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The significance of location for the mediating statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu

By Eleanor Simmance, University of Birmingham.

Abstract

Both the tenth pylon at Karnak and Amenhotep son of Hapu have enjoyed much attention in scholarly publications, the former in terms of its construction and iconography, and the latter in terms of his two scribal statues which sit at the pylon’s base and his deified status after death. It is the positioning of the two statues which will be explored here: it will be shown that their location has often been expressed in vague terms, and that there remains uncertainty as to whether they were originally placed at their find-spot; such ambiguities may have stemmed in part from the original publication of the pylon in 1914. Alongside this review, alternative original locations shall be considered, as will the ways in which the tenth pylon figured in the role of intermediary played by the statues, in that doorways into increasingly restricted areas defined the need for such a mediator between human and god in the ritual landscapes of the state. It will be asked how the symbolism of doorways may have impacted upon the effectiveness of the statues, discovered on the inside of the tenth pylon, with regard to their mediating role. Finally, it will be acknowledged that statues of this kind, wherever they were placed originally, offered their audience a medium through which they could interact with the landscape physically, spiritually and socially, for such monuments and the men they represented bridged the gap between tangible and intangible, ordinary man and elite, non-royal and royal, and earthly and divine.

Introduction

Amenhotep son of Hapu is a familiar name to many. The deification of this Eighteenth Dynasty official in Thebes, alongside his Third Dynasty predecessor Imhotep, and his subsequent veneration as a healing deity in the Ptolemaic Period, invites remarks on how a fairly ordinary man, from humble beginnings, left such a mark upon his contemporaries that he eclipsed many pharaohs in historic importance, and was even the receiver of royal prayer. Nine statues commissioned during his lifetime have survived to the present day, one of which was discovered in his hometown of Athribis in the Delta, and the other eight of which were found in Karnak Temple. All of these, combined with his building work for Amenhotep III, his large mortuary temple, and long life, will have contributed to his standing in the eyes of

---

1 This is a modified version of a paper given at the Birmingham Egyptology Symposium on 21st February 2014 (the theme of which was ‘Ritual Landscapes’), entitled ‘The arrangement of statues at the tenth pylon at Karnak and the significance of the doorway for the mediating scribal statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu’. Thanks in particular go to the editors of the Birmingham Egyptology Journal for their helpful suggestions for improvement.

2 Evidence for these men, as they appear individually or together, is collected in Wildung 1977a.


4 A Saite statue (temp. Psammetichus I) dedicated to Amenhotep, of which only the base survives today, bears an inscription of a princess beseeching Amenhotep for his aid as a healer (Wild 1958: 406-413).

5 Though these statues have been referred to in various publications, the main works are as follows: for the Athribis monument, see Habachi 1974; for those in Karnak, see Varille 1968 and Collombert 2002.

6 Larger even than the monuments of some pharaohs, this was nestled between the temples of Thutmose II and Amenhotep III (Robichon and Varille 1936: 27).
others. However, he has earned fame, amongst the ancients and modern scholars alike, as an intermediary between earthly and divine worlds as evidenced by two granite scribal statues first recorded at the tenth pylon of Karnak by Georges Legrain during excavations in 1913, now in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo. Their inscriptions explicitly claim Amenhotep to be Amun’s messenger, receiving prayers from the people to be transmitted to the god, and it seems that over time, supplicants who used these statues in this way began to devote their veneration towards Amenhotep himself.

If Hatshepsut’s favourite Senenmut, who relied largely on temple statuary for memorialisation, was an innovator in terms of statue form, it seems that Amenhotep son of Hapu – who also had a significant monumental presence at Karnak, albeit less numerous – introduced upon his two scribal statues a new type of text. These statues would play a specific part in the continuation of his memory by occupying a special position within the landscape of Thebes, and offering a particular service to those who passed them, which would essentially dictate the rituals to be enacted in his name, and thus form the basis of his own cult. In this regard, I have recently argued for the possibility that there was, in all eight Karnak statues and their texts, and to some extent in the Athribis statue also, a deliberate attempt by Amenhotep to construct a particular image of himself in order to propagate his memory. In other words he aimed to preserve his name through innovative means, though may not have anticipated the success of this endeavour in that it led to deification.

This paper is concerned primarily with the location of the scribal statues, for little attention has been paid to exact provenance, and in fact there is some ambiguity in the scholarship on this subject which may be traceable to the original French publication of the tenth pylon and its associated monuments. Moreover, that such monuments were relatively portable can cast original location, as compared to their recorded provenance in modern times, into doubt, and consequently some alternative original locations for these statues will be suggested here and an explanation will be given as to how this might change our perception of their function and status. The relationship of the statues with the temple of Karnak, and in particular the pylons, will be commented upon, especially how that relationship contributed to their role in ancient times. This will be undertaken with reference to doorway symbolism. Finally, the matter of location will be put aside and a more general discussion of the context behind these statues and their function will briefly be given.

Location, as discovered and recorded since 1913

The intermediary nature of the two statues in discussion is, in general, simply accepted; there are few questions regarding how the political, cultural and religious contexts of his time influenced Amenhotep son of Hapu, allowing him to assume what had hitherto been a royal prerogative and, more importantly, assume it so openly – the pharaoh, as the embodiment of Horus, had traditionally, or at least ideally (as portrayed in art and architecture), acted as the sole mediator between human and divine, maintaining cosmic order (ma’at) on his subjects’ behalf. Some contextualisation of the statues, with a focus upon their intermediary status, has

---

7 He lived to at least 80 years of age, as indicated by one statue (Cairo Museum CG 42127; Varille 1968: 4-13) which bears certain iconographic features (heavy brow, sunken eyes, naso-labial lines and bulging stomach) and an inscription which claims ‘I have reached 80 years’ (ph.i rnp.t 80). His exact age and year of death are disputed, variously stated as Year 31 (Varille 1968: 12; Robichon and Varille 1936: 28), Year 34 (Wildung 1977a: 291; 1977b: 88; Murnane 1991: 10, 57), Year 36 (Kozloff 2012: 224) or even within Akhenaten’s reign (Reeves 2001: 91). Cf. Simmance 2014: 10, n. 21.
8 Legrain 1914: 15-29; CG 44862 (Luxor J4) and CG 44861, Varille 1968: 18-25, 26-31.
9 Keller 2005: 117.
10 Simmance 2014: 2. These arguments are based on the assertion that the statues were created, or at least commissioned and planned, by Amenhotep himself, during his lifetime (discussion in Simmance 2014: 10-13).
been undertaken by Galán (2002), and I have sought to supplement his ideas in my own study of Amenhotep.\(^{11}\)

