. In front of her, and beneath her upheld arm, are the remains of three columns of hieroglyphic text. These are very difficult to read, for two reasons: the stone has suffered widespread though relatively shallow surface damage in this area, and the vast majority of signs are unfinished. Some signs present only the initial incision of the whole sign, while others are little more than disconnected initial chisel marks into the polished surface. The only phrase that can be reconstructed is 'undertaking protection of Horus (*ir s3 n Hr*)' in the first of the three columns, while the third bears the nomenclature 'lord of [appearances *Nht-hr-hb mry-In-Hr*, may he live] like [*Rꜥ*]'. Traces of some initial chiselling are visible within the cartouche, but no individual signs are recognisable.

A fragment recorded by Habachi at Bubastis (1957: 76–7, fig. 20) features similar decoration, though evidently from a wider door-frame. Habachi interpreted these as 'blocks which may have adorned' the eastern façade of the building.

Left side

EA 1106 (Fig. 12, Pls. 31–2)

The uppermost preserved part of the decoration upon the exterior left wall is a frieze of falcons with outspread wings, protecting alternate *prenomen* and *nomen* cartouches. Each

cartouche sits upon a *nbw*-sign and is topped with a sun-disc. Between each falcon and cartouche are a *šn*-ring and a *w3s*-sceptre. The falcons are identified as ‘the Behdedite, he gives life like Ra’. Although the Saft el-Henna naos featured a frieze of such falcons above the registers of divinities (Naville 1887: pl. 3), such friezes are more common in wall reliefs. Thirtieth dynasty examples include reliefs at Elephantine (Jenni 1998: pls.72–3) and el-Ashmunein (Snape 1989: 2, pl.15 [37]).⁴ Later uses of this motif above main wall relief scenes are not uncommon, such as on a corner block from Behbeit el-Hagar (Ptolemy II, Naville 1930: pl.16 [A1–4]) and upon the stone enclosure wall at Edfu (Goyon 1985: pls.32–3). The motif is also found on red granite columns inscribed for Ptolemy III at Behbeit el-Hagar (Naville 1930: 54–5, figs. 5–6, pl.15 [A]). Of course, this other Bubastis naos (EA 1106) may have had a further architectural feature, such as a cavetto cornice, above.

The scene below is topped with a row of stars, unfinished at the left edge. Close study of this unfinished area reveals that the whole naos side was polished smooth before the carving was done. The smooth surface of the far left star stands out from the surrounding area, as the sculptors had just commenced taking down the stone surface around the star. At least two scenes were featured on this principal register. To the left, the king is shown standing before an enthroned goddess with the head of a lioness. Pharaoh wears the *atef*-crown and a projecting kilt, and holds his hands by his side, with the hieroglyphs stating he is ‘adoring the god four times’ (*dw3-ntr sp 4*). A bouquet of flowers and an incense-stand are depicted below the text. He stands beneath a sun-disc adorned with uraei supporting *šn*-rings, to the left of which are his Horus name and two cartouches. To the left, an emblematic representation of Nekhbet as a vulture, seated upon a lotus-plant, itself flanked by the phrase ‘she gives life and dominion’. Four columns of inscription to the far left of the scene provide a gloss for the goddess depicted underneath:

Words spoken: (I) give to you a great kingship in joy

Words spoken: (I) give to you all the foreign-lands under your sandals.

Bastet, lady of the shrine/chest (*k3r/hm*)⁵

The eye of Horus, pre-eminent of the god’s field (*sh1-ntr*), lady of heaven, mistress of all the gods

The ‘god’s field’ is a toponym explicitly associated with the Bubastite nome, and cited upon many monuments found in the temple (Habachi 1957: 121). The goddess wears a tripartite wig without head-dress, an ornate collar, and grasps an *ankh*-sign and a papyrus sceptre.

Immediately to the right of the king, and without an intervening vertical division line, is another figure of a seated lioness deity, presumably receiving a king performing another cult action. The text above her is similar to that in the other scene, the first column being badly damaged:

... [lady of] the shrine/chest (*k3r/hm*) [eye of] Horus, lady of heaven, mistress of all the gods.

Unfortunately, the nature of the offering and the reciprocal gifts of the goddess are lost for this scene. Adjacent offering scenes featuring a king and a deity are very common in temples (many examples known from Behbeit el-Hagar, e.g. Favard Meeks 1991: 30–1).

Underneath this double (or more) scene, there are three identical depictions of the king, facing right and wearing the

blue crown and protruding kilt, his two arms extended to uphold the star-filled extended *pt*-sign. The figure to the far right is not fully preserved, due to the break in the stone. There are two columns of hieroglyphs before each king, difficult to read in parts due to the light style of carving, and the surface damage sustained in some areas.

The Dual King, lord of the Two Lands *šndm-ib-r^c stp-n-In-Hr*.

(I) come (*iw*) to you [Bas]tet lady of the shrine/chest (*k3r/hm*)

His arms are lifting/supporting (as) Twait, glories are given to him in satisfaction, before (*rdi^c ʿwy.fhr tw3 tw3it rdi n.f3hwm htp hr*)⁶...

[Son of Ra, lord of] appearances, *Nht-hr-hb mry-In-Hr*, I come (*iw*) to you [Bas]tet lady of [the shrine/chest (*K3r/hm*)]⁷... gives to him a great kingship (of) the Two Lands (*di.f[w] n.fnsyt ʿ3t t3wy*)

In addition, there are traces of the phrase ‘*s3 ʿnh h3.fmi R^c*’ behind each figure of the pharaoh.

As with the great naos itself, the relief decoration was never completed. The upper frieze of falcons on the outer left wall is progressively less finished from right to left.⁸ The right group, as far as it is preserved, seems finished. In contrast, the left group is not carved with horns on the *f*-viper, ‘cheek’ lines or plumage on the falcon, and a *mi*-sign has only received the initial incision. The *nbw*-basket, *šn*-ring and cartouche are not embellished with internal detailing. The middle group features details that fall somewhere in between the two stages. The band of stars above the register below suggest a similar progression of work, whereas the figures in the main register seem to provide evidence for an opposite progression, most notably in the unfinished throne and necklaces of the Bastet figure to the right, and the lion-tail of the king, which has only received the initial incisions into the stone’s surface.

A partially complete cartouche on the front face (Fig.13b) reveals that work was taking place on several sides simultaneously, as one would expect. Such monuments would have been polished and carved at Bubastis, whether in their intended emplacement or very nearby. The composition of the scenes seems somewhat careless: the king’s kilt causes a break in the vertical line at the side of the second column, while the layout of the *di.f ʿnh mi R^c* is modified at the left edge of the falcon and cartouche frieze, as if the artist was concerned with the lack of space while working near the torus-moulding. The composition of the king’s kilt in the lower scene on the left side is different for each figure: the kilt on the king to the right features a central element with rounded ends, while the carving is much finer on the middle king. Could this reflect different sculptors’ carving of the draughtsman’s inked lines? As with the large naos, one must allow for variations in carving caused by the difficult material and working conditions, possibly compounded by less than thorough checking of the relief carving at the end of the process.

The exact nature of the original structure is difficult to determine. Nonetheless, certain aspects of the iconography, considered alongside the architectural details that are preserved, suggest it was part of a sacred barque emplacement. A close chronological and geographical parallel for the scene and its texts is found upon a block recorded by Naville at Saft el-Henna (Naville 1887: 5, pl.8 [C1–2]). The present location of this block is unknown. One face features the remnants of a standing figure of the king, wearing a bag-wig, in the act of offering. Beneath a row of stars, presumably originally part of an extended *pt*-sign, is a large-scale rendering of part of the royal

titulary: *s3 R^c Nht-Hr-hb[t] [mry]-In-Hr*. This is the unusual cartouche employed upon the Bubastis shrine under discussion here (EA 1106), but not on other monuments from the site, upon which a second epithet, ‘son of Bastet’, appears within the cartouche. The opposite face of the Saft el-Henna block depicts, in the upper register, the standing pharaoh facing left. Underneath are the remnants of a scene in which the king faces in the opposite direction, upholding an extended *pt*-sign. All that survives is a section of stars, parts of pharaoh’s arms and parts of two damaged lines of text, which clearly read: ‘... [Sndm]-ib-r^c [stp-n] In-Hr, (I) come [to] ... his arms placed upon the *wts-nfrw*, given ...’. The *wts-nfrw* literally refers to the display of beauty, but is often the name of the processional barque, such as at Edfu (Wilson 1997: 273), Sais (el-Sayed 1974: 41–2) and Saft el-Henna (Roeder 1914: 76).

The relief from Saft el-Henna is decorated on both sides, with the king facing in opposite directions. It is easy to envisage this as the left wall of a similar monument to the other Bubastis shrine (EA 1106), with one side being the decoration on the inside return before the shrine cavity (Neville 1887: pl.8 [C1]),⁹ while the other side represents the outer side. This would result in the king being orientated as if entering the shrine, as expected. This is precisely the area missing from EA 1106, and it is impossible to preclude the possibility that they are from the same monument. Saft el-Henna is only 10km from Bubastis, and remnants of temples from the latter site have been found removed to many nearby villages and towns. The fact that it bears the same distinct form of the Nekthorheb *nomen* cartouche and is of the same material as EA 1106 underlines this as a possible join (Neville offers no indication of scale). Even if it does not derive from the same original monument as EA 1106, the fact that an inscription from a very similar monument includes a clear reference to *wts-nfrw* is noteworthy.

Other iconographical elements upon this shrine further suggest that it may have been designed to house a processional image. For instance, large-scale heraldic plants flanked the entrance to the cavity. Such a decorative device is commonly found near barque emplacements (as noted by Traunecker, 1992: 296–7), for example before the central barque-chapel in the temple of Amun-Ra at Karnak (Barguet 1962: 130, pl.20) or inside the Hakoris barque-station before the first pylon of the same temple (Lauffray 1995a: 29–32, n.41, pl.27 [B–C]).¹⁰ Indeed, it is a feature typically absent from the monolithic naoi.

A late Ptolemaic chapel at Koptos is carved with heraldic plants (Traunecker 1992: 293–303, pl.7 [a]), and its architectural form resembles the Bubastis shrine (EA 1106). In particular, the walls with exterior décor that project forward from the front face, and the relief representation of naoi with tapered sides housed within a shrine with vertical, rather than tapering, walls. Although the decorative content of the exterior walls at Koptos is more developed than in the Bubastis example, with dado processions and palace-façade panelling, it is similarly centred on a series of contiguous offering scenes. The Bubastis shrine (EA 1106) featured at least two contiguous scenes of pharaoh before Bastet, who endows him with kingship and dominion over foreign lands (Fig.12). The latter theme is invoked in the dedicatory text on the outside wall of the Koptos chapel (Traunecker 1992: 251–2). Of course, such themes are prominent in many temple inscriptions, but the row of kings supporting the heaven is also present on the Koptos chapel, beneath the frontal

‘substitution’ representation of the barque (for a 30th dynasty example at Karnak see Traunecker 1982).¹¹ There is no depiction of a naos upon EA 1106. This latter motif is evidently missing from the Bubastis shrine, and I propose that a real barque sat in its place, so that this was not a substitution chapel, but a barque chapel proper,¹² presumably that for ‘Bastet lady of the shrine/chest’.

A Meret-goddess is depicted beneath the level of the cavity on EA 1106 (Fig.13b, Pl.34), presumably matched by a symmetrically opposed figure on the now lost opposite side. These goddesses were associated with ritual music and movement of either ritual objects or pharaoh, but are particularly prevalent on depictions of sacred barques and their emplacements (Guglielmi 1991: 149–200; Dominicus 2004: pl.29).

The ‘upholding heaven’ ritual is well known from Ptolemaic temple scenes in which pharaoh offers an upheld *pt*-symbol to a deity (Kurth 1975, see pp.104–17 for the location of such scenes within temples), but on naoi and barque emplacements the motif is reduced to a series of figures of the king holding up heaven (e.g. Medinet Habu IV: pl.217 [A]; Gauthier 1912: pl.60 [A]).¹³ Ptolemaic shrines with this motif are known from Philae (British Museum EA 1134, Bowman 1986: 193, fig.119 and Louvre D30, Ziegler 1990: 82). A very similar motif is found on barque stands from the reign of Seti I (Vienna ÄS 5106, Habachi 1974: 96–7, figs.1–2, pl.5; and those depicted in his temple, e.g. Gardiner 1935: pls.5, 10) and was clearly part of the decoration upon the pedestal of a barque of Amun-Ra in use during the 20th dynasty (Fazzini 1975: xix, fig.7). Kushite pharaohs also employed the motif on barque stands, such as that of Taharqa still *in situ* at Gebel Barkal (Stevenson Smith 1981: 398 [391]) and a stand of Atlanarsa from the same site. The latter uses a modified form of the motif combined with a *sm3-t3wy* symbol and Meret goddesses (Reisner 1918: 104–5, pl.14).¹⁴

Given the symmetrical layout of pharaoh supporting heaven on all these stands, one can suggest that a similar lower register decorated the corresponding exterior right wall of this Bubastis shrine (EA 1106). The loss of the left wall where it projected forward from the cavity entrance (Fig.11) is critical, as we do not know whether the reverse of this face was decorated, i.e. the inner left wall leading up to the doorway. However, the relief fragment from Saft el-Henna offers one possibility. The centimetre or so of the return inside edge of EA 1106 is polished smooth, in a manner consistent with the other decorated surfaces (see n.9). The Koptos chapel cited above for its architectural and iconographical similarities does feature decoration on this inner face.