What is also brushed over is the physical position of these statues with reference to their mediating role. They were, as already mentioned, found at the tenth pylon, this being the southernmost entrance of the temple, and therefore it is assumed, understandably, that the mediation proposed by their inscriptions is related to this positioning\(^{12}\) in that Amenhotep would take the prayers of the public outside to the inner chambers where they could not enter. This as a general premise cannot be denied, but what is clear is that those who refer to these statues often mention location in vague terms. For instance, it is written that they are ‘beside the main entrance on the south of the temple’,\(^{13}\) ‘in front of Pylon X’,\(^{14}\) and similarly ‘in front of the 10th pylon’.\(^{15}\) Kozloff and Bryan are more specific, stating the location as ‘on the other side of the pylon’ to the pair of colossi of Amenhotep III.\(^{16}\) In total, four colossi were erected by this pylon, two on each side, and their temporal origins have been disputed; this is clear from the 1982 excavation report by Azim.\(^{17}\) There is a general consensus that those on the north face are of Horemheb, recut by Ramesses II,\(^{18}\) though Barguet tentatively dated them to Amenhotep III.\(^{19}\) As for those on the south face, that is the colossi purportedly of Amenhotep III according to Kozloff and Bryan, there have been varying suggestions as to whether these were both of Amenhotep III and recut by Horemheb,\(^{20}\) only one was recut and the other was originally from Horemheb’s reign,\(^{21}\) both were of Horemheb originally,\(^{22}\) or if they were only started by Amenhotep III but never finished, the task of completion falling to Horemheb.\(^{23}\) Whilst it is clear – from the general agreement as to the original creator of at least one of these colossi being Amenhotep III – that Kozloff and Bryan refer to the colossi on the south face and therefore in their statement correctly place the find-spot of the statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu on the north face, the point still stands that the location of the scribal statues has been described imprecisely.

Nonetheless, others have explicitly and correctly stated that the statues were discovered on the north side of the pylon: ‘devant le face septentriionale d l’aile est du X\(^{\circ}\) pylône’;\(^{24}\) and ‘found by the northern face of the Tenth Pylon’.\(^{25}\) I suggest that it be more appropriate to label this the ‘inner face’, as opposed to the somewhat ambiguous designation ‘in front of the pylon’. The latter would perhaps be more correctly applied to the external area, facing out to the processional routes in the south which lead to the Temple of Mut and Luxor Temple. The statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu, therefore, were sitting, side-by-side, on the inner (northern) face of the tenth pylon, immediately to the right upon passing through

---

\(^{11}\) In particular, Simmance 2014: 58-74 (Chapter Four). Galán’s contribution, though it contains several pertinent ideas, is just over four pages long, and is necessarily fairly brief.

\(^{12}\) Delvaux 1992: 50.

\(^{13}\) Wildung 1977b: 84.

\(^{14}\) Morenz 1973: 102.

\(^{15}\) Pinch 1993: 344.

\(^{16}\) Kozloff and Bryan 1992: 18.

\(^{17}\) Azim 1982: 149.


\(^{19}\) Barguet 1962; Azim (1982: 150) did leave this open as a possibility, though his attribution of these colossi to Horemheb (see footnote 18) is a result of stylistic and archaeological similarities with the colossus on the south face, west side, about whose creator he is more certain (footnote 21).

\(^{20}\) Barguet 1962: 244-245; Delvaux 1992: 49-50 (though here it is not mentioned that they were recut).

\(^{21}\) Legrain 1914: 14 (at least, it is acknowledged that the cartouche of Horemheb survives); Azim 1982: 146-149; cf. PM II\(^{\circ}\): 189 [(586), (587)].

\(^{22}\) Hari 1964: 256-257.

\(^{23}\) Galán 2002: 221.

\(^{24}\) Varille 1968: 18, 26.

\(^{25}\) Galán 2002: 221.
the doorway of the pylon from the south. Upon closer re-reading of the original report by Legrain a possible reason for the ambiguity or lack of specificity in the scholarship regarding location becomes apparent: while he speaks of the statues’ discovery alongside the colossi and other findings on the north side, when he then dedicates a section of his article to describing and discussing these statues, he writes that they are ‘à gauche du socle du colosse de Ramsès II situé devant le montant est, face sud, de la porte du Xᵉ pylône de Karnak’ [my emphasis].\(^{26}\) The colossal statue by which they were found does indeed have the name of Ramesses II, but this was on the north side. It seems that Legrain has put ‘south’ when ‘north’ was intended, and it is possible that this has affected later scholars’ work. One may think this is simply a printing error, or even a careless mistake in the excavation records, and can be ignored as largely irrelevant, especially given the reference to the colossus. However, given the strong relationship which is often implied between the intermediary statues and their presence at the doorway, it seems to me that their exact position should be taken into greater consideration nonetheless.

**Location, as originally established c. 1350 BC**

The self-proclaimed purpose of these statues was, according to their inscriptions which contain a form of appeal text, to receive the prayers of the ‘people of Ipet-sut, those who desire to see Amun’ and the prayers of ‘Upper and Lower Egypt, everyone who sees the sun-disk, those who come downstream and upstream to Thebes’.\(^{27}\) They also claim to ‘report’ these petitions to Amun on their behalf, the implication being that these people, for the most part, were not normally permitted to approach and interact with the image of Amun themselves, it being hidden within the deeper confines of the temple. The role apparent from the texts raises the question as to whether the statues were originally located by the tenth pylon, or elsewhere.

The access of the general population to temples was restricted, but how much so is a matter of some debate which cannot be assessed in any great detail here, there being only space to question what level of access the people had to the courtyard to the north of the pylon and thus to the statues, if located where they were discovered.\(^{28}\) Even if it were conceded that people could enter freely, this matter is complicated further by the fact that the ninth and tenth pylons, and their respective courts, were only completed under Horemheb. Under the earlier pharaoh Amenhotep III, when the scribal statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu were created, the ninth pylon did not exist and the tenth was no higher than around the first eight courses of stone.\(^{29}\) If the statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu originally sat here, then their effectiveness as intermediaries would surely have been compromised by the unfinished state of the monument and by the lack of solid connection to Karnak proper.\(^{30}\) Galán even suggested that simply by being at a side entrance, regardless of its state of completion, the

\(^{26}\) Legrain 1914: 17.

\(^{27}\) rmT n.t Ip.t-sw.t šbh.yw mšš Inn (Varille 1968: 24-25; Urk IV: 1834-1835; Simmance 2014: 85); and Šm.ru Mšw wr.t nb.t mšš ln lw.w m-hd šnt r WIs.t. (Varille 1968: 31; Urk IV: 1832-1833; Simmance 2014: 86).

\(^{28}\) See Griffin 2007 (and references contained within) for continuing debate on the accessibility of temples.


\(^{30}\) Loeben, as referenced by Galán (2002: 226, n. 1), also expressed the opinion that a pylon under construction such as the tenth pylon during the time of Amenhotep III would not be a suitable location for the erection of statues. Not only might this unfinished state be problematic for functional reasons, but it also risks any statue in the vicinity of the pylon being damaged during the latter’s completion.
great distance to the central shrine was a significant factor for those wishing to get close to the divine, even when this connection was forging through a mediator in the spiritual realm.