Though only a small section of this shrine survives, its iconography suggests it performed the role of permanent architectural setting for a processional image of Bastet. This further emphasises the variety of shrines set up at Bubastis in the reign of Nekthorheb. The size of the interior cavity, 76cm deep and 81cm high (width unknown) suggests a rather small processional image (possibly in the form of a barque) was housed within. That images of Bastet in this form existed in the 30th dynasty is clear from the Saft el-Henna naos, as it bears a depiction of a barque labelled as *wi3 n B3st* (Roeder 1914: 67, pl.18), followed by other gods associated with Bubastis. The substitution chapel at Koptos, though offering architectural parallels with this naos from Bubastis is somewhat larger, with

an inner space 2.10m deep and 1.70m wide. Much larger barque-shrines did exist, such as that of 'Hathor the great, lord of Dendera' which measured 8 cubits in length (4.2m, *Dendara V*: 23 = Cauville 2004: 102–3).¹⁵

Notes to Appendix 1

- 1 There are possible traces of chisel marks along the edge above the relief decoration on the left side, and another one on the front preserved edge (Pl.31); these may be related to the breaking up of this monument.
- 2 Roeder reproduces the text in horizontal lines (1914: 54); examination of the monument itself in October 2004 revealed the vertical cartouche on the left doorjamb features the *mry* and *In-Hr* signs side by side at the top of the cartouche.
- 3 During the 2005 season, Rosenow discovered several further blocks which she proposes are from this monument, including areas from the right side with similar decoration, a *sm3-t3wy* symbol on the threshold block, and areas of ceiling carved with stars (personal communication). These will be presented in her forthcoming doctoral dissertation.
- 4 The dimensions of the block from el-Ashmunein, 90cm thick, favour it being identified as a wall relief. An even larger relief fragment with this motif was also found at el-Ashmunein, with the falcon-cartouche frieze on top of an offering scene including a goddess with cow-horn and sun-disc head-dress. The cartouches bear the name of an Osorkon (Spencer 1989: pl. 73 [72]).
- 5 Habachi and Ghalioungui read this as 'lady of the *hn*', meaning papyrus-chest or library (1971: 70). The epithet *nbt hn* is discussed by Goyon (1968: 41–4), who includes an erroneous copy of the inscription on British Museum EA 1106 with a symmetrical *hn*-sign rather than the flattened naos shape. The *hn* is thought to be a sacred chest or even cenotaph, associated with the Osiris cult, but also goddesses such as Bastet, Menhyt and Mehit (Goyon 1968: 41–4; *Dendara X*: 411 = Cauville 1997a: 223). The artist may have been aware of the possible ambiguity of the reading as *k3r* 'naos', entirely appropriate in this context. The sanctuary of the *speos* at Gebel es-Silsilah includes reference to the goddess *Mkt nbt k3r* (Thiem 2000: 334).
- 6 Twait is one of the four goddesses that embody the notion of supporting the heavens (Kurth 1975: 91–100), known from late Ptolemaic temples, though her name is not usually written with this sign (see Leitz 2002d: 372–3). The hieroglyph with sun-disc atop three rays can refer to many aspects of the sun's rays, brilliance or glorious light (e.g. *stwt*, *psd*, *im3w*), but the seated figure as determinative implies that this inscription is invoking a divine embodiment of those features. The use of alliteration, in this case *tw3 tw3it*, is a frequent feature in texts accompanying this type of scene (Kurth 1975: 123–4). One cannot discount, however, that one of the other divine manifestations of solar light was intended, such as (*i*)*3hw*, *psd(t)*, *hddwt*, *šw* or *sšp*.
- 7 The preserved traces below the *nb*-sign suggest a sign with a near-horizontal top, reminiscent of the sign for *k3r* found in the register above.
- 8 There may be traces of red paint preserved in the sun-discs worn by the falcons. It has not yet proved possible to analyse this to ascertain if it is ancient (note the modern painting of the Leiden shrine discussed above).
- 9 This area on the lower part of EA 1106 is smoothed, and towards the top is the remnant of a small area of relief carving. This is insufficiently preserved to identify with certainty, though it is consistent with the curving top part of a feather flanking an *3ff*-crown, or a damaged sun-disc. In this part of the upper fragment of EA 1106 a vertical line has been carved into the surface, possibly part of a border to the scene, or delimiting a column of inscription.
- 10 It can also adorn doorways to larger cult complexes, such as the Sokar chapel at Medinet Habu, Epigraphic Survey 1963: pl. 405 [B]; or the temple proper at Dendur, Blackman 1911: pl. 32.
- 11 Though this monument was clearly inserted into the mud-brick enclosure wall, the surviving blocks are too damaged to ascertain if heraldic plants were featured, see Traunecker 1982: 253, pl. 1 [b–c].
- 12 Processional barques post-dating the New Kingdom are discussed in Karlshausen 1998; the position of barque emplacements in Late Period temples is not as clear as with earlier temples, exacerbated by the paucity of preserved temple plans.
- 13 Four gods support the bed of a recumbent deity depicted upon the Saft el-Henna naos, Roeder 1914: pl. 32.
- 14 Baboons are shown holding up the sky on the side of a pedestal supporting a figurine of a crocodile with falcon-head: Sotheby's 1987: 69 [96].
- 15 These processional shrines are to be distinguished from the full-scale boats, which housed shrines and other temple equipment, most notably the *Wsr-h3t* barque of Amun-Ra, which could measure 130 cubits in length during the New Kingdom (68.23m, Grandet 1989: 230, n.145).

Appendix 2

Checklist of Blocks from the Naos

Fragments excavated by Naville

Figure 5 provides a visual key to the relative positions of the fragments.

Museum	Naville reference	Other bibliography	Illustration
Cairo Museum, number unknown	1891: pl. 47 [C]		Pl.22
Cairo Museum CG 70016	1891: pl. 47 [H]	Roeder 1914: 49–50, pls. 12b, 55c–d, 77a, 84e, 87h; Mysliwiec 1998: fig. 75 (detail).	Pl.21
London, British Museum EA 1005	1891: pl. 47 [A]		Fig. 10, Pl. 19
London, British Museum EA 1078	1891: pl. 48 [D]		Fig. 7b, 8a, Pls. 15–18, 23, 24, Col. Pls. 3, 4
London, British Museum EA 1079	1891: pl. 48 [A, B, C]		Fig. 7a, 8b, 9, Pls. 10–14, 25, Col. Pls. 2, 5
London, British Museum EA 1080	1891: pl. 47 [D, E]		Fig. 6, Pls. 7–9
Switzerland, Private collection no. 240	1891: pl. 47 [F]	Chappaz and Chamay 2001: 44 [30], previously Sotheby's 1998: no. 71	Pl. 20
Location unknown	1891: pl. 47 [B]		Included in Pl. 5

NB: British Museum EA 1106 was excavated by Naville, and thought to come from the great naos (Naville 1891: pl. 47 [G, G', G'']), but is actually part of a different shrine, studied in Appendix 1. I have not included here the naos fragments found at Tell Basta in recent years (see Chapter 6, particularly ns. 7, 8).

Other blocks which may come from the Great Naos

Present location	Note	Bibliography	Illustration
Unknown	Cartouches	Bresciani 1982	-
Unknown	Lioness-headed deity	Ede 1984: no. 7	Pl. 27
Unknown, possibly at Bubastis	Child-god with heraldic plants	Habachi 1957: 84, fig. 24	-
Unknown, possibly at Bubastis	Winged falcon-headed god (upper register), falcon-headed god and Meret-goddess (lower)	Habachi 1957: 85	-
Unknown	Cartouches	DE V: pl. 29 [9]; it is possible this is actually EA 1080.	Pl. 28

See Chapter 2 for a discussion of these fragments.

Appendix 3

Towards a distribution list for the Egypt Exploration Fund excavations at Bubastis

The material excavated by Egypt Exploration Fund (EEF) expeditions was subject to division between the Egyptian authorities and the EEF. This included objects which Naville acquired from dealers during his excavation seasons.¹ In practice, a selection of objects were sent to the Museum in Cairo, while the remainder were distributed to institutions who had supported the work in Egypt. At the end of the first season, Naville listed the objects to stay in Cairo, and those to be sent back to England.² A similar list after the second season is followed by an enumeration of those objects still on site which deserved to be removed for division and distribution.³ The logistical difficulties in transporting the blocks from Tell Basta were significant, and delegated by Naville (Spencer 1987).

Subsequent letters reveal that he took a keen interest in where the antiquities were sent, and often offered suggestions. These were not always heeded by the EEF Committee. For example, Naville's letter to Edwards (1 June 1887; EES Archive Ve) includes a recommendation that the statue of Montuirkhepeshef should go to Oxford; it was sent to Boston (88.748). Naville obviously felt passionately about particular objects, and was concerned that the head of Amenemhat III might go to Boston:

I consider it a grave misfortune for Egyptology. It cannot be done. Let all the lot go to Boston, if you like, but keep the Hyksos statue' (Letter of Naville to Edwards, 6 August 1888 [EES Archive Vf]).

The colossal head was eventually donated to the British Museum (EA 1063). Another letter covers similar themes, including a reference to Edward's suggestion that a display of objects from the excavations should be held in London before the final distribution to participating institutions, and irritation at the attitude of the British Museum:

I rejoiced at the idea which you put forward in your past letter of having an exhibition, but I see from M. Poole's letter that it is not to take place; but that a good number will be shown in the Br. Museum. I am very impatient to know what you will think of the Hyksos head. The other one which is at Boolak is also very fine but it is not the same head and it will be necessary to have a plaster cast of it and to put it near the fine one. I very much hope you will not send too much to America, especially if the monuments of Boston are not to be seen by the English public. It would be a pity if the Hathor head went straight to America in case you send it to them. As for the two Ramses in red granite and... Mr... (?) told me expressly he did not care much for any of them, it would be better if they could remain together on each side of a door. I hope that after this campaign you shall have the hearty support of the Oriental department⁴ of the Br. Museum, and that they will cease their jealous and mean opposition. (Letter of Naville to Edwards, 24 March 1889 [EES Archive Vg])

By the time the two Memoirs were published, the bulk of the material had been distributed, though no list was included in the volumes (Neville 1891 and 1892). Several of the larger monuments are described as being housed in certain museums: in the case of the great naos 'most of the fragments have been carried away and sent to the museum of Gizeh or to the British Museum' (Neville 1891: 56–7). Consultation of the distribution registers at the EES make it clear that the majority of objects had been sent to subscribing institutions by 1890, but material was also sent out as late as 1922 (an object in the British Museum), with several groups of small antiquities being distributed in 1902, to Brooklyn and Colorado.

The list below represents a first step towards a distribution list, compiled from the published comments of Neville (1891), references in Porter and Moss, but especially through EES archives⁵ and correspondence with the many institutions who received objects from other EEF excavations. The difficulty in tracking down objects was compounded by three factors. Firstly, some of the material was distributed to private collections, and comes to light only once it is transferred to a public collection, or appears in an auction catalogue. Secondly, some museums have ceased to exist, and/or their collections have been transferred. Finally, it is known that some museums de-accessioned material for public sale at various periods. This is known to have occurred in Cairo and could explain the recent re-appearance of one statue base (Neville 1891: pl.45 [C]) in a private garden in England.⁶

This list does not include any objects which cannot be shown to result from Neville's visits and excavations at the site. Objects had been acquired at Bubastis since the mid-19th century. For example, 48 objects acquired from Reverend Chester by the British Museum, between 1867 and 1891, were described as coming from Tell Basta.

I offer no claim towards completeness, but believe the following list may nonetheless be of use to Egyptologists. References are given to the two Neville volumes, and the

Topographical Bibliography, where possible. If a study or good photographs of the object have been published recently, a further reference is given. Those objects in *italics* are known only from the EEF distribution book (see n.5); the present Museum, if it still exists, has no records of these objects.

Notes

- 1 For example, a letter to Eugène Grébaut, director of the Boulaq Museum, at the end of the third season notes that in addition to excavated objects from Bubastis, the museum was also to receive '3 limestone fragments from Horbeit, purchased from a Greek... at Bubastis'. Neville also states that he seized a relief depicting Akhenaten from an agent of the Italian consul, who had wrongfully acquired it (Letter of Neville to Grébaut, 5 April 1889 [EES Archive Vg]). The participation of his cousin, Ernest Cramer-Sarasin, an avid collector of ancient Egyptian art, in the excavations (Sotheby's 2005: 66–77), indicates the possibility that distinguished visitors could have been given excavated objects as gifts.
- 2 Letter of Neville to Edwards, 28 May 1887 (from Neville's home in Malagny, Switzerland) [EES Archive Ve]. Four objects were to stay in Cairo, and five were sent to England.
- 3 Letter of Neville to Poole, 21 April 1888 (from Cairo). Neville describes discussion with Grébaut, director of the Boulaq Museum, and notes six objects 'and several small things' staying in Cairo, and eleven monuments to be distributed by the EEF, including a block from the naos published here.
- 4 The forerunner of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities (from 1886), the Department of Egyptian Antiquities (from 1955) and since 2001, the present-day Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan. In a letter written after returning from the final season, Neville expressed further irritation with the Museum, particularly with the Keeper Le Page Renouf and his assistant Wallis Budge over their claim that the fragments of the colossal statue of Amenemhat III (EA 1063-4) were not actually from the same monument. Neville states that the sculptures should, in that case, go to the Louvre or Boulaq 'and it will be a proof of the correctness of Petrie's opinion about the Oriental department. But enough of that....' (Letter of Neville to Edwards, 30 April 1889 [EES Archive Vg]).
- 5 These include the original distribution books, arranged by Museum (two volumes, comprising material distributed up to and including 1899, and 1900–1914). In addition, a preliminary list of receiving institutions compiled by Patricia Spencer in 1982 proved useful.
- 6 Fragment brought into the Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan, The British Museum, in 2002.

Museum	Acc No	Description	Naville reference	Bibliography	Notes	
Brooklyn Museum of Art	02.235	Faience <i>udjat</i> -eye			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Faience udjat</i> -eye			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Faience Isis figurine</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Faience Anubis figurine</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Faience menat</i> -symbol			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Faience shabti</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Faience shabti</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Faience shabti</i>			Acquired 1902	
	Cairo Museum	CG 383 & 540	Seated granite colossal royal statue of Amenemhat III	1891: 26-7, pls.11, 24	PMIV: 28	
		CG 389	Black granite statue of Khyan	1891: 23-4, pls.12, 35 [A]	PMIV: 29	
		CG 590	Black granite statue of vizier Amenhotep (reign of Amenhotep II)	1891: 31-2, pls.13, 25 [B], 35 [F-F'] 1891: 46, pls.16, 38 [K]	PMIV: 31; Kozloff and Bryan 1992: 51, fig.11 [10]	
		CG 634	Upper part of a red granite statue of Ramses VI	1891: 35, 38, pl.15	PMIV: 3	
		CG 636	Red granite statue of Ramses II, head		PMIV: 31; Chadefaud 1982: 33-4	
		CG 70016	Red granite fragment of a naos (Nekhtorheb)	1891: pl. 47 [H]	Roeder 1914: 49-50, pl.12 [B]; this volume, Pl.21	
No. unknown		Red granite fragment of a naos (Nekhtorheb)	1891: pl.47 [C]	This volume, Pl.22.		
No. unknown		Basalt block statue (reign of Apries)	1891: 55-6, pl.43 [D]	PMIV: 32		
No. unknown		Red limestone statue of Ramses VI	1891: 46, pl.38 [H-H'-H'']	PMIV: 31		
No. unknown		Headress from a colossal statue of Ramses II	1891: 34-5, pl.21 [C]	PMIV: 31		
No. unknown	Red granite relief bearing Aten cartouches.	1891: 34, pl.35 [I]	PMIV: 31			
No. unknown	Statue base of Kherfu (reign of Amenhotep III)	1891: 33, pl.35 [H-H']	PMIV: 31			
No. unknown	Fragment of a granite statue group (reign of Ramses II)	1891: 40-1, pl.38 [B]	PMIV: 28			
No. unknown	Pepyl reliefs	1891: 5-6, pl.32 [D]	PMIV: 29			
No. unknown	Limestone seated statue of Merenptah	1891: 45, pl.38 [D]	PMIV: 30			
No. unknown	Red granite pillar, of Osorkon I	1891: pls.51-3	PMIV: 30			
	'Greek inscription'					
	Base of a black granite statue of Ramses VI					
	Sandals from a red sandstone statue of Ramses III					
Denver, Museum of Nature & Science ³		<i>Bronze figure of Osiris</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Bronze figure of Anubis</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Bronze figure of Bes</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Bronze figure of Taweret</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Bronze figure of Isis and Horus</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Bronze figure of Ptah-Sokar</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Bronze figure of a cat</i>			Acquired 1902	
		<i>Bronze figure of a ram</i>			Acquired 1902	
		Wadji-sceptre			Acquired 1902	
	Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek	AE.I.N.1341	Upper part of a red granite statue of Ramses II	1891: pl.24 [C]	PMIV: 28	
Geneva, Musée d'Art et d'Histoire	MAH 8934	Granodiorite statue of Ramses II	1891: 16, 37, pl.14	Chappaz in Geneva 1986 22-3 [11]	Acquired 1888/9	
Greenock, McLean Museum	1987.415	Red granite relief of Nekhtorheb	1891: pl.46 [D]		Formerly in the Watt Institute, Greenock (acquired in 1890). This piece was offered for sale in 1965 (see Hill 2004: 133, n.50). While other objects were sold from the collection, this relief was evidently not.	