There was indeed a growing desire in the New Kingdom for the individual to be close to the gods, what is termed Gottesnähe — for example, the contra-temple of Thutmose III on the exterior eastern wall at Karnak, at the point closest to the restricted god’s shrine, was apparently constructed to achieve that closeness, thus evidencing this desire.

Further indicating the desire to be close to the gods is the wear evident on the papyri on the statues of Amenhotep, which has worn away the hieroglyphs to the extent that they are almost unreadable in places; this wear has been understood to be the result of years of touching by visitors who were attempting to get that much closer to the divine. The inscriptions on the scribal statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu in fact invite physical contact, albeit not explicitly, in that they purport that Amenhotep occupied, as intermediary, a position along the spiritual road between human and divine, and thus by touching the statue a supplicant would not only increase the chance of their prayers being heard, but would also be closer to that imperceptible, liminal space. Furthermore, once Amenhotep had been deified, that route of mediation became less relevant, and touching the statue would instead be indicative of veneration directed toward Amenhotep himself, and the desire to be close to him.

Here it is pertinent to note that also discovered beside Amenhotep’s statues (and also incorrectly stated by Legrain as being on the south side in his report) were two further scribal statues in the name of Paramessu, who was to become king as Ramesses I. Although less detailed in their carving, these later statues clearly emulate the monuments of the earlier official, and indeed show similar wear on the papyri on their laps. That Paramessu’s statues bear evidence of the same treatment seems to imply an element of veneration by association — people approaching Amenhotep (as an intermediary and later as a god) would also turn to Paramessu. These statues represent Ramesses as he was before he acceded to the throne and therefore the wear was probably not the result of cult activity for a royal individual. It is likely that the intermediary function of Amenhotep’s scribal statues was well-established by Paramessu’s time and that the statues of the former set a precedent for the monuments of future individuals.

Because of the importance of closeness to the divine, as laid out above, it does seem plausible that the scribal statues of Amenhotep were originally situated elsewhere and were moved to their find-spot sometime after the completion of the tenth pylon. This idea was acknowledged by Legrain, who suggests that they were intended for the tenth pylon and were moved from their temporary location by Horemheb, after this pharaoh completed the pylon. Horemheb is likely to have benefited from this decision: evidence for the start of Amenhotep’s veneration as a god is far from certain, but even if he was not yet worshipped

---

31 Galán 2002: 225. The designation of the tenth pylon as a ‘side entrance’ is of course questionable, as it lay on the processional route for the Opet festival and therefore should not be seen as peripheral to the functions of the complex (pers. comm. Steven Gregory 22 Aug 2014).
33 Sullivan 2010: 8.
34 Wildung 1977b: 88. Delvaux (1992: 52) points out that Horemheb’s Memphite scribal statue (Metropolitan Museum, New York 23.10.1) also shows traces of similar wear.
35 PM II: 188 ([584]); on the identification of Paramessu as Ramesses I, see Zivie 1984: 101.
36 Legrain 1914: 29 (note, however, that Legrain does not propose a potential area for their temporary positioning). It is worth observing here that Kozloff and Bryan have entirely misinterpreted Legrain, attributing to him the belief that the statues were in their original positions. Thus, they continue, this is significant for our understanding of the arrangement of statues (Kozloff and Bryan 1992: 18).
37 The identification of an individual named ‘prince [and royal scribe(?)] Huy’ (a common sobriquet for Amenhotep), being venerated amongst deceased members of the royal family in a now-destroyed relief in the
in his own right by the time of Horemheb, his intermediary statues, and the rest of his monuments, had probably ensured the continuation of his name and extraordinary reputation until this time; in associating his own monuments with a man of such repute in Thebes, Horemheb may have intended to share in that fame. Such an association would also further connect his building programme with the Thutmoside line, in particular the long and prosperous reign of Amenhotep III whose pylon he finished, and might strengthen Horemheb’s legitimacy despite not truly being a member of the royal bloodline. This is perhaps even more relevant given the desire of the post-Amarna kings to distance themselves from the Atenist ideology of Akhenaten and restore the traditional values. Accordingly, Horemheb would not only demonstrate his piety and ideology through his additions to the Temple of Karnak, but also by placing the scribal statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu, which of course serve Amun specifically, at this new monument to reinforce his ideological programme. The scribal statues suffered some iconoclast damage during the Amarna period, and if it is submitted that the relocation of these statues to the tenth pylon from their original location should be attributed to Horemheb, or at least an official working under his orders, it seems likely that the restoration of the inscriptions damaged under Akhenaten was undertaken at the same time.  

A related, but more practical, consideration which may have been taken into account by Horemheb is that if, as is likely, the intermediary statues attracted visitors, by moving them to the tenth pylon this visiting audience would be drawn to and interact with his own edifice, which thereby endorses his building programme as well as his iconography and ideology recorded in its reliefs.

Delvaux also believed that the original location of the statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu is in doubt. Unlike Legrain, he went further to provide a possible position: he submitted that they were originally either side of the doorway on the south face of the tenth pylon associated with the colossi there, and that either Horemheb or Ramesses II ordered their relocation to the north face, suggesting some kind of political and lineage-based motivation on their part, as has also been discussed above. Delvaux also put forward the suggestion that the statues of Paramessu had been set up originally as counterparts on the north face, after which they were all then grouped together. He did not, however, fully take into account the unfinished state of the pylon when the scribal statues of Amenhotep were erected, which would be equally true of an original location on the south face as it would on the north.

If indeed the statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu were moved from another location, they will have interacted differently with the landscape of the temple and perhaps functioned differently, when compared to their perceived role at the tenth pylon, north face. As mentioned previously, Galán suggested that the distance of the tenth pylon from the main core of the temple was significant for the supposed effectiveness of the intermediary statues. This, it is argued, supports the notion that the statues mediated not for Amun of Karnak but for the colossi near which they sat, the colossi in question being those considered to be of Amenhotep III on the south face of the pylon. Galán reasoned that these colossi were thought to be divine because of their proportions and the designation of the king on the eastern

---

38 Presumably this was also around the time that Paramessu erected his statues; it was suggested in the questions following this paper at the Birmingham Egyptology Symposium that Paramessu himself grouped all four statues together. The authority to do so, however, probably came from Horemheb.