Museum	Acc No	Description	Naville reference	Bibliography	Notes
Liverpool Museum	21.3.89.1	Granite relief of Ramses II		<i>Egyptian Treasures 4</i> .	Acquired 1888.
	56.22.399	Granite weight, hexagonal			Previously in the Norwich Castle Museum
	56.22.400	Granite weight, rectangular			Previously in the Norwich Castle Museum
	56.22.401	Red granite (?) weight, cuboid			Previously in the Norwich Castle Museum
	56.22.402	Weight, cylindrical			Previously in the Norwich Castle Museum
	56.22.403	Basalt weight, flat and rectangular			Previously in the Norwich Castle Museum
	56.22.404	Weight, flat			Previously in the Norwich Castle Museum
London, British Museum⁴	EA 874	Limestone dyad	1891: 55-6, pl.43 [A-A]	This volume, Pl.19	Acquired 1888
	EA 1005	Red granite fragment of a naos (Nekthorheb)	1891: pl.47 [A]		
	EA 1063-4	Seated granite colossa (royal statue of Amenemhat III)	1891: 26, pls.1, 10, 25 [F], 26 [B]	PMIV: 28; Russmann 2001: 105-7 [31]	Acquired 1889
	EA 1065	Palm-leaf granite column of Ramses II (additional inscriptions of Osorkon II)	1891: 11	PMIV: 29	Acquired 1889
	EA 1066	Upper part of a granite statue of Ramses II	1891: 38-9	PMIV: 28; Chadefaud 1982: 34-5	Acquired 1889
	EA 1068	Black granite statue of a vizier Amenhotep (reign of Amenhotep III)	1891: 32-3, pls.13, 35 [E-E]	PMIV: 31	Acquired 1889
	EA 1077	Red granite relief of Osorkon II	1892: 26-9, pls. 14-16 [8], 28 [right]	PMIV: 29; James 1988 fig. 15	Acquired 1889
	EA 1078	Red granite fragment of a naos (Nekthorheb)	1891: pl.47 [D]	This volume, Pls. 15-18	Acquired 1889
	EA 1079	Red granite fragment of a naos (Nekthorheb)	1891: pl.47 [C]	This volume, Pls. 10-14	Acquired 1889
	EA 1080	Red granite fragment of a great naos (Nekthorheb)	1891: pl.47 [D-E]	This volume, Pls. 6-9	Acquired 1889
	EA 1097	Red granite relief of Khufu	1891: 5, pls.8, 32 [A-B]	PMIV: 28	Acquired 1891
	EA 1098	Red granite relief of Khafre	1891: 5, pls.8, 32 [A-B]	PMIV: 28	Acquired 1891
	EA 1099	Red granite relief of Senwosret III	1891: 9, 14, 36, pls.24 [A], 26 [C], 33 [B-F], 34 [C]	PMIV: 30	Acquired 1891
	EA 1100	Architrave of Sobekhotep II	1891: 15, pl.33 [G-I]	PMIV: 30	Acquired 1891
	EA 1101	Red granite relief of Apepi	1891: 22-3, pls.22 [A], 35 [C]	PMIV: 28	Acquired 1891
	EA 1102	Red granite relief of Senwosret III, re-inscribed for Ramses II	1891: 9, 14, 36, pls.24 [A], 26 [C], 33 [B-F], 34 [C]	PMIV: 30; Parkinson 1999: 142 [55]	Acquired 1891
	EA 1103	Red granite relief of Amenhotep II	1891: 30-1, 56, pls.26 [A], 35 [D]	PMIV: 30	Acquired 1891
	EA 1104	Red granite reliefs of Ramses II, foreign names	1891: 40, pls.17, 36 [B-D]	PMIV: 31; Parkinson 1999: 79 [8].	Acquired 1891
	EA 1105	Red granite relief of Osorkon II	1892: 33-5, pls.21-4, 25 [1], 31 [left]		Acquired 1891
	EA 1106	Red granite fragment of a naos (Nekthorheb)	1891: pl.47 [G]	This volume, Pls. 29-34	Acquired 1891
	EA 1107	Red granite Hathor capital (Osorkon II)		Russmann 2001: 214-15 [113]	Acquired 1891
	EA 1825	Limestone statuette of Hakoris	1891: 56, pl.43 [B]	PMIV: 32	Acquired 1885 ⁵
	EA 22069	Yellow-glazed sherd			Acquired 1885 ⁶
	EA 22272	Base of red-slipped pottery bowl			Acquired 1885
	EA 22273	Vessel sherd, with white slip and black painted decoration			Acquired 1885
	EA 22274	Vessel sherd			Acquired 1885
	EA 22276	Vessel sherd			Acquired 1885
	EA 22457	Pottery jar			Acquired 1885
	EA 27684	Terracotta fragment bearing an image of an Apis bull			Acquired 1885
	EA 55373	Green mudstone inscription			Acquired 1922

Museum	Acc No	Description	Naville reference	Bibliography	Notes
	GR 1890,0706.1	Faience horse's head			Acquired 1890
	GR 1890,0706.3	Black-glazed pottery lamp			Acquired 1890
London, Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology	UC14632	Figure from a granodiorite dyad (reign of Amenhotep III)	1891: 33, pl.35 [G]	Page 1976: 74–5 [78]	
Macclesfield Museum	Unnumbered	<i>Black granite slab and minor antiquities</i> ⁷		David 1980: 60 [13]	Acquired 1888/9
		Bronze cat statuette			
		<i>Shabtī</i>			Acquired 1895
		<i>Shabti</i>			Acquired 1895
Manchester, Heywood Free Library ⁹		<i>Fragment of Bastet figurine, pierced for suspension</i>			Acquired 1895
		<i>Papyrus-column amulet (22nd dynasty)</i>			Acquired 1895
		<i>Figure of Shu, pierced for suspension</i>			Acquired 1895
Manchester Museum	1779	Red granite relief with figures of Horus and Bastet (Osorkon I)	1891: pl.39 [Q]		Originally sent to Owen's College, Manchester (pre-decessor of the University of Manchester) in 1890
	1780	Red granite column inscribed for Ramses II and Merenptah			
	1784	Colossal red granite head from a dyad or triad (Ramses II)			Originally sent to Owen's College, Manchester (pre-decessor of the University of Manchester) in 1888–9
	1786	Head from a black granite statue of Sekhmet			
	13771	Fragment of a granite column bearing a depiction of Ramses II before Ptah ⁷			
Montreal, Redpath Museum	Unnumbered	Red granite relief fragment of Ramses II	1891: pl.36 [H]	PM IV: 31, Berg 1990: 76–81	Acquired 1890
Paris, Musée du Louvre	E 10592 = B 53	Red granite relief of Osorkon II	1892: pl.10 [B]		Acquired 1890
	E 10591 = B 55	Red granite relief of Osorkon II.	Tanis 1987: 170–1 [45]		
	E 10589	Red granite papyrus column	Tanis 1987: 168–9 [44].		
	E 10590	Hathor column capital (Osorkon II)	1891: pl.24 [B]	PM IV: 29	Acquired 1890
	E 10602	Terracotta figure of Aphrodite (?)			Acquired 1890
Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum	E225	Red granite heb-sed relief (Osorkon II)	1892: pl.23 [7]	Ziegler 2002: 423 [90].	
		<i>Limestone relief with a depiction of a king</i> ¹¹			Acquired 1890.
		<i>Beads (22nd dynasty)</i>			
		<i>Shabti of Nes-Bastet</i>			
		<i>Shabti of Ramen-hor</i>			
		<i>Shabti of the scribe Nsiptah</i>			
		<i>Uninscribed shabti</i>			
		<i>Statuette of Bastet 'from a tomb'</i>			
		<i>Beads 'from a tomb' (same tomb as above?)</i>			
		<i>Miniature glazed-ware jug</i>			
		<i>Amulet depicting a pair of hawks</i>			
		<i>Ram-headed amulet</i>			
		<i>Felspar Isis and Horus amulet</i>			
		<i>Lapis lazuli amulet of a deity</i>			
		<i>Pelican amulet</i>			
		<i>Nepththys amulet</i>			
St Helens Museum	1899/11/2	Faience shabti (22nd dynasty?)			
	1899/11/3	Faience amulet			

Museum	Acc No	Description	Naville reference	Bibliography	Notes
St Helens, Gamble Institute		<i>Faience shabti (22nd dynasty?)</i> <i>Bronze Osiris figure</i> <i>Bronze Nefertum figure</i>			Acquired 1889 Acquired 1889 Acquired 1889
Switzerland, private collection	No.240	Red granite fragment of the great naos (Nekhtorheb)	1891: pl.47 [F]	Chappaz and Chamay 2001: 44 [30]; this volume, PL20	
Sydney Nicholson Museum	62.657	Granodiorite head from a statue of Amenhotep III/Ramses II	1891: 9, 14, 37	PM IV: 30; Merrillees 1990: 5, fig. 6.	via Josiah Mullens
Tamworth	No number	Hathor capital (Osorkon II) <i>Black granite statue of Bastet</i> <i>Relief from the Festival Hall</i>	1891: pl.23 [B]	Sowada and Ockinga 2003	via Josiah Mullens Acquired 1888 Acquired 1890
Toronto University, Victoria College		<i>Bronze figure of a cat</i> <i>Bronze figure of Harpocrates</i> <i>Bronze figure of Nefertum</i> <i>Bronze (?) handle</i> <i>Model of a Bes-head</i>			Acquired 1902 Acquired 1902 Acquired 1902 Acquired 1902
York Museum ¹²	No number	Amulet of Pashed			Acquired 1902
	No number	Amulet of Taweret			Acquired 1902
	No number	Amulet of Anubis			Acquired 1902
	No number	Bronze figurine of Osiris			
	No number	Shabti			
UK, private collection		Granodiorite private statue fragment (Third Intermediate Period?)	1891: pl.43 [C]		Brought into Dept. of Ancient Egypt and Sudan in 2002 (appears to be from the base of a block statue)

Notes

- The Ethnological Museum has seven shabtis in its collection, but none that can be dated to the 22nd dynasty. I am grateful to Gillian Shepherd, curator of the Ethnological Museum, for this information.
- These were previously in the York Museum, and before that in the Birmingham University Medical School, from where they were transferred in 1973. It is possible these are the same shabtis recorded as distributed to the Birmingham University Ethnological Museum in the EEF distribution book (1900-1914).
- The EEF distribution register for 1900–1914 names a President Slocum as recipient of these objects. He was President of Colorado College from 1887 to 1917, and it seems likely the objects formed part of the College's Palmer Museum collection, which was dispersed in 1977. Most of the objects went to the Museum of Natural History in Denver (now the Denver Museum of Nature & Science). I am grateful to Jessy Randall, Curator and Archivist of Colorado College Special Collections, and Ryntha Johnson, Anthropology Collections Manager at the Denver Museum of Nature & Science, for this information.
- Naville refers to a false door, which he dates to the Old Kingdom, sent to the British Museum (1891: 7–8, pls.6,22 [D]), cited in PM IV: 28) but this never entered the collection.
- This is one of 544 objects donated by the EEF, registered at the British Museum on 1 January 1885. Provenances are given for a small number of these objects, including Tanis, Tell el-Yahudiyeh, Athribis, Tell el-Muqdam, Tell Suelin, and Tell el-Maskhuta.
- EA 22272-4, 22276, 22547 and 27684 form part of a group of 587 objects donated by the EEF, registered at the British Museum on 11 January 1885. Nearly all of the objects are from Naukratis and Tanis, with a small number from Gebelein and Athribis. These Bubastis objects, and EA 22069 (see previous note) cannot be from Naville's excavations at Bubastis, but may have been acquired by him or Petrie, in 1884 or before. Naville is known to have visited Bubastis in 1882 (see p.42, n. 1). Both men are known to have spent time visiting other sites to ascertain opportunities for future excavations; during these visits, antiquities were often acquired. The main EEF excavations prior to 1885 were, of course, at Tell el-Maskhuta, Tanis and Naukratis.
- The 'black granite slab' is probably the statue UC 14632. Other objects in the Petrie Museum with a Bubastis provenance can be accessed at www.petrie.ucl.ac.uk/index2.html; it is unclear if any of these were acquired from the EEF or other sources such as Amelia Edwards, Petrie or Griffith.
- Forty-three shabtis are listed in a catalogue of the Macclesfield Museum (David 1980: 45–9), including several with an EEF provenance (Abydos, the Fayum). D32 in David's list was donated by the EEF, but no provenance is recorded. It is of course possible, that the two shabtis sent by the EEF are other ones in the collection, whose acquisition details have been lost.
- A booklet produced to mark the opening of Heywood Municipal Art Gallery & Museum (housed in the Heywood Technical School adjacent to the Heywood Library) in 1904 refers to the gift of Egyptian, Greek and Roman antiquities by Thomas Kay Esq JP of Stockport (who was closely associated with the Heywood Library). The accession register of over 40 items transferred to Rochdale Museum from Heywood Library in 1985 most likely include the items donated by Thomas Kay; the only Egyptian object listed is a canopic jar and stopper. The Rochdale Museum collection contains many Egyptian amulets, including examples from excavations at Saft el-Henna, Memphis, Sedment, Gurob Qau el-Kebir and Harageh, but none associated with Bubastis (I am grateful to Andrew Moore, Collections Manager at the Rochdale Museum, for this information).
- This fragment was on display in Whitworth Hall until 2000, and only recently catalogued by the Manchester Museum. As such, it is possible that it was sent directly to Whitworth Hall by the EEF. I am grateful to Christina Riggs, Curator of Egyptology at the Manchester Museum, for this information.
- The following pieces ascribed to Philadelphia are mentioned in a separate notebook housed in the EES archives, dated to between 1888 and 1892.
- A handwritten list at the York Museum, dating to the late 1880s, records the entry of these five objects, and the granite relief subsequently transferred to Birmingham. Thanks are due to Elizabeth Hartley of the York Museum for this information.

Appendix 3 – Towards a distribution list for the Egypt Exploration Fund excavations at Bubastis

Museum	Acc No	Description	Naville reference	Bibliography	Notes
American Committee of the EEF		<i>Limestone fragment of an altar, bearing name of Akhenaten</i>			Distributed 1897; subsequent distribution unknown
		<i>Black granite 'Roman figure'</i>			Distributed 1897; subsequent distribution unknown
		<i>Black granite 'fragment of Ptah'</i>			Distributed 1897; subsequent distribution unknown
Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung	10834	Red granite Hathor capital (Osorkon II)	1891: pl.21 [A], 23 [C]	PM IV: 29	Acquired 1890
	10835	Upper part of a granite statue of Ramses II		PM IV: 28; Chadefaud 1982: 35–6	Acquired 1890
	10836	Double crown from a colossal statue of Ramses II (not associated with 10835)			Acquired 1890
	10837	Relief of Osorkon II	1892: 23–5, pls. 11 [6], 10–13, 26.3, 31 [right], 37	PM IV: 29	Acquired 1890
	10838	Relief of Osorkon II, including Karomama sacrificing a monkey <i>Ptah-Sokar Osiris (22nd dynasty)</i>	1892: pl.3 [13]	PM IV: 28	Acquired 1890 Acquired between 1900–14
		<i>Osiris (22nd dynasty)</i>			Acquired between 1900–14
		<i>Anubis (22nd dynasty)</i>			Acquired between 1900–01
		<i>Thoth (22nd dynasty)</i>			Acquired between 1900–14
		<i>'Mummy earring' (22nd dynasty)</i>			Acquired between 1900–14
		<i>Shabti (22nd dynasty)¹</i>			Acquired between 1900–14
	<i>Shabti (22nd dynasty)</i>			Acquired between 1900–14	
	<i>Shabti (22nd dynasty)</i>			Acquired between 1900–14	
	<i>Bronze figure of a cat</i>			Acquired between 1900–14	
	<i>Bronze figure of Nefertum</i>			Acquired between 1900–14	
Birmingham Museum	1972A135	Red granite relief of Osorkon II	1892: pl.26 [1]		Transferred from York Museum (1972), who acquired the relief in 1890
Bolton, Museum & Art Gallery	1890.8.1	<i>Shabti</i> Re-used red granite relief depicting Shu (Third Intermediate Period?)			Previously in the Chadwick Museum, who acquired the relief in 1890
	1890.8.2	Red granite relief from a gateway (Osorkon II)	1892: 30, pl.30, 35 [6], 33		Previously in the Chadwick Museum, acquired 1890
	1966.111A	Calcite torso of Aphrodite (Hellenistic)			EEF redistribution, this object bears a pencil note: 'Bubastis'
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts	88.748	Granodiorite block statue of Montuirkhpeshef (reign of Ramses II)		PM IV: 31	Acquired 1887
	89.555	Red granite Hathor capital (Osorkon II)	1891: pls.9, 23 [A]	Freed <i>et al.</i> 2003: 173	Acquired 1888
	89.558	Upper part of a red granite statue of Ramses II	1891: 38–9	PM IV: 28; Chadefaud 1982: 36?7; Freed <i>et al.</i> 2003: 163	Acquired 1888
	89.556a-b	Red granite papyrus column (12 th dynasty)		Freed <i>et al.</i> 2003: 132	Acquired 1888
Bristol Museum	Number unknown	Fragment of a black granite statue of the Viceroy of Kush (reign of Ramses II)	1891: 42, 44–5, pls.36 [N].	PM IV: 31	
	90.233	Red granite relief (Nekhtorheb)	1891: pl.44 [L]	Bothmer 1953: fig.3.	
		<i>Red granite relief from Festival Hall</i>			Acquired 1888
		<i>Limestone block with relief depiction of a ram-headed god and a human figure</i>			Acquired 1890
		<i>Limestone block, relief of Senwosret I usurped by Ramses II</i>			Acquired 1890
	<i>Limestone block, relief of Ramesses II</i>			Acquired 1890	
	<i>'Festival and procession of Osorkon II'</i>			Acquired 1890	
	<i>Part of doorway, inscribed with 'lady of ...'</i>			Acquired 1890	
	Head from a red granite statue, wearing the atef-crown			Acquired 1888	
	H 798			Grinsell 1972: 50–1, fig.28.	

Appendix 4

30th Dynasty Temple Naoi

The following list presents all the monolithic naoi, or fragments thereof, which can reasonably be attributed to the 30th dynasty. Further unfinished shrines have been found at the quarry site of Rod el-Gamra in the Eastern Desert (Harrell 2002: 240–1, pls.145–7); ceramic evidence suggests these may also date to the 30th dynasty. In addition, Habachi mentions an unpublished shrine of the 30th dynasty being kept in the Babylon fortress under St George's church in Old Cairo (Habachi and Habachi 1952: 259–60, n.30) and the fragment in Verona may date to the reign of Nekhtorheb (Clère 1973).

Site	Reign	Museum	Dedicated to God(s) cited in the dedicatory text or in the inscriptions upon the doorjamb	Material	Height (m)	Width (m) at base
Saft el-Henna	Nekhtnebef	Cairo Museum CG 70021	Soped (various forms)	Granodiorite	-	1.91
Saft el-Henna	Nekhtnebef	Cairo Museum JE 25774 (currently in Alexandria Graeco-Roman Museum), Paris, Louvre Museum D37	Shu lord of <i>Pr-wr</i> , who is in <i>Hwt-nbs</i>	Granodiorite	1.78	0.83***
Saft el-Henna	?	Present location unknown	Tefnut lady of <i>Pr-nsr</i> , who is in <i>Hwt-nbs</i>	Granodiorite	-	-
Saft el-Henna	Nekhtnebef	Ismailia Museum 2248	Geb? (Habachi)	Granodiorite	1.27	0.79
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	Cairo Museum CG 70016, British Museum EA 1005 and 1078–80 & Private Collection (Switzerland) no.240.	Bastet lady of Bubastis	Red granite	3.52*	1.54*
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	British Museum EA 1106	Bastet lady of the shrine/chest (<i>k3r/hn</i>)	Red granite	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	Cairo Museum CG 70013	Heryshef lord of the Two Lands who is in Bubastis; and Bastet lady of Bubastis	Granodiorite	1.95	0.95
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	Tell Basta B/4.3	-	Red granite (?)	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	Tell Basta C/6.8	-	Red granite (?)	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	Seen in Cairo, c. 1988.	Khonsu-Horus lord of joy, son of Bastet	Granodiorite	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	'Bilbeis 1', present location unknown	Horhekenu lord of protection, who is in Bubastis	Granodiorite	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	'Bilbeis 2', present location unknown	Shesmetet who is in Bubastis	Granodiorite	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	'Bilbeis 3', present location unknown	Sekhmet the great who is in Bubastis	Granodiorite	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	'Bilbeis 4', present location unknown	Montu great of strength who is in Bubastis	Granodiorite	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb	Present location unknown	-	Granodiorite	-	-
Bubastis	Nekhthorheb (?)	Tell Basta G/14.29	-	Basalt	-	-
Tanis	Nekhthorheb	Present location unknown	-	Basalt	-	-
Tell el-Balamun	Nekhtnebef (?)	On site	-	Red granite	-	-
Tell el-Balamun	Nekhtnebef (?)	On site (?)	-	Quartzite	-	-
Mendes	Nekhtnebef	Cairo Museum, CG 70022	Banebdjed	Granodiorite	1.47	0.87
Mendes	Nekhtnebef	Cairo Museum, JE 43279	Hat-Mehit who is in Heliopolis & Banebdjed who is in Heliopolis	Granodiorite	1.46	-
Samanud	Nekhthorheb	Cairo Museum, CG 70012	Onuris-Shu, son of, Ra lord of Samanud	Green schist	2.03	0.96
Samanud	Nekhthorheb	Cairo Museum, CG 70015	-	Green diorite	-	1.14*
Sais	Nekhtnebef	Cairo Museum, CG 70020	-	Granodiorite	0.93	0.65
Athribis	Teos	Present location unknown	-	-	-	-
Heliopolis (?)	Nekhtnebef	Cairo Museum, JE 34673	Unknown, but texts invoke Apis son of Osiris, Nephthys, Nut and Ra	Granodiorite	-	-
Herakleopolis Magna	Nekhthorheb	Present location unknown	-	Granite	-	-
Hermopolis Magna	Nekhthorheb	Present location unknown	-	Red granite	-	-
Tuna el-Gebel	Nekhthorheb	Cairo Museum, CG 70014	Thoth	Red granite	2.52	1.05
Abydos	Nekhthorheb	Cairo Museum, CG 70017	-	Red granite	1.3	-
Abydos	Nekhtnebef & Nekhthorheb	Cairo Museum, CG 70018	Thoth, Hathor and Onuris-Shu (?)	Red granite	-	-
Koptos	Nekhtnebef	Cairo Museum, CG 70019	Min of Coptos	Green slate (greywacke?)	2.18	0.95
Edfu	Nekhthorheb	On site	Horus the Behdedite	Black syenite	4.17	2.2
Elephantine	Nekhthorheb	On site	-	Red granite	4.4	2.27
Elephantine	Nekhthorheb	On site	Khnum-Ra <i>hry st.fwrt</i> (?)	Granodiorite	3.66	2.15
Elephantine	Nekhthorheb	On site	-	Black diorite	-	-
-	Nekhthorheb	Florence, Gaddiano Museum	-	-	-	-

* Reconstructed dimensions

** Height extrapolated from published drawing

*** Measurements at base of roof

Depth (m) at base	Roof type	Architecture	Decoration	Bibliography
-	-	Unknown, though no torus mouldings at corners	Rows of gods (at least six registers, some gods labelled), extensive dedicatory texts on jambs and below registers	Roeder 1914: 58?99, pls.17–32, 33b
0.73***	Pyramidal	Plain sides	Dedicatory text at top, decades depicted on three external faces; depiction of Shu on rear interior wall	Clère 1950; Habachi and Habachi 1982; Leitz 1995: 3–57, pls. 1–23
-	-	Plain sides	Depiction of Tefnut on rear interior wall	Sharpe 1855: pl.120; Yoyotte 1954: 81–2, fig.1; Davoli 2001: 46, 64, 99, 110, fig.16
0.61	Pyramidal	Plain sides	Lengthy mythological text on exterior; rows of gods on internal side walls	Goyon 1936; Schumacher 1988: 179–84
-	Pitched	Torus at sides, cornice, ledge Two levels inside (but one width)	Rows of gods (at least four registers), dedicatory text. Unfinished	This volume, Chapters 1–2. It is possible that the fragment pictured in DE (V: pl.29 [9]) is identical to EA 1080, or part of yet another naos from the site.
-	-	Torus moulding	Meret-goddess on jamb; scenes of king offering to Bastet, and king uplifting heaven on left outer wall	This volume, Appendix 1
0.95	Pitched	Cavetto cornice, torus mouldings, ledge	Inscriptions on doorjambs; decorated lintel	Roeder 1914: 44–5, pls. 13, 48 [a–c]. Roof depicted incorrectly
-	-	Cavetto cornice	Parts of royal titulary in dedicatory text, with cartouche frieze upon cornice	This volume, PL.42
-	-	Cavetto cornice	Cartouche frieze upon cornice	This volume, PL.43
-	-	Torus mouldings	Inscription on doorjamb, amd lengthy text on exterior right wall	Rondot 1989
-	-	-	Inscriptions on doorjambs	Habachi 1957: 82–3, fig.23 [1], 126 [4, 6], 128 [9]
-	-	-	Inscriptions on doorjambs	Habachi 1957: 82–4, fig.23 [2], 133 [24]
-	-	-	Inscriptions on doorjambs	Habachi 1957: 82–3, fig.23 [3], 126 [2, 5]
-	-	-	Inscriptions on doorjambs	Habachi 1957: 82–3, fig.23 [4], 128 [11], 135–6
-	-	-	-	Habachi 1957: 81, pl.43c
-	-	-	-	This volume, Chapter 6 (Rosenow)
-	-	-	-	Yoyotte 1973: 83, pl.3b
-	-	-	-	Spencer 1996: 37, pl.8b
-	-	-	-	Spencer 1996: 45
0.78**	Pyramidal	Cornice, torus moulding, ledge	Inscriptions on doorjambs; decorated lintel	Roeder 1914: 99–100, pls. 16b, 65b–c
-	Pyramidal	Cornice, torus moulding, ledge	Inscriptions on doorjambs; decorated lintel	De Meulenaere and Mackay 1976: 195, pl.15c–d
1.22	Pyramidal	Plain sides. Front: cavetto cornice, torus moulding, ledge	Inscriptions on doorjambs (unfinished); decorated lintel	Roeder 1914: 42–3, pls. 14, 47b–c, e
-	Pyramidal	-	King offering to deities	Roeder 1914: 47–8, pls.63c–d, 83a–b
0.53	Curved	No cornice or torus mouldings	Inscriptions on doorjambs; decorated lintel	Roeder 1914: 57–8, pl.16 [a], 51 [e–f]
-	-	-	-	PM IV: 66; Sharpe 1855: 43 [1]; Daressy 1894: 127 [115]; Daressy 1917.
-	-	-	Inscriptions on doorjambs, and both sides of preserved block	Kamal 1901
-	-	-	-	Petrie 1904: 12, 17
-	-	-	Naos fragment?	Szafrenski and Makramallah 1989
1.66	Pitched	Plain walls	Inscriptions on doorjambs; decorated lintel	Roeder 1914: 45–6, pls. 11b, 49d–e ¹
-	-	-	Inscription on doorjamb; pharaoh offering. Heraldic plants at base	Roeder 1914: 50–2, pl.52 [a, b]
-	Curved	-	Large offering scenes (exterior and interior)	Roeder 1914: 53–5; Saleh and Sourouzian 1987: no.257
0.86**	Pyramidal	Cornice, torus moulding, ledge, thinner base area in cavity	Inscriptions on doorjambs only; decorated lintel	Roeder 1914: 55–7, pls. 15, 49[a–c]
2.2	Pyramidal	Lintel, torus moulding, stepped interior	Inscriptions on doorjambs; also heraldic plants at back of cavity, and solar birds on cavity ceiling	Legrain 1917: 67–70, fig.5; <i>Edfou I</i> ² : 9–11, fig.2
2.50**	Pyramidal	Torus moulding at sides, cornice, ledge. Two levels inside	Unfinished	Niederberger 1999: 19, 86–88, figs.51–2, pls.32a, 33a
2.53**	Pyramidal	Simple walls. Two levels inside.	Unfinished	Niederberger 1999: 19, 86–91, figs.53–4, pls.32b, 33b
-	Pyramidal	Cavetto cornice, torus mouldings	Small fragments survive	Niederberger 1999: 19, 86–91, figs.51–5, pls. 32–3
-	-	-	Titulary on preserved fragment	Kircher 1654: 385, fig.2; Gauthier 1916: 190, n.2

1 The 30th dynasty shrine(s) from Abydos are problematic. Mariette noted 'debris' of a naos in the small western temple (1880a: 552 [1424]; 1880b: 36–7, pl.42) but subsequent authors present these blocks as parts of two monuments (Roeder 1914: CG 70017 and CG 70018).

Bibliography

Abbreviations for series and journals follow those in Helck, W. and Otto, E (eds). 1992. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie VII. Nachträge, Korrekturen und Indices*. Wiesbaden: xiv–xxxviii; with the following additional abbreviations:

BSAK	<i>Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur, Beihefte</i> . Hamburg.
BSFFT	<i>Bulletin de la Société Française des Fouilles de Tanis</i> . Paris.
DE	<i>Description de l'Égypte ou recueil des observations et des recherches qui ont été faites en Égypt pendant l'expédition de l'armée française</i> . Paris 1809 (Second edition 1823).
EA	<i>Egyptian Archaeology. The Bulletin of the Egypt Exploration Society</i> . London.
JSSEA	<i>Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities</i> . Toronto.