39 Nowadays, the tenth pylon is in a poor state of survival, and thus most of the reliefs are fragmentary, particularly on the south face (see PM II: 186-190, plan XV).

colossus as ‘the image of Amun-Re’, and that the relationship between Amenhotep III and his favoured official would continue in monumental form as it had done in life.\(^{41}\) It should be mentioned here that earlier in his article Galán recognised that both pylon and southern colossi were finished by Horemheb,\(^{42}\) making his later assertion potentially a little problematic: can it be accepted that the scribal statues were set up to act as intermediaries for a statue which was not yet completed? Nevertheless, should it be granted that the colossi were set up and finished wholly by Amenhotep III, only being usurped by Horemheb, Galán’s suggestion for the different function of the mediating statues does have some weight, for it is not inconceivable for them to mediate for the divine image of their own king. This is especially true if we then put forward that the original location of the scribal statues was the south side of the pylon, beside these colossi, expanding, therefore, Delvaux’s theory above. In this regard Galán failed to reconcile, at least explicitly, the issue that Amenhotep’s statues were found on the north face whereas the colossi in question were found on the south. Whilst the opening paragraph of his article asserts these locations, he later writes that Amenhotep son of Hapu acted as intermediary between visitors and the deified form of the king ‘represented next to him’.\(^{43}\) Nowhere is it recognised that in their recorded find-spots the monuments of Amenhotep and the king’s colossi were not immediately next to each other, though perhaps there is an unwritten assumption that the statues of Amenhotep son of Hapu were originally on the south face.

If we subscribe to this theory, this may alleviate the problem of the unfinished pylon: the colossal statues, once set up, were unlikely to have been moved again,\(^{44}\) so it may not have mattered to the intermediary function of the scribal statues that the pylon was unfinished, as long as the colossi were firm and complete. In other words, the intermediary purpose may have been connected to the colossi rather than strictly to the temple and its resident deity, reinforcing the relationship between the king and his official as evidenced from many of Amenhotep son of Hapu’s inscriptions and titles.

However, when the inscriptions on the bases of the two scribal statues are taken into account in more detail, Galán’s suggestion becomes less convincing. Aside from their claims to act as messenger, both also state that the king granted permission for, or even approved and encouraged, the erection of these statues: ‘Nebmaatre caused me to repeat the words of the Two Lands’, and ‘I am the reporter whom the King has placed for hearing the words of supplication (and) in order to present the affairs of the Two Banks’.\(^{45}\) Whilst it could be argued that this does not disprove the possibility of the statues mediating for the royal colossi as images of the god, a distinction is clearly made in the inscriptions between Amun ‘Lord of the gods’, for whom they act as messenger, and the king, and this separation seems to point more towards a benefaction for the temple and its deity, as opposed to a deified image of the king.

An alternative location for the scribal statues as they were originally erected, first advocated by Helck, is the third pylon,\(^{46}\) and here this is felt to be the most convincing. The third pylon was built and finished under Amenhotep III and was thus, on the east-west axis of Karnak, the westernmost pylon at the time. Another statue of Amenhotep son of Hapu, the ‘grande statue biographique’,\(^ {47}\) was found on the inner, eastern face, and it is possible that the

\(^{41}\) Galán 2002: 225.

\(^{42}\) Galán 2002: 221.

\(^{43}\) Galán 2002: 225.

\(^{44}\) See Azim 1982: 145.

\(^{45}\) rdl.n wt Nh-m$m^3.t-R$ r whm dd.wt t$b.w$; and ink whm.w n dd usw n sdm md.wt n.t c$m.n mh r s:5$r.t hr.wt id$b.w$ (see references in footnote 27).


\(^{47}\) CG 583 and CG 835 (fragment), Varille 1968: 32-49.
scribal statues sat either nearby, or before the western face, an idea preferred here. In addition, their positioning could be speculatively reconstructed either side of the doorway. An albeit tenuous argument in favour of this is the inscription on one which refers to people coming ‘downstream and upstream’ to Karnak, which might be most relevant at the pylon nearest to the Nile, that is, the third.\textsuperscript{48} As has been said, a different location may indicate a different relationship with Karnak, and as such, if they sat at the extremity of this axis of the temple, Amenhotep’s statues would have perhaps enjoyed a higher status within the landscape of the temple when compared with the so-called ‘side entrance’ that is the tenth pylon (though see footnote 31); the third pylon was not only finished at the time, but it was also the result of a large reconfiguration project in this part of the temple removing the pylon and festival court of Thutmose II,\textsuperscript{49} building work in which Amenhotep son of Hapu himself probably had some input.\textsuperscript{50} Thus his scribal statues would sit at this prestigious entrance, representing the king and the king’s architectural programme, and, as door-keeper in all but title,\textsuperscript{51} would welcome visitors, sitting in line with the main axis of the temple, in line with the hidden gods’ shrines.

The seventh pylon is also a possibility for their original location, as put forward by Loeben.\textsuperscript{52} Evidently, there are many plausible suggestions and the truth may remain unknown. But, even if we are to disregard the specifics, the crucial point is that it seems to me impossible that these statues were originally erected on the north face of the tenth pylon, for reasons of their relationship with the doorway. Their function as intermediaries seems more suited to a location visible from the exterior of the temple, or on the outer face of a pylon closer to, or at least more in line with, the shrines where images of deities were kept, not on the \textit{inside} of the doorway at the outermost tenth pylon. Even if the initial incompleteness of the pylon did not reduce their effectiveness as mediators and even if, as suggested earlier, we concede that the people had access to the courtyard where they were found, the symbolism of doorways cannot be ignored.

\textbf{Doorway symbolism and intermediaries}

Various studies of the nature of doors (both ancient Egyptian and more generally), as well as studies on liminal and transitional spaces or situations, have been conducted, in particular since the seminal work of Arnold van Gennep in 1909, \textit{Les rites de passage}.\textsuperscript{53} Only selected ideas can be presented here, in brief: the basic function of a doorway is to act as a boundary between two worlds and a way of access from one to another. As such, two worlds separated by a doorway could reasonably be presented as those of external (hostile, chaotic) and

\textsuperscript{48} Of course, it must be stated the exact position of the Nile at any point in ancient times is uncertain, though the general trend at Karnak seems to be that it migrated west (see, for instance, Hillier, Bunbury and Graham 2006; Bunbury, Graham and Hunter 2008: especially 367).


\textsuperscript{50} From his title of ‘overseer of the works’ (\textit{imy-r k\textsuperscript{3}wt}) and his inscriptions, in particular that on the biographical statue (see footnote 47) we know he was involved in the royal building programme. In addition, one of the scribal statues at the tenth pylon refers to his building works in Karnak and throughout Egypt, leading Varille to dub it a statue of an ‘architecte’ (1968: 26); indeed, this is used by Varille for the main title of his book.

\textsuperscript{51} Statues naming the depicted individuals as ‘door-keepers’ whilst also professing to have an intermediary role are known from the Ramesside period, a well-preserved example being that of Inhernakht, now in the Linkoping Museum, no. 189 (Clère 1995: 7-9, 98-103).

\textsuperscript{52} Galán 2002: 226, n. 1. This would place it near the kneeling statue of Amenhotep purportedly showing him at 80 years of age (see footnote 7).

\textsuperscript{53} The English translation (\textit{The Rites of Passage}), which was the version consulted, was published in 1960.
Having said that, it has also been pointed out that the doorway is to some extent an unwanted break in that boundary, albeit one that is necessary, in that there must be a way to pass from one space to another. Moreover, it is possible to describe a doorway as both a pathway and a place in its own right, being a way to pass through to another other space but which must be respected and at which certain rites must be enacted. The doorway is a neutral ground – in that it is where outside and inside meet and one changes into the other – upon which ‘rites of passage’ and ‘threshold rites’ take place. That they can be seen as a place in themselves is supported by Egyptian evidence where doorways of temples (and perhaps of palaces) are used as places of judgement, one of the many characteristics and functions of Egyptian doorways in this world that are paralleled in the next. The practice of naming doorways in this and the next life also gives them additional significance as an entity with identity which can actively affect the movements of humans who wish to pass through.

The doorway of a temple pylon, being an opening in a boundary within a sacred complex, embodies much of the doorway symbolism of which the above ideas represent a small proportion. Consequently, anything sitting at a pylon was likely interacting with the sacred, interior space, with the wider complex and exterior spaces, and with the boundary and the transition it represents, especially since the monumental nature of these pylons made them significant areas in the complex. That the mediating scribal statues sat by a pylon would imply, it is submitted here, the taking of prayers offered by supplicants through the doorway. However, this would mean the prayers offered to Amenhotep son of Hapu’s statues on the north face of the tenth pylon would be taken through the doorway to the exterior of the temple. In addition, a visitor would have to pass through the doorway to see and approach the statues. This seems to defeat their purpose, their appeal text suggesting a public, visible location, drawing people to the temple and welcoming them inside. As a sacred area, a certain level of purity or worthiness was presumably expected to enter, and in passing through the doorway of the pylon in order to approach the statues of Amenhotep, a visitor would thus have to interact with the boundary and the deities housed within both temple and doorway even before they come into contact with Amenhotep’s monuments.

Considering the scribal statues’ claim that they act as an intermediary in this temple context, they seem almost superfluous if they were on the inside of the doorway, the visitor having already gained access to this space which is more sacred than the exterior, and to some extent more restricted. Conversely, one might say that the statues’ presence on the inside of the doorway means the effectiveness of the doorway itself, as a boundary, is compromised, in that they actively encourage people to approach them, regardless of the sacred spaces through which those people would have to pass to do so. For all these reasons it is argued that their find-spot at the tenth pylon, north face, was not their original location. For

54 MacCulloch 1911: 846; van Gennep 1960: 20; Grimes 1987: 452. The idea that one space is chaotic and the other orderly, or similar, can be relative – the domestic, familiar space of the home compared with the relative unknown of the outdoors for example. This is also the case where the activities that are conducted in one space are not considered to be suitable relative to the other – the kitchen and the living room, perhaps. This, of course, does not cover all eventualities or take into account personal preferences.
58 Brunner 1986: 782; Quaegebeur 1993: especially 201-211 (and references within).
59 For a direct comparison between gate-keepers of this world and the hereafter, see Leprohon 1994, especially 82ff. Doorways in the afterlife are common to several cultures, ancient and modern. For instance, the New Testament Book of Revelation 21:21 presents the idea of the twelve Pearly Gates into Heaven.
60 On door-names in temples, see in particular Grothoff 1996.
these reasons also it is argued that their purpose would nonetheless be suited to a position by a doorway, but more specifically on the outer face.

**Amenhotep son of Hapu as an intermediary**

If one was to argue in *favour* of their find-spot being their original or intended location, it could be said that the specific positioning on the inside of the pylon would have mattered little to visitors at Karnak, especially those already aware of the statues’ presence and of their function. Similarly, one could see location as entirely irrelevant; what may have been important was simply their presence in the temple complex, and their claims to be mediators for the god. To reiterate what was mentioned above, the worn-down papyri attest to great reverence accorded to these monuments, and also to the need for physical contact in order to interact with the divine sphere. In touching the statue, petitioners would be placed closer to or on the incorporeal, intangible route from physical to metaphysical worlds interacting simultaneously with both landscapes.

Amenhotep, and his manifestation in monumental form, was an ideal intermediary in several ways: between the non-elite and the elite or the king; between the elite and the king; between human and divine; and between physical and metaphysical worlds (in the case of his statues). He was particularly suited to this role between non-elite and higher spheres in part because he had fairly humble origins in his hometown and because his roles in life brought him into contact with the non-elites as a mediator and messenger for the king, in various guises, as demonstrated by his titles.\(^{61}\) In addition, the scribal function, which he particularly emphasised in the inscriptions of all his monuments and which was expressed in statue form, exudes a sense of humility and patience but also of wisdom, thus he represents the ideal middleman between lower and upper classes. The roles he had in life (official-king) were then transferred to a human-god relationship in his monumental form. His statues therefore allowed supplicants to interact with both the elite class and with the entire landscape of Karnak irrespective of their own status which, for the majority, was presumably fairly low.

These statues represented a man who had been able to achieve very high status and who understood the ideological and religious climate of the New Kingdom and in particular the climate under the so-called ‘sun-king’ Amenhotep III.\(^{62}\) Not only did Amenhotep son of Hapu manage to secure a permanent place in the ritual landscape of Karnak and wider Thebes, and in the memory of contemporaries and those after him, but he also represented an effective medium through which the ordinary man himself could interact with the landscape, in a place where much knowledge was restricted and participation controlled. Equally, the presence of the statues also represents a method *by which* participation was controlled, firstly in that they give instructions for how the visitors were to utilise his mediating influence,\(^{63}\) and secondly, in that the provision of intermediaries satisfied the religious needs of the people and their wishes to be close to their god, and thus they would perhaps have had no further desire to know of the secrets contained within the restricted shrines.

---

61 For a study of the titles and connotations of mediating roles, see Simmance 2014: 34-48.
62 Simmance 2014: Chapter Four, especially pages 68-74. Many studies of Amenhotep III refer in detail to his solar ideology, such as Kozloff and Bryan 1992; ‘Egypt’s sun-king’ is, incidentally, the title used by Fletcher (2000).
63 By approaching the statues and speaking their petitions, and then giving offerings or libations to Amenhotep.
Conclusions and final remarks

The two main conclusions of this paper are thus: firstly, the association between the intermediary role of Amenhotep son of Hapu’s scribal statues and their location at a doorway has been implied, but their original location is uncertain. Secondly, the relationship between specific position and function has not been tackled in any depth, and it has been suggested here that exact location has significance for these types of monuments, especially where the location involves a doorway. This is because of what that doorway might represent and how the intermediary and doorway interact and work together.