- Abd er-Raziq, M. 1968. Study on Nectanebo I st in Luxor Temple and Karnak. *MDAIK*, 23: 156–9.
- 1978. Eine Stele Nektanebos I. *MDAIK*, 34: 111–15.
- Alcock, S. E. 2002. *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscapes, Monuments, and Memories*. The W.B. Stanford Memorial Lectures. Cambridge.
- Aldred, C. 1956. The Carnarvon Statuette of Amun. *JEA*, 42: 3–7.
- Allen, T.G. 1974. *The Book of the Dead or Going Forth By Day. Ideas of the Ancient Egyptians Concerning the Hereafter as Expressed in Their Own Ideas*. SAOC 37. Chicago.
- Allen, J.P. 2002. The Speos Artemidos Inscription of Hatshepsut. *BES*, 16: 1–17.
- Alliott, M. 1949. *Le culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées*. BdE 20/1. Cairo.
- Alston, R. 2002. *The City in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*. London and New York.
- el-Aref, N. 2003. A fruitful season. *El-Ahram Weekly*, 653 (28 August - 3 September 2003).
- Arnaudès-Montélimard, E. 2003. Un reposoir de barque en calcite édifié par Thoutmosis III dans le temple d'Amon-Rê à Karnak. *Cahiers de Karnak*, 11: 159–255.
- Arnold, D. 1994. *Lexikon der ägyptischen Baukunst*. Zürich.
- 1996. Hypostyle Halls of the Old and Middle Kingdom? In *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson I* (eds. P. Der Manuelian and R. E. Freed). Boston: 39–54.
- 1999. *Temples of the Last Pharaohs*. Oxford.
- Assmann, J. 1977. *Das Grab der Mutirdis*. Grabung im Asasif, 1963–1970, Bd.6 = AV 13. Mainz.
- 2002. *The Mind of Egypt. History and Meaning in the Time of the Pharaohs*. Translated by A. Jenkins. Harvard.
- Aubert, J.-F. and Aubert, L. 2001. *Bronzes et or Égyptiens*. Contributions à l'Égyptologie 11. Paris.
- Baines, J. 1973. The destruction of the pyramid temple of Sahure. *GM*, 4: 9–14.
- 1990. Restricted Knowledge, Hierarchy, and Decorum: Modern Perceptions and Ancient Institutions. *JARCE*, 27: 1–23.
- 1997. Temples as symbols, guarantors and participants in Egyptian civilisation. In *The temple in ancient Egypt. New discoveries and recent research* (ed. S. Quirke). London: 216–41.
- Bakr, M. I. 1992. *Tell Basta I. Tombs and Burial Customs at Bubastis. The Area of the so-called Western Cemetery*. Cairo.
- Barguet, P. 1951. Au sujet d'une représentation du ka royal. *ASAE*, 51: 205–15.
- 1954. Quelques fragments nouveaux au nom de Nekhthorheb. *Kēmi*, 13: 87–91.
- 1962. *Le Temple d'Amon-Rê à Karnak. Essai d'exégèse*. Cairo.
- Barguet, P. and Leclant, J. 1954. *Karnak-Nord IV*. Cairo.
- Barta, W. 1978. Die Sedfest-Darstellung Osorkon II im Tempel von Bubastis. *SAK*, 6: 25–42.
- 1983. Zur Lokalisierung und Bedeutung der mrt-Bauten. *ZÄS*, 110: 98–104.
- Beinlich, H. 1977. Gauprozession. *LÄ*, II: 417–20.
- 1991. *Das Buch vom Fayum. Zum religiösen Eigenverständnis inner ägyptischen Landschaft*. ÄA 51. Wiesbaden.
- Bell, L. 1985. Luxor Temple and the Cult of the Royal Ka. *JNES*, 44: 251–94.
- Bénédite, G. 1891. Le tombeau de la reine Thiti. *MMAF* 5, Cairo: 381–412.
- 1895. *Le temple de Philae*. *MMAF* 13. Cairo.
- Berg, D. 1990. Some Ramesside Fragments. *SAK*, 17: 75–106.
- Berlandini, J. Meret. *LÄ*, IV: 79–87.
- Berman, L. M. and Letellier, B. 1996. *Pharaohs. Treasures of Egyptian Art from the Louvre*. Cleveland.
- Bianchi, R. S. 1983a. Those ubiquitous glass inlays from Pharaonic Egypt: suggestions about their functions and dates. *Journal of Glass Studies*, 25: 29–35.
- 1983b. Those ubiquitous glass inlays, Part II. *BES*, 5: 9–29.
- Bickel, S. 1994. *La cosmogonie égyptienne. Avant le Nouvel Empire*. OBO 134. Göttingen.
- Billings, N. 2002. *Nut. The Goddess of Life in Text and Iconography*. Uppsala Studies in Egyptology 5. Uppsala.
- Björkman, G. 1971. *Kings at Karnak; A Study of the Treatment of the Monuments of Royal Predecessors in the Early New Kingdom*. Uppsala.
- Blackman, A. M. 1911. *The temple of Dendûr. Les temples immergés de la Nubie*. Cairo.
- Boeser, P. A. A. 1915. *Beschreibung der ägyptischen Sammlung der nederländischen Reichsmuseums der altertümer in Leiden. Die Denkmäler der saïtischen, griechisch-römischen, und koptischen Zeit*. The Hague.
- Bologna 1990 = *Il Senso dell'arte nell'Antico Egitto*. Milan.
- Borchardt, L. 1899. Der zweite Papyrusfund von Kahun und die zeitliche Festlegung des mittleren Reiches der ägyptischen Geschichte. *ZÄS*, 37: 89–103.
- 1930. *Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten III*. CG. Berlin.
- 1934. *Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten IV*. CG. Berlin.
- Bothmer, B.V. 1953. Ptolemaic Reliefs III: Deities from the Time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. *BMFA*, 51: 2–7.
- Bothmer, B.V. and Keith, J.L. 1974. *Brief Guide to the Department of Ancient Art*. Brooklyn.
- Bowman, A. 1986. *Egypt after the Pharaohs. 332 BC - AD 642 from Alexander to the Arab Conquest*. London.
- Bresciani, E. 1982. Notizie inedite su Tell Basta (Mss Acerbi, Bibl. Comunale di Mantova, XII 26/3). *EVO*, 5: 1–7.
- Briant, P. 1988. Ethno-classe dominante et populations soumises dans l'empire achéménide. Le cas de l'Égypte. In *Achaemenid History III. Method and Theory* (eds. A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg). Leiden: 137–74.
- Brissaud, P. 1995. Rapport de la campagne d'Automne 1995 (XLIIIe campagne). *BSFFT*, 9: 15–37.
- 1998. Les principaux résultats des fouilles récents à Tanis (1987–1997). L'émergence d'une vision nouvelle du site. In *Tanis. Travaux récents sur le Tell Sân el-Hagar* (eds. P. Brissaud and C. Zivie-Coche). Paris: 13–70.
- 2001a. Tanis. Résultats récents. 1997–2000. *BSFE*, 150: 26–41.
- 2001b. Mission française des fouilles de Tanis. Rapport sur la campagne d'automne 2001 (Septembre – Novembre 2001). *BSFFT*, 15: 5–23.
- Brissaud, P., Chauvet, V. and Hairy, I. 1998. Deux siècles de fouilles à Tanis: analyse des divers modes d'intervention sur le site. In *Tanis. Travaux récents sur le Tell Sân el-Hagar* (eds. P. Brissaud and C. Zivie-Coche). Paris: 71–100.
- Brugsch, H. 1855. *Reiseberichte aus Aegypten*. Leipzig.
- Brunner-Traut, E. 1956. Atum als Bogenschütze. *MDAIK*, 14: 20–8.
- 1977. Geierhaube. *LÄ* II: 515.
- Bryan, B. M. 2001. Painting techniques and artisan organisation in the Tomb of Suemniwet, Theban Tomb 92. In *Colour and Painting in*

- Ancient Egypt* (ed. W.V. Davies). London: 63–71.
- Burnett, C. 2003. Images of Ancient Egypt in the Latin Middle Ages. In *The Wisdom of Egypt*. (eds. P. Ucko and T. Champion). UCL Encounters Series. London: 65–99.
- Cabrol, A. 2001. *Les voies processionnelles de Thèbes*. OLA 97. Leuven.
- Capart, J. 1902. *Recueil de monuments Égyptiens*. Brussels.
- 1940. Rapports sommaires sur les fouilles de la Fondation Reine Elisabeth. Deuxième campagne (janvier à mars 1938). In *Fouilles de El Kab*. Brussels: 20–34.
- 1954. Troisième rapport sommaire sur les fouilles de la Fondation Reine Elisabeth. In *Fouilles de El Kab*. Brussels: 73–78.
- Capel, A.K. and Markoe, G.E. 1996. *Mistress of the House, Mistress of Heaven. Women in Ancient Egypt*. Cincinnati.
- Cauville, S. 1987a. Les statues cultuelles de Dendera d'après les inscriptions pariétales. *BIFAO*, 87: 73–117.
- 1987b. *Essai sur la théologie du temple d'Horus à Edfou*. BdE 102. Cairo.
- 1997a. *Dendara. Les chapelles osiriennes. Transcription et traduction*. BdE 117. Cairo.
- 1997b. *Dendara. Les chapelles osiriennes. Commentaire*. BdE 118. Cairo.
- 1997c. *Dendara X. Les chapelles osiriennes*. Cairo.
- 1998. *Dendara I. Traduction*. OLA 81. Leuven.
- 1999. *Dendara II. Traduction*. OLA 88. Leuven.
- 2000. *Dendara III. Traduction*. OLA 95. Leuven.
- 2002. *Dendara. Les fêtes d'Hathor*. OLA 105. Leuven.
- 2004. *Dendara V-VI. Traduction. Les cryptes du temple d'Hathor*. OLA 131. Leuven.
- Chappaz, J.-L. 1993. La déesse aux multiples visages. *Geneva*, 41: 47–57
- Chappaz, J.-L. and Chamay, J. 2001. *Reflets du divin. Antiquités pharaoniques et classiques d'une collection privée*. Geneva
- Christie's 1991 = *Fine Antiquities. Wednesday, 10 July 1991*. London. Auction Catalogue.
- 1999 = *Antiquities. Friday 4 June 1999*. New York. Auction Catalogue
- Christophe, L.A. 1951. *Karnak-Nord III*. FIFAO 23. Cairo.
- Clère, J. 1950. Le système des décades du calendrier du Louvre (Louvre D37). *JNES*, 9: 143–52.
- 1961. *La porte d'Évergète à Karnak. 2e partie*. MIFAO 84. Cairo.
- 1973. Trois fragments épigraphiques à Verone. *Oriens Antiquus* 12: 99–105.
- 1986. Deux groupes inédits de génies-gardiens du quatrième prophète d'Amon Mentemhat. *BIFAO*, 86: 99–106.
- Cohen, A.P. 1985. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. Chichester.
- Colin, M.-E. 1996. Le saint des saints (ou sanctuaire des barques) du temple de Dendara à travers ses inscriptions dédicatoires. In *Hommages à François Daumas II*. Montpellier, 108–31.
- Coptos 2000 = *Coptos. L'Égypte antique aux portes du désert*. Lyon, Musée des Beaux-Arts. 3 février - 7 mai 2000. Lyon.
- Coulon, L., Leclère, F. and Marchand, S. 1995. Catacombes' Osiriennes de Ptolémée IV à Karnak. Rapport préliminaire de la campagne de fouilles 1993. *Karnak*, 10: 205–51.
- Coulon, L. and Defernez, C. 2004. La chapelle d'Osiris Ounnefer Neb-Djefau à Karnak. Rapport préliminaire des fouilles et travaux 2000–2004. *BIFAO*, 104: 135–90.
- Couyat, J. and Montet, P. 1912. *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouadi Hammamat*. MIFAO 34. Cairo.
- Cruz-Urbe, E. 1987. Hibis Temple Project: Preliminary Report, 1985–1986 and Summer 1986 Field Seasons. *Varia Aegyptiaca*, 3: 215–30.
- 1988. *Hibis Temple Project. I: Translations, Commentary, Discussions and Sign-lists*. San Antonio.
- Daressy, G. 1894. Notes et Remarques. *RecTrav*, 16: 123–33.
- 1906. *Statues de divinités*. CG. Cairo.
- 1908. Construction d'un temple d'Apis par Nectanébo Ier. *ASAE*, 9: 154–7.
- 1912. Notes sur des pierres antiques du Caire. *ASAE*, 12: 284–6
- 1917. Le roi Téôs à Athribis. *ASAE*, 17: 42.
- Daumas, F. 1958. *Les mammisis des temples Égyptiens*. Annales de l'Université de Lyon 3ème Serie (Lettres) 32. Paris.
- David, R. 1980. *The Macclesfield Collection of Egyptian Antiquities*. Warminster.
- Davies, N. de G. 1953. *The temple of Hibis in el-Khargeh Oasis. III: The decoration*. MMA Egyptian Excavations 17. New York.
- Davies, S. and Smith, H.S. 1997. Sacred Animal Temples at Saqqara. In *The Temple in Ancient Egypt. New discoveries and recent research* (ed. S. Quirke). London: 112–31.
- Davoli, P. 2001. *Saft el-Henna. Archeologia e storia di una città del Delta orientale*. Archeologia Storia della Civiltà e del Vicino Oriente Antico. Materiali e studi 6. Imola.
- De Meulenaere, H. 1958. Le Vizier Harsiesis de la 30e Dynastie. *MDAIK*, 16: 230–6.
- 1986. Un general du Delta, gouverneur de la Haute Égypte. *CdE*, 61: 203–10.
- De Meulenaere, H. and Mackay, P. 1976. *Mendes II*. Warminster.
- De Meulenaere, H., Depuydt, F., Derchain, P., Vandersleyen, C. and Vanvinckenroye, W. 1970. ElKab 1966–69. *CdE*, 45: 19–44.
- Derchain, P. 1962. Un manuel de liturgie géographique à Edfou. *CdE*, 37: 31–65.
- 1964. *Le Papyrus Salt 825 (B.M. 10051), rituel pour la conservation de la vie en Égypte*. Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des Lettres. 2e série 58/1a. Brussels.
- 1994. Review of Beinlich 1991. *BiOr*, 51: 42–50.
- 1996. Théologie et littérature. In *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and forms* (ed. A. Loprieno). PdÄ 10. Leiden: 351–60.
- Depuydt, F., Hendrickx, S. and Huyge, D. 1989. *Elkab 4: Topographie*. Brussels.
- Desti, M. 2004. *Des dieux, des tombeaux, un savant. En Égypte, sur les pas de Mariette pacha*. Boulogne.
- Devauchelle, D. 1994. Un archétype de relief culturel en Égypte ancienne. *BSFE*, 131: 38–60.
- Drower, M. S. 1982. The Early Years. In *Excavating in Egypt. The Egypt Exploration Society 1882–1982* (ed. T.G.H. James). London: 9–36.
- Dominicus, B. 2004. *Untersuchungen im Totentempel des Merenptah in Theben II. Die Dekoration und Ausstattung des Tempels*. BÄBA 15. Mainz.
- Eaton-Krauss, M. 1984. *The Representations of Statuary in Private Tombs of the Old Kingdom*. ÄA 39. Wiesbaden.
- Ede 1984 = *Small Sculpture from Ancient Egypt. Egyptian Sculpture XI*, Charles Ede, London. Auction Catalogue.
- Edgar, C.C. 1914. Notes from my inspectorate. *ASAE*, 13: 277–84.
- Egberts, A. 1993. *In Quest of Meaning. A Study of the Ancient Egyptian Rites of Consecrating the Meret-Chests and Driving the Calves*. Egyptologische Uitgaven 8. Leiden.
- Egyptian Treasures 4 = Egyptian Treasures in Europe*. Volume 4: *National Museums & Galleries on Merseyside*. Liverpool. CCER CD-Rom. Utrecht.
- Enzoli Vittozzi, S. 1990. *Musei Capitolini. La collezione egizia*. Milan.
- Epigraphic Survey 1957 = *Medinet Habu. V: The Temple Proper, part 1. The Portico, the Treasury, and Chapels Adjoining the First Hypostyle Hall with Marginal Material from the Forecourts*. OIP 83. Chicago.
- 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.
- 1981 = *The Temple of Khonsu. II: Scenes and Inscriptions in the Court and First Hypostyle Hall*. OIP 103. Chicago.
- Étienne, M. 2000. *Heka. Magie et envoiement dans l'Égypte ancienne*. Exposition-dossier du département des Antiquités égyptiennes 57. Paris.
- Farid, S. 1964. Preliminary Report on the Excavations of the Antiquities Department at Tell Basta. *ASAE*, 58: 85–98.
- Faulkner, R.O. 1952. *The Wilbour Papyrus*. IV: *Index*. Oxford.
- Favard-Meeks, C. 1991. *Le temple de Behbeit el-Hagara. Essai de reconstitution et d'interprétation*. BSAK 6. Hamburg.
- Fazzini, R. 1975. *Images for Eternity. Egyptian Art from Berkeley and Brooklyn*. New York.
- Fazzini, R.A., Bianchi, R.S., Spanel, D. and McKercher, M. 1988. *Cleopatra's Egypt. Age of the Ptolemies*. Brooklyn.
- Finnestad, R.B. 1997. Temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods: Ancient Traditions in New Contexts. In *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (ed. B. Shafer). London: 185–237.
- Firth, C. M. and Quibell, J.E. 1935. *Excavations at Saqqara: The Step Pyramid*. II. Cairo.
- Fischer, H.G. 1988. *Ancient Egyptian Calligraphy. A Beginner's Guide to Writing Hieroglyphs* (Third edition). New York.
- Fitzenreiter, M. 2003. Richtungsbezüge in ägyptischen Sakralanlagen oder: Warum im ägyptischen Tempel das Sanktuar hinten links in der Ecke liegt (Teil II). *SAK*, 31: 119–48.
- Frankfort, H. 1933. *The Cenotaph of Seti I at Abydos*. London, Egypt Exploration Society.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria. II: Notes*. Oxford.
- Gardiner, A.H. 1935. *The Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos. II. The chapels of Amen-Re, He-Harakhti, Ptah and king Sethos*. London and Chicago.
- 1938. The House of Life. *JEA*, 24: 157–79.
- 1948. *The Wilbour Papyrus*. Oxford.
- Gasse, A. and Étienne, M. 2004. *Les stèles d'Horus sur les crocodiles*. Paris.
- Gauthier, H. 1912. *Le temple de Ouadi es-Sebouâ. Les temples immergés de la*