Interaction with these intermediary monuments allowed the people to experience the landscape on several different levels, tangible and intangible, permitting a more profound relationship between the supplicant and his surroundings. Amenhotep son of Hapu’s statues represent a phenomenon which draws in aspects of, amongst others, elite authority, the development of royal ideology and the religious beliefs of the ordinary people. Several later statues use similar constructions to those of Amenhotep in their inscriptions, claiming to be, for example, the ‘servant’ (hm), ‘reporter’ (whm.w), ‘sistrum-player’ (iHy) or ‘door-keeper’ (iry-<'j) of a deity, receiving prayers on their behalf.64 Such intermediary statues were ostensibly for the people, but in fact embody an elite-driven phenomenon: the individuals who created these monuments were not only responding to developments – in the New Kingdom and later – in personal religious practices and desires, but also producing a means of directing these practices. In doing so, this ensured that the individual represented by the statue secured a place in memory, and that engagement with the divine, or metaphysical realm, in ancient Egypt would continue to be managed by the elite and royal classes.

Abbreviations:

PM II² = Porter and Moss 1972
Urk IV = Helck 1958
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64 For example: ‘servant’ – CG 930 (Kha; Clère 1995: 208-210); ‘reporter’ – CG 901 (Men; Clère 1995: 177-180); ‘sistrum-player’ – Louvre E. 14241 (Neferrunpet; Clère 1995: 181-186); ‘door-keeper’ – see footnote 51.


Pitt-Rivers, the Painter and the Palaeolithic Period

By Beth L. Asbury, The Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford

Abstract

As part of the Rethinking Pitt-Rivers project, staff at the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford were invited to write object biographies about items in the Museum’s founding collection. The author was drawn to an Early Dynastic Period ripple-flaked knife published by Pitt-Rivers himself in an article for the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland in 1881 after a trip he made to Egypt earlier that year. His paper was significant because it established that there was a Palaeolithic Period of Egyptian history when the existence of a prehistoric phase had not yet been accepted. In a footnote, Pitt-Rivers wrote that he acquired the knife from ‘Mr McCallum, the artist’ in 1874. Although his name is spelled differently in different places, the author is convinced this was Andrew MacCallum (1821-1902), the ‘Painter’ with whom Amelia Edwards famously sailed a thousand miles up the Nile in the same year. MacCallum was a landscape artist who wanted to paint the Great Temple at Abu Simbel and, while there, discovered a painted chamber, to which Edwards dedicated a whole chapter.

The Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford is not well-known for its Egyptology collection, often being overlooked in favour of its neighbour, the Ashmolean. However, it does contain some wonderful objects, including the Oxford Bowl (PRM 1887.27.1), one of the rare ‘letters to the dead’. It was founded in 1884 when the famous antiquarian, Lieutenant-General Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt-Rivers (1827-1900) (fig. 1), who coined the phrase ‘typology’, donated his first collection to the University of Oxford. The Leverhulme Trust-funded project, Rethinking Pitt-Rivers, in 2009-2013 explored the collecting habits of the General for this collection as well as his, sadly now dispersed, second collection. Members of staff were encouraged to write object biographies as part of the project and an ancient Egyptian flint knife (PRM 1884.140.82) was particularly attractive. The knife (fig. 2) is displayed in a case on the Lower Gallery and labelled in a bold hand,

Fig 1: General Pitt-Rivers (PRM 1998.271.66).
©Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford.

1 See Stevenson 2010, and chapters 5-7 of Hicks and Stevenson 2013.
2 See the online database at http://objects.prm.ox.ac.uk/search.html [5 May 2014].
3 One of the outcomes of the Rethinking Pitt-Rivers project was the decision to hyphenate the General’s name, but not the Museum’s name (Petch 2010).
4 Bowden 1991: 55.
5 See the project website at http://web.prm.ox.ac.uk/rpr [4 May 2014].
the nature of which will not be discussed here.\(^6\) It measures 30.6 by 8.4 cm and has been dated to the Early Dynastic period due to its similarity with other examples from First Dynasty tombs at Abydos, such as UC16205 in the Petrie Museum.\(^7\) It is a ‘comma-shaped’\(^8\) ripple-flaked knife made of caramel-coloured flint, a colour chosen perhaps to imitate metal.\(^9\) It was on display in South Kensington Museum\(^10\) (now the Victoria and Albert Museum) sometime before becoming part of the Pitt Rivers Museum’s founding collection because it is listed in Delivery Catalogue II, one of the two volumes compiled when the objects were packed for Oxford.\(^11\)

![Fig 2: Flint knife from Kom Ombo (PRM 1884.140.82). ©Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford.](image)

The knife (fig. 3) is illustrated in Figure 14, Plate 33, of Pitt-Rivers’ significant article, *On the Discovery of Chert Implements in Stratified Gravel in the Nile Valley Near Thebes*, a paper that he gave to the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland in June 1881 after a trip he made to Egypt earlier that year. The trip led to one of Pitt-Rivers’ ‘most important and controversial discoveries’\(^12\).

At the time of the paper’s publication, it was generally believed that worked flints found in Egypt were used for carving hieroglyphs, tomb building and mummification, and did not belong to any earlier phases of human activity.\(^13\) The existence of a prehistoric Stone Age period in Egypt had not yet been accepted, even by prominent Egyptologists like Auguste Mariette, the head of the Antiquities Service at the time.\(^14\) However, Pitt-Rivers, who asserts himself by

![Fig 3: The knife as illustrated in Pitt-Rivers’ paper (by permission of John Wiley and Sons).](image)

---

\(^6\) See Asbury 2012.
\(^7\) See the online catalogue at [http://petriecat.museums.ucl.ac.uk/search.aspx](http://petriecat.museums.ucl.ac.uk/search.aspx) [4 May 2014].
\(^8\) Graves-Brown 2010: 450-451, 534.
\(^9\) Stevenson 2011: 72
\(^10\) It may also have been displayed at the South Kensington Museum’s branch at Bethnal Green.
\(^11\) Blackwood 1964: ii.
\(^12\) Bowden 1991: 90, and, incidentally, a meeting with Flinders Petrie (Bowden 1991: 92-93).
\(^13\) Stevenson (no date) and Pitt-Rivers 1882: 384.
\(^14\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 387.
explaining that he had learned to knap flints and had studied European Palaeolithic tools,\(^{15}\) used a "particularly elegant method"\(^{16}\) to prove that there had been prehistoric, what he called "pre-Egyptian,"\(^{17}\) occupation of the area and became one of the first people to study Predynastic period flints.\(^{18}\)

Pitt-Rivers investigated Eighteenth Dynasty tombs near Qurna in Luxor and observed worked flints of Palaeolithic types in conglomerated gravel deposits that had been cut through when the walls of the tombs were constructed. As the knapping of the flints pointed in the opposite direction to where they were exposed, flush with the walls, he knew that this meant they were *in situ* and therefore much older than the tombs themselves.\(^{19}\) He enlisted the help of a geologist, J. F. Campbell, who was also visiting Luxor, as a witness to support his findings and extracts of letters from Campbell are published as an appendix to the paper.\(^{20}\) Campbell describes one flint and concluded:

> It belongs to the geological delta formation, and beyond question it is older beyond calculation than the tomb which was cut into the gravel, and cut through the end of this particular flint flake. We got more, and they are being marked for the famous collection at South Kensington.