- Nubie. Cairo.
- 1916. *Le livre des rois de l'Égypte* IV. MIFAO 21. Cairo.
- 1928. Un vice-roi d'éthiopie enseveli à Bubastis. *ASAE*, 28: 12–137.
- Geneva 1986 = *Images du Musée d'art et d'histoire de Genève* 28. 1986.
- Germond, P. 1981. *Sekhmet et la protection du monde*. Aegyptiaca Helvetica 9. Geneva.
- Geßler-Löhr, B. 1983. *Die heiligen Seen ägyptischer Tempel. Ein Beitrag zur Deutung sakraler Baukunst im alten Ägypten*. HÄB 21. Hildesheim.
- Gilbert, P. 1954. La place d'El-Kab dans l'histoire. In *Fouilles de El Kab*. Brussels: 83–9.
- Godley, A.D. 1920. *Herodotus. I: Books I and II*. Loeb Classical Library. London and New York.
- Goebis, K. 1995. Untersuchungen zu Funktion und Symbolgehalt des *nms*. *ZÄS*, 122: 154–81.
- Golenisheff, W. 1877. *Die Metternichstele in der Originalgröße*. Leipzig.
- Golvin, J.-C. 1995. Enceintes et portes monumentales des temples de Thèbes à l'époque ptolémaïque et romaine. In *Hundred-Gated Thebes. Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period* (ed. S.P. Vleeming). Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 21. Liège: 31–41.
- Golvin, J.C. and el-Hegazy, S. 1993. Essai d'explication de la forme et des caractéristiques générales des grandes enceintes de Karnak. *Karnak*, 9: 145–60.
- Golvin, J.-C., Jaubert, O. and el-Hegazy, S. 1990. La grande enceinte à assises courbes de Karnak. *CRAIBL*, 1990: 905–46.
- Goyon, G. 1936. Les travaux de Chou et les tribulations de Geb d'après le Naoi 2288 d'Ismailia. *Kêmi*, 6: 1–42.
- Goyon, J.-C. 1968. Les cultes d'Abydos à la Basse Époque d'après une stèle du Musée de Lyon. *Kêmi*, 18: 29–44.
- 1972. *Confirmation du pouvoir royal au Nouvel An [Brooklyn Museum Papyrus 47.218.50]*. BdE 52. Cairo.
- 1985. *Les dieux-gardiens et la genèse des temples (d'après les textes de l'époque gréco-romaine). Les soixante d'Edfou et les soixante-dix-sept dieux de Pharbaetos*. BdE 93. Cairo.
- Goyon, J.-C., Golvin, J.-C., Simon-Boidot, C. and Martinet, G. 2004. *La construction pharaonique du Moyen Empire à l'époque gréco-romaine. Contexte et principes technologiques*. Paris.
- Graefe, E. 1998. Phallus und Ei: Ptah al Urgott. Das Fragment einer magischen Stele der Bibliothèque Humaniste et Municipale de Sélestat. In *Egyptian Religion. The last thousand years. Studies dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur I* (eds. W. Clarysse, A. Schoors and H. Willems). OLA 85. Leuven: 117–24.
- Grandet, P. 1994. *Le Papyrus Harris I*. BdE 109. Cairo.
- Grébaut, E. 1900. *Le Musée égyptien I. Recueil de monuments et de notices sur les fouilles d'Égypte*. Cairo.
- Grimal, N.-C. 1981. *Études sur la propagande royale égyptienne I. La stèle triomphale de Pi ('ankh) au musée du Caire*. MIFAO 105. Cairo.
- Grimm, A. 1995. *Wilhelm Spiegelberg als Sammler*. Recherchen zur Aegyptiaca in München. Studien zur Erwerbungs-geschichte der Sammlung 1. Munich.
- Grimm, A., Schoske, S. and Wildung, D. 1997. *Pharao. Kunst und Herrschaft im alten Ägypten*. Munich.
- Grinsell, L.V. 1972. *Bristol City Museum. Guide Catalogue to the Collections from Ancient Egypt*. Bristol.
- Guermeur, I. 2003. Glanures. *BIFAO*, 103: 281–96.
- Guglielmi, W. 1991. *Die Göttin Mr.t. Entstehung und Verehrung einer Personifikation*. PÄ 7. Leiden.
- 2003. Drei Reliefs in Essen. In *Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück. Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. N. Kloth, K. Martin and E. Pardey). *BSAK*, 9: 167–78.
- Habachi, L. 1955. Notes on the Delta Hermopolis, capital of the XVth nome of Lower Egypt. *ASAE*, 53: 441–80.
- 1957. *Tell Basta*. Cahiers de l'IFAO 22. Cairo.
- 1963. Edjo, Mistress of Nebt. *ZÄS*, 90: 41–9.
- 1970. Le mur d'enceinte du Grand Temple d'Amen-Re à Karnak. *Kêmi*, 20: 229–31.
- 1974. Sethos I's Devotion to Seth and Avaris. *ZÄS*, 100: 95–102.
- 1977. *Tavole d'offerta are e bacili da libagione n. 22001-22067*. Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino. Serie Seconda - Collezioni 2. Turin.
- 1982. Athribis in the XXVth Dynasty. *BIFAO*, 82: 213–35.
- Habachi, L. and Ghalioungui, P. 1971. 'House of Life' of Bubastis. *CdE*, 46: 59–71.
- Habachi, L. and Habachi, B. 1952. The naos with the decades (Louvre D37) and the discovery of another fragment. *JNES*, 11: 251–63.
- Hannig, R. 1995. *Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch – Deutsch (2800–950 v. Chr.)*. Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 64. Mainz.
- Hall, H.R. 1931. Egyptian and Babylonian Antiquities. *BMQ*, 5: 18–19.
- Harrell, J.A. 2002. Pharaonic Stone Quarries in the Egyptian Deserts. In R. Friedman (ed.), *Egypt and Nubia. Gifts of the Desert*. London: 232–43.
- Hartung, U., Ballet, P., Béguin, F., Bourriau, J., French, P., Herbich, T., Kopp, P., Lecuyot, G. and Schmitt, A. 2003. Tell el-Fara'in ? Buto. 8. Vorbericht. *MDAIK*, 58: 199–267.
- Hayes, D.M. 2001. From Boundaries Blurred to Boundaries Defined: Clerical Emphasis on the Limits of Sacred Space in England and France during the later Middle Ages. In *Holy Ground: Theoretical Issues Relating to the Landscape and Material Culture of Ritual Space Objects* (eds. A.T. Smith, A. Brookes). BAR International Series 956. Oxford: 85–90.
- Helck, W. 1958. Drei Stücke aus einer Privatsammlung. *ZÄS*, 83: 92–6.
- 1968. Ritualszenen in Karnak. *MDAIK*, 23: 117–37.
- Herbert, S.C. and Berlin, A.M. 2002. Coptos: Architecture and Assemblages in the Sacred Temenos from Nectanebo to Justinian. In *Autour de Coptos. Actes du colloque organisé au Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon (17–18 mars 2000)*. Topoi, Supplément 3. Lyon: 73–115.
- Herbin, F.-R. 2003. La renaissance d'Osiris au temple d'Opet (*P.Vatican Inv. 38608*). *RdE*, 54: 67–127.
- Hölscher, U. 1939. *The Excavation of Medinet Habu. 2: The temples of the Eighteenth Dynasty*. OIP 41. Chicago.
- 1954. *The Excavation of Medinet Habu. 5: Post-Ramessid Remains*. OIP 66. Chicago.
- Hope, C. A. 1998. Objects from the Temple of Tutu. In *Egyptian Religion. The Last Thousand Years. Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur II* (eds. W. Clarysse, A. Schoors and H. Willems). OLA 85. Leuven: 803–58.
- Hornung, E. 1978. Struktur und Entwicklung der Gräber im Tal der Könige. *ZÄS*, 105: 59–66.
- Hornung, E. and Bryan, B.M. 2002. *The Quest for Immortality: Hidden Treasures of Egypt*. Munich and London.
- Iversen, E. 1972. *Obelisks in Exile. II: The Obelisks of Istanbul and England*. Copenhagen.
- Jacquet-Gordon, H. 1999. *Karnak-Nord VIII. Le trésor de Thoutmosis Ier. Statues, stèles et blocs réutilisés*. FIFAO 39. Cairo.
- James, T.G.H. 1988. *Ancient Egypt. The Land and its Legacy*. London.
- Jaritz, H. 1980. *Elephantine III. Die Terrassen vor den Tempeln des Chnum und der Satet*. AV 32. Mainz.
- Jelinkova-Reymond, E. 1956. *Les inscriptions de la statue guérisseuse de Djed-Hor- "le Sauveur"*. BdE 23. Cairo.
- 1957. Quelques recherches sur les réformes d'Amasis. *ASAE*, 54: 251–87.
- Jenni, H. 1986. *Das Dekorationsprogramm des Sarkophages Nektanebos II*. Aegyptiaca Helvetica 12. Geneva.
- 1998. *Elephantine XVII. Die Dekoration des Chnumtempels auf Elephantine durch Nektanebos II*. AV 90. Mainz.
- Johnson, J.H. 1983. The Demotic Chronicle as a Statement of a theory of Kingship. *JSSEA*, 13: 61–72.
- Josephson, J.A. 1997. *Egyptian Royal Sculpture of the Late Period 400–246 B.C.* DAIK Sonderschrift 30. Mainz.
- Junge, F. 1987. *Elephantine XI. Funde und Bauleite 1.–7. Kampagne. 1969–76*. AV 49. Mainz.
- Junker, H. 1958. *Der Grosse Pylon des Tempels der Isis in Philä*. Vienna.
- Junker, H. and Winter, E. 1965. *Das Geburtshaus des Tempels der Isis in Philä*. Philä – Publikation II. Vienna.
- Kaiser, W., Grossmann, P., Haeny, G. and Jaritz, H. 1970. Stadt und Tempel von Elephantine: Erster Grabungsbericht. *MDAIK*, 26: 87–139.
- Kaiser, W., Bommas, M., Jaritz, H., Krekeler, A., Von Pilgrim, C., Schultz, M., Schmidt-Schultz, T. and Ziermann, M. 1993. Stadt und Tempel von Elephantine: 19./ 20. Grabungsbericht. *MDAIK*, 49: 133–87.
- Kákosy, L. 1982. Temples and Funerary Beliefs in the Graeco-Roman Epoch. In *L'Égyptologie en 1979. Axes prioritaires de recherches*. Tome I (ed. J. Leclant). Paris: 117–27.
- 1985. *La Magia in Egitto ai tempi dei faraoni*. Modena.
- 1999. *Egyptian healing statues in three museums in Italy (Turin, Florence, Naples)*. Catalogo del Museo egizio di Torino. Serie prima, Monumenti e testi 9. Turin.
- Kamal, A. B. 1901. Note sur un fragment de Naos. *ASAE*, 2: 129–30.
- 1904. Fragments de monuments provenant du Delta. *ASAE* 5: 193–200.
- 1908. Notes prises au cours des inspections. *ASAE* 9, 191–2.
- Kaper, O.E. 1997. A painting of the gods of Dakhleh in the temple at Ismant el-Kharab. In *The Temple in Ancient Egypt. New Discoveries and Recent Research* (ed. S. Quirke). London: 204–15.
- 2003. *The Egyptian God Tutu. A Study of the Sphinx-God and Master of Demons with a Corpus of Monuments*. OLA 119. Leuven.
- Karlshausen, C. 1998. L'iconographie des barques processionnelles divines