> This is my story of yesterday’s work, which may yet live in history as a date from which to calculate the antiquity of man.\(^{21}\)

Pitt-Rivers also seems to have been proud of the discovery, but shrewdly observed that it was ‘likely to be more widely known hereafter than the author of it.’\(^{22}\)

The paper was also used as an opportunity by Pitt-Rivers to discuss some other Egyptian flint objects in his collection, including two flint bracelets\(^{23}\) and the knife. He reported that the knife was from a tomb in Kom Ombo in 1874 and in a footnote stated that both the knife and bracelets were ‘obtained by Mr McCallum, the artist, from whose possession they passed into my collection’.\(^{24}\) This person must have been well-known to Pitt-Rivers’ audience to have been so vaguely described, and although his name is variously spelled\(^{25}\) and there appears to be some confusion between him and another artist of a similar name,\(^{26}\) we know that an artist called Andrew MacCallum also accompanied Amelia Edwards (1831-1892)\(^{27}\) on her well-known voyage in Egypt that same year.

In *A Thousand Miles Up the Nile*, Edward’s book about her experiences in Egypt, first published in 1877, she refers to herself throughout as ‘the Writer’ and to MacCallum as ‘the Painter’. However, his true name can be identified from Appendix I of the book, a copy of a letter by him to *The Times* newspaper,\(^{28}\) and from the diary of Jenny Lane, the maid of Lucy

\(^{15}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 389.

\(^{16}\) Greene 1983: 14.

\(^{17}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 383.


\(^{19}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 389-390.


\(^{21}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 397.

\(^{22}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 389.

\(^{23}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 385-386, figures 7 and 8, plate 33.

\(^{24}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 386.


\(^{26}\) See [www.askart.com/askart/artist.aspx?artist=11083666](http://www.askart.com/askart/artist.aspx?artist=11083666) and [http://idesweb.bc.edu/becker/artists/mccullum](http://idesweb.bc.edu/becker/artists/mccullum) (note the difference in surname between the page title and the web address) [4 May 2014].

\(^{27}\) Bierbrier 1995: 137.

Renshaw (‘L.’), who accompanied Amelia Edwards on her travels.\textsuperscript{29} Lane also refers to the boat the party travelled in as ‘Mr McCallum’s boat’, so it may have been MacCallum and not Edwards after all who chartered it for the journey.\textsuperscript{30}

MacCallum (1821-1902) (fig. 4) was born in Nottingham and became known as a landscape painter, patronised even by Queen Victoria.\textsuperscript{31} He was commissioned to decorate the interior of the first lecture theatre of the South Kensington Museum in 1857,\textsuperscript{32} so perhaps this is where he met Pitt-Rivers. MacCallum was in Egypt at the same time as Edwards in order to paint a large picture of the Great Temple at Abu Simbel\textsuperscript{33} and was already an acquaintance of hers.\textsuperscript{34} ‘Egypt by 1873 was already thoroughly opened-up tourist territory’,\textsuperscript{35} ‘most tourists went up the Nile’\textsuperscript{36} and MacCallum had been to Egypt three times, bringing useful experience to Edwards’ boat party.\textsuperscript{37}

MacCallum is described by the anonymous ‘de G. S.’, who appears to have known him well, as short, slight, with dark skin and hair, small, dark, deep set eyes, and an energetic and dramatic personality.\textsuperscript{38} Edwards describes him as ‘that indomitable Painter’, who often enjoyed going on an ‘afternoon excursion…striking off generally into the desert; looking for onyxes and carnelians among the pebbles that here and there strew the surface of the sand’.\textsuperscript{39} MacCallum later became a known collector of antiquities\textsuperscript{40} and Edwards mentions one occasion during their trip when he haggled for a small stuffed crocodile.\textsuperscript{41}

Edwards’ boat party was at Abu Simbel for fourteen days,\textsuperscript{42} during which time MacCallum had the bright idea of setting the crew to work staining one of the colossi with coffee on sponges tied to sticks to keep them occupied for a few days while he painted. Edwards describes how one was still marked with plaster from a cast taken for the British Museum by Robert Hay (1799-1863)\textsuperscript{43} over fifty years earlier and she even illustrated the event.\textsuperscript{44} More significant, however, was a discovery made by MacCallum on one of his afternoon excursions that even

\textsuperscript{29} Moon 2006: 112, 116.
\textsuperscript{30} Moon 2006: 119.
\textsuperscript{31} de G. S. 1879, Davies 1926: 412, Bierbrier 1995: 265, Long 2004. Queen Victoria commissioned MacCallum to paint pictures of Balmoral and also let him use a tower in Windsor Great Park as a studio.
\textsuperscript{32} Long 2004.
\textsuperscript{34} Edwards 1993: 34 and 88, Rees 1998: 38.
\textsuperscript{35} Rees 1998: 37.
\textsuperscript{36} Moon 2006: 117.
\textsuperscript{37} Edwards 1993: 88.
\textsuperscript{38} de G. S. 1879.
\textsuperscript{39} Edwards 1993: 238.
\textsuperscript{40} de G. S. 1879.
\textsuperscript{41} Edwards 1993: 359. He also played the accordion and kept a notebook of useful phrases in Arabic (Edwards 1993: 332 and 198).
\textsuperscript{42} Rees 1998: 39.
\textsuperscript{43} Bierbrier 1995: 194.
\textsuperscript{44} Edwards 1993: 307-309.
led him to missing lunch. He sent a note to the others somewhat prosaically requesting them to, ‘pray come immediately – I have found the entrance to a tomb. Please send some sandwiches – A. M’C’.  

The excited group spent some time clearing the chamber, enlisting the help of a large group of local Egyptians in exchange for some slightly unusual *baksheesh*, including two pots of jam and some sardines.  

Although they did find two skeletons in the ‘tomb’, they eventually decided it was part of a ruined pylon, possibly a library, and called it a ‘speos’ instead. Edwards dedicated the whole of chapter eighteen to the discovery, describing it in great detail and providing several illustrations (figs. 5 and 6), including hieratic and hieroglyphic texts. When they were finished:

The Painter wrote his name and ours, with the date (February 16th, 1874), on a space of blank wall over the inside of the doorway; and this was the only occasion upon which any of us left our names upon any Egyptian monument. On arriving at Korosko, where there is a post-office, he also despatched a letter to “The Times,” briefly recording the facts here related.