- à la Basse Époque: tradition et innovation. In *Egyptian Religion. The Last Thousand years. Studies dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur II* (eds. W. Clarysse, A. Schoors and H. Willems). OLA 85. Leuven: 859–73.
- Kemp, B.J. 1989. *Ancient Egypt. Anatomy of a Civilisation*. London.
- Kessler, D. 1989. *Die heiligen Tiere und der König. I: Beiträge zu Organisation, Kult und Theologie der spätzeitlichen Tierfriedhöfe*. ÄAUT 16. Wiesbaden.
- 2003. Hermopolitanische Götterformern im Hibis-Tempel. In *Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück. Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. N. Kloth, K. Martin and E. Pardey). BSAK, 9: 211–23.
- Kienitz, F.K. 1953. *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens von 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende*. Berlin.
- Kircher, A. 1654. *Oedipi Aegyptiaci III*. Rome.
- Kitchen, K.A. 1968. *Ramesseid Inscriptions. Historical and Biographical IV*. Oxford.
- 1973. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*. Warminster.
- 1975. Barke. LÄ, I: 619–25.
- Klemm, R. and Klemm, D. D. 1993. *Steine und Steinbrüche im Alten Ägypten*. Berlin.
- Knipe, D.M. 1988. The temple in image and reality. In *The Temple in Society* (ed. M.V. Fox). Winona Lake: 105–38.
- Kozloff, A.P. and Bryan, B.M. 1992. *Egypt's Dazzling Sun. Amenhotep III and his World*. Cleveland.
- Kuentz, C. 1932. *Obélisques*. CG. Cairo.
- Kuhlmann, K.P. 1998. Ptolemais - the Demise of a Spurious Queen (Apropos JE 43610). In *Statuen. Beiträge zur Kultugeschichte Ägyptens. Rainer Stadelmann Gewidnet* (eds. H. Guksch and D. Polz). Mainz: 469–72.
- Kurth, D. 1975. *Den Himmel Stütze. Das "Tw3 pt"-Szenen in den ägyptischen Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Epoche*. Rites égyptiens 2. Bruxelles.
- Labrique, F. 2004. Le catalogue divin de 'Ayn al-Mouftella: jeux de miroir autour de 'celui qui est dans ce temple'. BIFAO, 104: 327–57.
- Laskowska-Kusztal, E. and Radziejowska-Parandowska, E. 1995. Un naos d'Edfou au Musée National de Varsovie. *Études et Travaux*, 17: 95–110.
- Lauffray, J. 1970. La colonnade-propylée occidentale de Karnak dite 'Kiosque de Taharqa' et ses abords. *Kêmi*, 20: 111–64.
- 1995a. *La chapelle d'Achôris à Karnak. I: Les fouilles, l'architecture, le mobilier et l'anastylose*. Paris.
- 1995b. Maisons et ostraca ptolémaïques à l'Est du Lac Sacré. *Karnak*, 10: 301–48.
- Leahy, A. and Mathieson, I. 2002. Late Period temple platforms at Saqqara. *EA*, 21: 14–16.
- Leclant, J. 1951. Compte rendu des fouilles et travaux menés en Égypte durant les campagnes 1948–1950. III. *Orientalia*, 20: 340–475.
- 1993. Les scènes de la fête *sed* au temple de Soleb (Soudan). In *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East* (ed. J. Quaegebeur). OLA 55. Leuven: 235–6.
- Leclère, F. 1997. *Les villes de Basse Égypte au Ier millénaire av. J.-C. Analyse archéologique et historique de la topographie urbaine*. Thèse de doctorat de troisième cycle (Université de Lille III).
- Legrain, G. 1900. Notes prises à Karnak. *Rec Trav*, 22: 51–65
- 1917. Le logement et transport des barques sacrées et des statues des dieux dans quelques temples égyptiens. BIFAO, 13: 1–76.
- Leitz, C. 1995. *Altägyptische Sternuhren*. OLA 62. Leuven.
- 2001. *Die Aussenwand des Sanktuars in Dendera. Untersuchungen zur Dekorationsystematik*. MÄS 50. Mainz.
- 2002a. *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen II*. OLA 111. Leuven.
- 2002b. *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen III*. OLA 112. Leuven.
- 2002c. *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen VI*. OLA 115. Leuven.
- 2002d. *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen VII*. OLA 116. Leuven.
- Lembke, K. 1998. Die Sphingenallee von Saqqara und ihre Werkstatt. *MDAIK*, 54: 266–73.
- Leospo, E. 1978. *La mensa isiaca di Torino*. Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino, Serie prima: Monumenti a testi 4 = Édition spéciale des Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain à l'occasion du 60-ième anniversaire de Maarten J. Vermaseren. Leiden.
- Lepsius, R. 1842. *Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter nach dem hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin*. Leipzig.
- Lesko, L. H. 1991. Ancient Egyptian Cosmogonies and Cosmology. In *Religion in Ancient Egypt. Gods, Myths and Personal Practice* (ed. B.E. Shafer). London: 88–122.
- Lézine, A. 1951. Le temple du nord à Tanis. *Kêmi*, 12: 46–58.
- Lichtheim, M. 1980. *Ancient Egyptian Literature. III: The Late Period*. Berkeley, Meay.
- Limme, L. 1988. Égypte – Égypte. *Acquisitions – Aanwistern 1979–1988*. BMAH, 59: 19–25.
- Lloyd, A.B. 1988. *Herodotus Book II. Commentary 99–182*. EPRO 43/3. Leiden.
- Loprieno, A. 2003a. Travel and fiction in Egyptian Literature. In *Mysterious Lands* (eds. D. O'Connor and S. Quirke). Encounters with Ancient Egypt. London: 31–51.
- 2003b. Views of the Past in Egypt During the First Millennium B.C. In *'Never Had the Like Occurred': Egypt's view of its past* (ed. J. Tait). UCL Encounters with Ancient Egypt. London: 139–54.
- Macadam, M.F.L. 1949. *The Temples of Kawa. I. The Inscriptions*. Oxford University Excavations in Nubia. Oxford.
- Mackay, E. and Petrie W.M.F. 1915. *Heliopolis, Kafr Ammar and Shurafa*. ERA 24. London.
- Maspero, G. 1885. Notes sur quelques points de Grammaire et d'Histoire. *ZAS*, 23: 3–13.
- Meeks, D. 1989. Un manuel de géographie religieuse du Delta. In *Akten des vierten Ägyptologen Kongresse 1985 III* (ed. S. Schoske). BSAK 3. Hamburg: 297–304.
- Mendel, D. 2003. *Die kosmogonische Inschriften in der Barkenkapelle des Chonstempels von Karnak*. MRE 9. Turnhout.
- Merrillees, R.S. 1990. *Living with Egypt's Past in Australia*. Melbourne.
- Meskel, L. 2004. *Object Worlds in Ancient Egypt. Material Biographies Past and Present*. Oxford and New York.
- Messiha, H. and el-Hitta, M.A. 1979. *Mallawi Antiquities Museum. A Brief Description*. Cairo.
- Miho 1997 = *Miho Museum. South Wing*. Kyoto.
- Möllers, G. 1926. *Die archäologischen Ergebnisse des vorgeschichtlichen Gräberfeldes von Abusir el-Me'eq*. Leipzig.
- Mond, R. and Myers O.H. 1934. *The Bucheum*, III. MEEF 41. London.
- Montet, P. 1933. *Les Nouveaux Fouilles de Tanis*. Paris.
- 1952. *Les Énigmes de Tanis*. Paris.
- 1966. *Le lac sacré de Tanis*. Paris.
- Mousa, A.M. 1985. A Red Granite Door-jamb Bearing the Name of Nectanebo II. *ASAE*, 70: 37.
- Mumford, G. 2003. Illuminating a Period of Conquest: 343 B.C. *Newsletter SSEA*, September 2003.
- 2004a. A Preliminary Reconstruction of the Temple and Settlement at Tell Tebilleh (East Delta). In *Egypt, Israel and the Ancient Mediterranean World. Studies in Honor of Donald B. Redford* (eds. G.N. Knoppers and A. Hirsch). PdÄ 20. Leiden: 267–86.
- 2004b. Survey & Excavation Projects in Egypt. East Delta. Tell Tebilla 5. <http://www.deltasinai.com/delta-05.htm> [March 30th, 2004].
- Mysliwiec, K. 1988. *Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI–XXX*. Mainz.
- 1998. *Her beider Länder. Ägypten im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Translated by Tadeusz Kachlak.
- Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 69. Mainz.
- Naville, E. 1887. *The Shrine of Saft el Henneh and the Land of Goshen (1885)*. MEEF 5. London.
- 1888. Les fouilles du Delta pendant l'hiver 1887. *Rec Trav*, 10: 50–60.
- 1890. *The Mound of the Jew and the City of Onias*. MEEF 7. London.
- 1891. *Bubastis*. MEEF 8. London.
- 1892. *The Festival Hall of Osorkon II in the Great Temple of Bubastis*. MEEF 10. London.
- 1930. *Détails relevés dans les ruines de quelques temples égyptiens*. Paris.
- Neuffer, E., Bittel, K. and Schott, S. 1932. Bericht über die Zweite vom Deutschen Institut für Ägyptische Altertumskunde nach dem Ostdelta-Rand und in das Wâdi Tumilât unternommene Erkundungsfahrt. *MDAIK*, 2: 39–73.
- Neugebauer, O. and Parker, R.A. 1969. *Egyptian Astronomical Texts. III. Decans, Planets, Constellations and Zodiacs*. London.
- Niederberger, W. 1999. *Elephantine XX. Der Chnumtempel Nektanebos' II. Architektur und baugeschichtliche Einordnung*. AV 96. Mainz.
- O'Connor, D.B. 1969. Abydos and the University Museum: 1898–1969. *Expedition*, 12: 28–39.
- O'Rourke, P.P. 1990. A Late Period Naophoros from Bubastis. *BES*, 10: 109–28.
- Osing, J. 1990. Zur Anlage und Dekoration des Tempels von Hibis. In *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim II* (ed. S. Israelit-Groll). Jerusalem: 751–67.
- Osing, J., Moursi, M., Arnold, D., Neugebauer, O., Parker, R.A., Pingree, D. and Nur el-Din, M.A. 1982. *Denkmäler der Oase Dachla aus dem*

- Nachlass von Ahmed Fakhry. AV 28. Mainz.
- Otto, E. 1954. *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit; ihre geistesgeschichtliche und literarische Bedeutung*. Leiden.
- Page, A. 1976. *Egyptian Sculpture. Archaic to Saite. From the Petrie Collection*. Warminster.
- Parker, R.A. and Lesko, L.H. 1997. The Khonsu Cosmogony. In *Pyramid Studies and Other Essays presented to I.E.S. Edwards* (eds. J. Baines, T.G.H. James, A. Leahy, and A.F. Shore). EES Occasional Publications 7. London: 168–75.
- Parkinson, R. B. 1999. *Cracking Codes. The Rosetta Stone and Decipherment*. London.
- Perdu, O. 2002. *Recueil des inscriptions royales Saïtes. I: Psammétique Ier*. Études d'Égyptologie 1. Paris.
- 2004. Les métamorphoses d'Andjty. *BSFE* 159: 9–28.
- Petrie, W. M. F. 1889. *Two Hieroglyphic Papyri from Tanis*. London.
- 1902. *Abydos I*. MEEF 22. London.
- 1904. *Ehnasya*. MEEF 26. London.
- 1908. *Athribis*. ERA 14. London.
- Piankoff, A. 1933. Le naos D 29 du Musée du Louvre. *RdE*, 1: 161–79.
- Piankoff, A and Rambova, N. 1957. *Mythological Papyri*. New York.
- Pillet, M. 1923. Le naos de Senousret I. *ASAE*, 23: 143–58.
- Pirelli, R. 1999. Once more on Undulating Walls in Ancient Egypt: Mythological Reasons or Technical Requirements? In *Egyptological Studies for Claudio Barocas* (ed. R. Pirelli). Serie Egittologica 1. Naples: 55–94.
- Pirritano, A. 1979. Interim Report of the Akhenaten Temple Project. Excavations in East Karnak (to 1979). Unpublished manuscript.
- Porten, B. 1996. *The Elephantine Papyri in English. Three Millennia of Cross-cultural Continuity & Change*. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and Civilisation 22. Leiden.
- Posener-Kriéger, P. 1976. *Les archives du temple funéraire de Néferirkarê-Kakai (Les papyrus d'Abousir): traduction et commentaire*. BdE 65. Cairo.
- Pye, G. 1998. *The Iconography of Kingship in Libyan Period Egypt*. PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham.
- Quack, J. 2003. Le manuel du temple. In *La Littérature égyptienne (Égypte Afrique & Orient, 29)*: 11–18.
- Quaegebeur, J. 1991. Le culte de Boubastis-Bastet en Égypte Gréco-Romaine. In *Les divins chats d'Égypte* (eds. L. Delvaux and E. Warmenbol). Leuven: 117–27.
- 1992. Les pantoufles du dieu Thot. In *Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia. Atti I*. Turin, 521–7.
- Redford, D.B. 1981. A Royal Speech from the blocks of the Tenth Pylon. *BES* 3: 87–102.
- 1986. *Pharaonic King-lists, Annals and Day-books. A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*. SSEA Publications 4. Mississauga.
- 1996. Mendes: une capitale éphémère. In *L'Égypte du Delta: les capitales du nord* (ed. J. Yoyotte). Dossiers d'Archéologie 213. Dijon: 78–83.
- 2004. *Excavations at Mendes. Volume 1. The Royal Necropolis*. Culture & History of the Ancient Near East 20. Leiden and Boston.
- Redford, D. B. and Redford, S. 2005. The Cult and Necropolis of the Sacred Ram at Mendes. In *Divine Creatures. Animal Mummies in Ancient Egypt* (ed. S. Ikram). Cairo and New York: 164–98.
- Reisner, G. A. 1918. The Barkal Temples in 1916. *JEA*, 16: 99–112.
- Revez, J. 2004. Une stèle commémorant la construction par l'empereur Auguste du mur d'enceinte du temple de Montou-Rê à Médamoud. *BIFAO*, 104: 495–510.
- Reymond, E.A.E. 1969. *The Mythical Origin of the Egyptian Temple*. Manchester.
- Ricke, H. 1935. Eine Inventortafel aus Heliopolis im Turiner Museum. *ZÄS*, 71: III–33.
- Ritner, R. K. 1989. Horus on the Crocodiles: A Juncture of Religion and Magic in Late Dynastic Egypt. In *Religion and Philosophy in Ancient Egypt* (ed. J. P. Allen). Yale Egyptological Studies 3. New Haven.
- Rivera Dorado, M. 1997. Clues to the System of Power in the City of Oxtintok. In *Emergence and Change in Early Urban Societies* (ed. L. Manzanilla). Fundamental Issues in Archaeology. New York and London: 169–79.
- Roeder, G. 1914. *Naos*. CG. Cairo.
- 1930. *Der Tempel von Dakka*. Temples immergés de la Nubie. Cairo.
- 1954. Zwei hieroglyphische Inschriften aus Hermopolis. *ASAE*, 52: 315–443.
- 1956. *Ägyptische Bronzefiguren*. Mitteilungen aus der ägyptischen Sammlung 6. Berlin.
- Rondot, V. 1989. Une monographie Bubastite. *BIFAO*, 89: 249–70.
- 1990. Le naos de Domitien, Toutou et les sept flèches. *BIFAO*, 90: 303–37.
- 2002. Les témoignages d'activités artisanales dans le téménos du temple de Soknebtynis à Tebtynis (Fayoum). In *Les Artisans dans la Ville Antique* (eds. J.-C. Béal and J.-C. Goyon). Collection Archéologie et Histoire de l'Antiquité 6. Lyon: 33–8.
- Rosenow, D. 2001. Der Nektanebos-Tempel. In *Tell Basta XIII. Vorläufiger Grabungsbericht der 13. Kampagne* (ed. C. Tietze). Potsdam.
- (forthcoming) Neue Entdeckungen im Sanktuar des Großen Bastet-Tempels. In *Tell Basta XVIII. Vorläufiger Grabungsbericht der 18. Kampagne* (ed. C. Tietze). Potsdam.
- Russmann, E.R. 1972. A relief of the last native king of Ancient Egypt. *M (A Quarterly Review of the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts)*, 3 (4): 10–13.
- 1997. Vulture and Cobra at the King's Brow. In *Chief of Seers. Egyptian Studies in Memory of Cyril Aldred* (eds. E. Goring, N. Reeves and J. Ruffle). London: 266–84.
- 2001. *Eternal Egypt. Masterworks of Ancient Art from the British Museum*. London.
- Ryholt, K. 2002. 'Nectanebo's Dream or the Prophecy of Petesis'. In *Apokalyptik und Ägypten. Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten* (eds. A. Blasius and B.U. Schipper). OLA 107. Leiden: 221–41.
- Saleh, M and Sourouzian, H. 1987. *The Egyptian Museum Cairo. Official Catalogue*. Munich and Mainz.
- Sander-Hansen, C.E. 1956. *Die Texte der Metternichstele*. Analecta Orientalia 7. Copenhagen.
- Sauneron, S. 1962. *Esna V. Les fêtes religieuses d'Esna aus derniers siècles du paganisme*. PIFA. Cairo.
- Satzinger, H. 1994. *Das Kunsthistorisches Museum in Wien. Die ägyptisch-orientalische Sammlung*. Mainz.
- Säve-Söderbergh, T. 1953. *On Egyptian Representations of Hippopotamus Hunting as a Religious Motive*. Uppsala.
- el-Sawi, A. 1979. *Tell Basta. Excavations of Seasons 1967–1971 and Catalogue of Finds*. Prague.
- Schneider, H.D., Spurr, S., Reeves, N. and Quirke, S. 2003. *The Small Masterpieces of Egyptian Art. Selections from the Myers Museum at Eton College*. Leiden.
- el-Sayed, R. 1974. Quelques éclaircissements sur l'histoire de la XXVIe dynastie, d'après la statue du Caire CG. 658. *BIFAO*, 74: 29–44.
- 1975. *Documents relatifs à Saïs et ses divinités*. BdE 69. Cairo.
- Schneider, H. D. 1992. *Beeldhouwkunst in het land van de farao's*. Amsterdam.
- Schoske, S. 1995. *Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst München*. Mainz.
- Schumacher, I.W. 1988. *Derr Gott Sopdu der Herr der Fremdländer*. OBO 79. Göttingen.
- Schweitzer, U. 1956. *Das Wesen des Ka im Diesseits und Jenseits der alten Ägypter*. ÄF 19. Munich.
- Seeber, C. 1976. *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Totengerichts im Alten Ägypten*. MÄS 35. Munich.
- Seipel, W. 2001. *Gold der Pharaonen*. Vienna.
- Sharpe, S. 1855. *Egyptian Inscriptions from the British Museum and other sources*. Second series. London.
- Sherman, C.L. 1952. *Diodorus of Sicily. VII: Books XV.20–XVI.65*. Loeb Classical Library. London.
- Shirun-Grumach, I. 1985. Remarks on the Goddess Maat. In *Israelit-Groll, S. Pharaonic Egypt, the Bible and Christianity*. Jerusalem: 173–201.
- 1993. *Offenbarung, Orakel und Königsnovelle*. ÄAUT 24. Wiesbaden.
- Shorter, A.W. 1932. Two Statuettes of the Goddess Sekhmet-Ubastet. *JEA*, 18: 121–4.
- Smith, H.S. 1981. A l'ombre d'Auguste Mariette. *Supplement to BIFAO*, 81: 331–9.
- Smith, H.S. and Jeffreys, D.G. 1981. The Anubieion, North Saqqâra Preliminary Report, 1979–80. *JEA*, 67: 21–3.
- Smith, H.S. and Stewart, H.M. 1974. The Gurob Shrine Papyrus. *JEA*, 70: 54–64.
- Snape, S.R. 1989. *A Temple of Domitian at el-Ashmunein*. British Museum Occasional Paper 68. London.
- Snape, S.R. and Bailey, D. 1988. *The Great Portico at Hermopolis Magna: Present State and Past Prospects*. British Museum Occasional Paper 63. London.
- Soghor, C. 1967. II. Inscriptions from Tell el Rub'a. *JARCE*, 6: 16–32.
- Sotheby's 1928 = *Catalogue of The Important Collection of Egyptian Antiquities. The Property of General Sir John Maxwell, G.C.B.* 11-12

- June 1928. London. Auction Catalogue.
- 1964 = *Catalogue of The Ernest Brummer Collection of Egyptian and Near Eastern Antiquities and Works of Art. 16-17 November 1964*. London. Auction Catalogue.
- 1986 = *Antiquities. Monday 8 December 1986, Tuesday 9 December 1986*. London. Auction Catalogue.
- 1987 = *Antiquités et Objets d'Art. Collection de Martine, Comtesse de Béhague, provenant de la Succession du Marquis de Ganay. Samedi 5 décembre 1987*. Monaco. Auction Catalogue.
- 1991 = *Antiquities. Tuesday 3 December 1991*. London. Auction Catalogue.
- 1998 = *Antiquities and Islamic Art. Thursday 4 June 1998*. New York. Auction Catalogue.
- 2005 = *Antiquities. June 7, 2005*. New York. Auction Catalogue.
- Sourouzian, H. 1993. Statues et représentations de statues royales sous Séthi I. *MDAIK*, 49: 239–57.
- Sowada, K. and Ockinga, B. 2003. *Egyptian Art in the Nicholson Museum, Sydney*. Mediterranean Archaeology Supplementary Volume. Sydney.
- Speleers, L. 1923. *Recueil des inscriptions égyptiennes des Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire à Bruxelles*. Brussels.
- Spencer A. J. 1978. Two Enigmatic Hieroglyphs and their Relation to the Sed-festival. *JEA*, 68: 52–5.
- 1979. *Brick architecture in ancient Egypt*. London.
- 1989. *Excavations at El-Ashmunein. II: The Temple Area*. London.
- 1996. *Excavations at Tell el-Balamun. 1991–1994*. London.
- 1999a. *Excavations at Tell el-Balamun. 1995–1998*. London.
- 1999b. Casemate foundations once again. In *Studies on Ancient Egypt in Honour of H.S. Smith* (eds. A. Leahy and J. Tait). EES Occasional Publications 13. London: 295–300.
- 2002. The Exploration of Tell Belim, 1999–2002. *JEA*, 88: 37–51.
- 2003. *Excavations at Tell el-Balamun. 1999–2001*. London.
- Spencer, N. A. 1999. The Epigraphic Survey of Samanud. *JEA*, 85: 55–83.
- 2000. Sustaining Egyptian Culture. Royal and Private Construction Initiatives in the First Millennium B.C. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- 2003. Review of Niederberger 1999. *JEA* 89, 273–8.
- 2005. The great naos of Nekhtorheb from Bubastis. *EA*, 26: 21–4.
- (forthcoming) A statue base of Nekhtnebef.
- [Spencer, P.] 1987. The Egypt Exploration Fund 100 years ago. *EES Newsletter* 1 (November 1987): 5–6.
- Spiegelberg, W. 1904. Demotische Miscellen. *Rec Trav*, 26: 154–65.
- 1906. Die demotischen Inschriften der Steinbrücke von Turra und Ma'sara. *ASAE*, 6: 219–33.
- Stanwick, P.E. 2002. *Portraits of the Ptolemies. Greek Kings as Egyptian Pharaohs*. Austin.
- Steindorff, G. 1945. Reliefs from the temples of Sebennytos and Iseion in American Collections. *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery*, 7–8 (1944–5): 39–59.
- Sternberg el-Hotabi, H. 1994a. Die 'Götterliste' des Sanktuars im Hibis-Tempel von El-Chargeh. Überlegungen zur Tradierung und Kodifizierung religiösen und kulturopographischen Gedankengutes. In *Aspekte spätägyptischer Kultur. Festschrift für Erich Winter zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. M. Minas and J. Zeidler). *Aegyptiaca Treverensia* 7: 239–54.
- 1994b. Ein vorläufiger Katalog der sog. Horusstelen. *GM*, 142: 27–54.
- 1994c. Die Mensa Isiaca und die Isis-Aretalogien. *CdE*, 69: 54–86.
- Stevenson Smith, W. 1981. *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*. Revised with additions by W.K. Simpson. Harmondsworth.
- Stiénon, J. 1940. Notes techniques. In *Fouilles de El Kab*. Brussels: 34–40.
- Strauss, C. 1981. Kronen. In *LÄ* III: 811–16.
- Stricker, B. H. 1939. Le naos vert de Memphis. *ASAE*, 39: 215–26.
- Szafrański, Z.E. and Makramallah, A. 1989. A new inscription of Nektanebo II from Ashmunein. *GM*, 112: 65–6.
- Tait, J. 2003a. Introduction - ... since the Time of the Gods. In *'Never Had the Like Occurred': Egypt's view of its past* (ed. J. Tait). UCL Encounters with Ancient Egypt: 1–13.
- 2003b. The 'Book of the Fayum': Mystery in a Known Landscape. In *Mysterious Lands* (eds. S. Quirke and D. O'Connor). UCL Encounters with Ancient Egypt. London: 183–202.
- 2004. A Papyrus bearing a Shrine Plan and a Book of the Dead. In *Res Severa Verum Gaudium. Festschrift für Karl-Theodor Zauzich zum 65. Geburtstag am 8. Juni 2004*. *Studia Demotica* 6. Leuven: 573–82.
- Tanis 1987 = *Tanis. L'or des pharaons*. Paris.
- Teeter, E. 1997. *The Presentation of Maat. Ritual and Legitimacy in Ancient Egypt*. SAOC 57. Chicago.
- 2002. Piety at Medinet Habu. *The Oriental Institute. News & Notes*, 173 (Spring 2002): 1–4.
- Thiem, A.-C. 2000. *Speos von Gebel es-Silsileh*. ÄAUT 47. Wiesbaden.
- Thiers, C. 1995. Civils et militaires dans les temples. Occupation illicite et expulsion. *BIFAO*, 95: 493–516.
- 1997. Un naos de Ptolémée II Philadelphie consacré à Sokar. *BIFAO*, 97: 253–68.
- 1998. À propos de Xp.w / Xp(y).w 'Figures en relief, gravures'. *RdE*, 49: 257–8.
- 2003a. Tôd: les inscriptions du temple ptolémaïque et romain. 2: Textes et scènes nos.173–329. *FIFAO* 18/2. Cairo.
- 2003b. Tôd: les inscriptions du temple ptolémaïque et romain. 3: Relevé photographique. *FIFAO* 18/3. Cairo.
- Tietze, C. 2000. Bubastis. In *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt* I (ed. D.B. Redford). Oxford: 208–9.
- 2004. 'Tell Basta – die Stadt der Katzensgöttin'. *Antike Welt* 5 (2004), 45–52.
- Tietze, C. and Omar, M. 1996. Fünf Jahre archaologische Arbeit in der Tempel-anlage von Tell Basta. *Kemet*, 5/3: 59–64.
- Tomoum, N. 2005. *The Sculptors' Models of the Late and Ptolemaic Period. A Study of the Type and Function of a Group of Ancient Artefacts*. Cairo.
- Traunecker, C. 1979. Essai sur l'histoire de la XXIXe dynastie. *BIFAO*, 79: 395–436.
- 1982. Un exemple de rite de substitution: une stèle de Nectanébo Ier. *Karnak*, 7: 339–54.
- 1987b. Les 'temples hauts' de Basse Époque: un aspect du fonctionnement économique des temples. *RdE*, 38: 147–62.
- 1989. Le 'Château de l'Or' de Thoutmosis III et les magasins nord du temple d'Amon. *CRIPÉL*, 11: 89–111.
- 1992. *Coptos. Hommes et dieux sur le parvis de Geb*. OLA 43. Louvain.
- Traunecker, C. and Laroche, F. 1980. La chapelle adossée au temple de Khonsou. *Karnak*, 6: 167–96.
- Traunecker, C., Le Saout, F. and Masson, O. 1981. *La chapelle d'Achôris à Karnak* 2. Recherches sur les grandes civilisations, Synthèse 5. Paris.
- Tresson, P. 1931. La stèle de Naples. *BIFAO*, 30: 369–91.
- Uphill, E. 1984. *The Temples of Per-Ramesses*. Warminster.
- Van Siclen III, C.C. 1984. The City of Basta. An Interim Report. *NARCE*, 128 (Winter 1994): 28–39.
- 1987. Rifaud, Tell Basta, and a Stela of Ramesses-set-hir-wenemef. *GM*, 95: 73–8.
- 1994. Nectanebo II's Great Naos for Bastet. *Essays in Egyptology in Honor of H. Goedicke* (eds. B.M. Bryan and D. Lorton). San Antonio: 321–32.
- 1999. Tell Basta. In *Encyclopaedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt* (ed. K.A. Bard). London: 776–8.
- Valentia, G. (Earl of Mountnorris) 1811. *Voyages and travels to India, Ceylon, the Red Sea, Abyssinia and Egypt: in the years 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805 and 1806*. III. *Abyssinia-Red Sea-Egypt*. London.
- Vandier, J. [1962.] *Le Papyrus Jumilhac*. Paris.
- Varille, A. 1942. Inventaire d'objets cultuels d'un temple Thébain de Maat. *BIFAO*, 41: 135–9.
- Vassilika, E. 1989. *Ptolemaic Philae*. OLA 34. Leiden.
- Vercoutter, J. 1950. Les Statues du General Hor, Gouverneur d'Hérakleopolis, de Busiris et d'Héliopolis. *BIFAO*, 49: 85–114.
- Vernus, P. 1978. *Athribis: textes et documents relatifs à la géographie, aux cultes et à l'histoire d'une ville du Delta égyptien à l'époque pharaonique*. BdE 74. Cairo.
- 1984. Schreiftafel. *LÄ*, V: 703–9.
- Von Känel, F. 1980. Les mesaventures du conjurateur de Serket Onnophris et de son tombeau. *BSFE*, 87–8: 31–45.
- 1987. Notes épigraphiques. In *Cahiers de Tanis* 1 (ed. P. Brissaud). Mission Française des Fouilles de Tanis. Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, Mémoire 75. Paris: 45–60.
- Von Pilgrim, C. 2001. Stratigraphie d'un temple: le temple de Khnoum à Éléphantine du Nouvel Empire à la Période Ptolémaïque. *BSFE*, 151: 35–53.
- Wildung, D. and Schoske, S. 1985. *La femme au temps des pharaons*. Mainz.
- Wilkinson, G. 1843. *Modern Egypt and Thebes: being a Description of Egypt: including the Information Required for Travellers in That Country*. Volume I. London: 427–30.
- Wilkinson, R.H. 2003. *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt*. London.
- Will, E. 1960. Chabrias et les finances de Tachôs. *Revue des études anciennes*, 62: 254–75.
- Willems, H. 2003. The Belgian Excavations at Deir al-Barsja, season 2003. www.PalArch.nl. *Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology* [27

- September 2003].
- Willems, H., Coppens, F., de Meyer, M. and Dils, P. 2003. *The Temple of Shanhûr. 1: The Sanctuary, Wabet and the Gates of the Central Hall and the Great Vestibule (1–98)*. OLA 124. Leuven.
- Wilson, P. 1997. *A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu*. OLA 78. Leuven.
- Winlock, H.E. 1941. *The Temple of Hibis in el-Khargeh Oasis I*. MMA Egyptian Excavations I. New York.
- Winter, E. 1975. Bigga. *LÄ I*: 792–3.
- Wreszinski, W. 1906. *Aegyptische Inschriften aus dem K.K. Hofmuseum in Wien*. Leipzig.
- Yoyotte, J. 1954. A propos du naos des décades. *JNES*, 13: 79–82.
- 1972. Pétoubastis III. *RdÉ*, 24: 216–23.
- 1973. Fouilles à Tanis. Rapport sur la XXIVe Campagne (1968–1969). *ASAE*, 61: 79–86.
- 2001a. Le grand Kôm el-Ahmar de Menûfiyeh et deux Naos du Pharaon Amasis. *BSFE*, 151: 54–83.
- 2001b. Le second affichage de décret de l’an 2 de Nekhtnebef et la découverte de Thônis-Héracléion. *Egypte Afrique & Orient*, 24: 25–34.
- 2003. Un nouveau souvenir de Sheshanq I et un muret héliopolitain de plus. *RdÉ*, 54: 219–53.
- Yoyotte, J. and Rougemont, J. 1990. Un voyage dans le Delta. 30 September – 8 octobre 1989. *BSFFT*, 4: 97–158.
- Zecchi, M. 1996. *A Study of the Egyptian God Osiris Hemag*. Archeologia e Storia della Civiltà Egiziana e del Vicino Oriente Antico. Materiali e studi 1. Imola.
- Ziegler, C. 1990. *The Louvre. Egyptian Antiquities*. Paris.
- 2002. *The Pharaohs*. Milan.
- Zignani, P. 2001. Cartographie de Dendera, remarques sur l’urbanisme du site. *BIFAO*, 101: 415–47.
- Zivie, A. 1975. *Hermopolis et le nome de l’ibis: recherches sur la province du dieu Thot en Basse Egypte*. BdE 66. Cairo.
- Zivie-Coche, C.M. 1991. *Giza au premier millénaire. Autour du temple d’Isis Dame des Pyramides*. Boston.

Index of Museum Objects

This index is designed to facilitate reference to discussions of the monuments included. As such, it does not include fragments of the naos itself (British Museum EA 1005, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1106; Cairo Museum CG 70016 and number unknown; Swiss private collection no.240) nor those objects listed in the distribution register in Appendix 3.

Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung

2099 45 fig.26
2280 52 n.6

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts

90.233 17 n.25

Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire

E.5818 3, 20, 22, 29–30 n.12, 37 n.13
E.6622 37 n.16

Cairo, Egyptian Museum

CG 661 52 n.6
CG 39151 17 n.20
CG 70008 1, 7, 10, 15, 19, 22
CG 70011 1, 17 n.6, 22
CG 70012 64–5
CG 70013 1, 5, 6, 10, 17 n.2, 41, 44
CG 70014 1, 64–5
CG 70015 1, 5, 64–5
CG 70017 7, 64–5
CG 70018 64–5
CG 70019 64–5
CG 70020 1, 64–5
CG 70021 2, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 17 nn.6–7, 21, 23–7, 29–30 n.12
42 n.7, 64–5
CG 70022 1, 64–5
JE 2091 19
JE 25774 64–5
JE 33262 52 n.16
JE 34673 64–5
JE 43279 64–5
TR 22-II-55-1 20, 29 n.6
TR 30-5-24-5 15, 20–1

Eton Myers Museum

ECM 1587 17 n.18

Ismailia Museum

2248 64–5

Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden

IM 107 1, 17 nn. 2, 6, 21, 22, 33

London, British Museum

EA 22 17 n.4
EA 964 29 n.7
EA 998 17 n.4
EA 1134 55
EA 1230 52 n.6
EA 15974 17 n.11
EA 36254 17 n.18
EA 38255 4 n.4
EA 46676 17 n.17

Montreal, Musée des Beaux Arts

1964.B.1 18 n.32

Munich, Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst

ÄS 4270–8 4 n.7
ÄS 5330 4 n.7

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art

28.9.7 29 n.7
50.85 37 n.15

Paris, Musée du Louvre

D29 1, 11, 17 n.6, 21–2, 27, 33
D30 55
D37 64–5
E605 17 n.5
E11152 52 n.16
E27124 17 n.23
E32580 17 n.24
N504 17 n.5

Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum

909.80.303 40, 42 n.5, pl.35
909.80.304 40, 42 n.5, pl.36

Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum

ÄS 5106 55