---

49 Edwards 1993: 331, 338 and TIMEA.  
The chamber is still at Abu Simbel, to the south of the Great Temple, relocated with the rest of it when Lake Nasser was formed. Roger De Keersmaecker has visited it several times to note the names of the visitors, but they are now almost illegible. They were faint even by the time Edwards came to publish her book, however, only three years later, but have been published by Christophe. MacCallum’s painting, on the other hand (fig. 7), was donated to the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago by an art dealer called Thomas S. Hughes in 1925. It was recorded in the annual report for that year as ‘a very instructive picture of great archaeological interest’ and displayed in the museum’s Egyptian Hall. It measures 1.8 by 2.4 m and is catalogue number 29945 (Anthropology Accession 1587).

---

Bierbrier 1995: 266.
52 Personal communication, 26 September 2013.
54 Christophe 1965: 162.
55 Davies 1926: 412.
56 Davies 1926: 439, although it is currently in storage and has not been on public display for some time (Jamie Kelly, personal communication, 29 May 2014).
57 Alan Francisco, personal communication, 3 October 2013.
In chapter twenty, Edwards notes that:

Between Kom Ombo and Silsilis, we lost our Painter. Not that he either strayed or was stolen; but that, having accomplished the main object of his journey [the painting], he was glad to seize the first opportunity of getting back quickly to Cairo. That opportunity [was] represented by a noble Duke honeymooning with a steam-tug.\(^{58}\)

Although it could never be proven, as MacCallum could have bought the Kom Ombo knife anywhere on the trip or even from outside of Egypt that same year, it is exciting to think that it was at this point in Edwards’ story that he haggled for or found it and subsequently gave it to Pitt-Rivers. Pitt-Rivers seems to have been very proud of his acquisition, describing it as, ‘a remarkable specimen of a flint knife…As a specimen of flint chipping it is unequalled.’\(^{59}\)

Along with the knife, Pitt-Rivers illustrated two flint bracelets from MacCallum in Figures 7 and 8, Plate 31, of his paper. He calls them ‘remarkable objects…excellent workmanship…found in one of the tombs near Koorneh…unique, so far as I know’.\(^{60}\) One of these, PRM 1884.140.83 (fig. 8), appears to have become part of the Pitt Rivers Museum’s founding collection as well, as it has a matching label, although a letter to Pitt-Rivers from MacCallum in 1896 indicates that in total he gave him three flint bangles and knives (in the plural).\(^{61}\) MacCallum also collected objects belonging to Neskhon from the royal cachette at Deir el-Bahri, which made their way into the British Museum (EA16672 and EA59197-59200).\(^{62}\)

In conclusion, this impressive knife connects two historic moments in the study of ancient Egyptian ritual landscape. The first was the recognition of the existence of a Palaeolithic Period in Egypt and the second was Amelia Edward’s trip to Egypt, which led to the discovery of a painted chamber at Abu Simbel and to Edwards’ foundation of the Egypt Exploration Society (EES) in 1882.\(^{63}\) Moon even goes so far as to say that it may have been the discovery of that chamber by MacCallum that ‘convinced Amelia that much remained to be found, and needed to be preserved for scholarly examination and not merely as

---


\(^{59}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 386.

\(^{60}\) Pitt-Rivers 1882: 385-386, although Petrie (1902: 16) later found a grave at Abydos, M14, containing eight flint bracelets, but did not publish any illustrations of them in his field report.

\(^{61}\) Petch 2011.

\(^{62}\) Bierbrier 1995: 266. See the online catalogue at [www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx) [4 May 2014], but note that the wooden tablet, EA16672, has been attributed to F. MacCallum here.

trinkets.’⁶⁴ Also worthy of note is that when she founded the EES, Edwards wrote to Pitt-Rivers for financial support, which he gave until his death in 1900.⁶⁵
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Book of the Dead Chapter 182: a case of related structure between the text and its vignette

By Amandine Godefroid, University of Louvain-la-Neuve.

Abstract
The Book of the Dead is one of the most famous funerary texts of Ancient Egypt. In this article, I present a part of the results from my thesis in Ancient Oriental Languages and Literature at the Université Libre of Brussels. It was focused on Chapter 182 of the Book of the Dead. In this chapter, the god Thoth introduces himself and presents his own qualities and actions. The peculiarity of the text is its structure, which repeats almost systematically the formula ‘I am Thoth’. The text is divided into two parts: Thoth’s discourse and a hymn to Osiris. The latter part is framed by the first one. In addition, an analysis of the vignette of Chapter 182 also revealed a well-defined organization. On the one hand, the symbols held by the demons are organized in mirror symmetry from one register to the other (vertical analysis). On the other hand, a horizontal reading enables us to spot groups of symbols, which succeed to one another on the same way in the two registers they occupy. Finally, the comparison between the text and the image clearly shows that both are closely related: they are constructed the same way and act in both cases to protect the deceased and to allow his rebirth by the power of protective deities. The vignette of Chapter 182 is therefore no simple illustration but can be regarded as an independent version of the chapter itself.

Introduction
The Book of the Dead is the famous corpus of funerary texts which appears as such at the dawn of the New Kingdom. It proceeds from an evolution of the Pyramid Texts and the Coffin Texts and will remain in use from the beginning of New Kingdom to the early Roman Period. This corpus, as we currently know it, consists in total of 192 formulae (called chapters). Each of these chapters comprises a text and, in most cases, an image called the ‘vignette’. The study of the Book of the Dead did not begin until the nineteenth century. One of the first most important works on that subject is the 1842 edition by Lepsius of the Book of the Dead, based on the funerary papyrus of Iufankh (dated from the Ptolemaic period). Another edition which is still an important reference for the study of the corpus is the 1886 edition by Édouard Naville, which consists of three volumes. The first one includes a summary of each chapter with the indication of the papyrus that was used as the main source for representing the chapter. The second volume is composed of copies (for text and vignette) that Naville made out of a number of papyri, namely from the British Museum collection. The last one presents in synoptic tables comparisons drawn from several versions of the same chapter appearing on different papyri.

The paper I present here deals with a part of the results I obtained at the end of my thesis work, whose subject was Chapter 182 of the Book of the Dead (referred to as ‘BD 182’ from here on) and its comparison to the Isis-aretalogies. Throughout my research, it became increasingly obvious to me that there was something of interest in the way both text and vignette were constructed. As such, my goal is, first, to deal with the text of BD 182, then

1 Lepsius 1842.
3 I wish to thank here Professor Christian Cannuyer, who greatly helped me finding and determining my thesis subject.
to explore the building of the vignette, and finally to discuss the links that can be highlighted between the text and the vignette of this chapter.

**The documents related to BD 182**

BD 182 is known to us through a number of documents attested on various archaeological materials, such as papyri, stelae, or tombs. Seven of these documents were used in my thesis:¹

P. London BM EA 10010, or *Papyrus Murray* (British Museum, London): the funerary papyrus of Muthetepty, priestess and *smfjt* of Amun. The papyrus dates from between the end of the Twentieth Dynasty and the beginning of the Twenty-first Dynasty and is still in good condition. It was purchased in 1861 from the antiquities market in Thebes by an Englishman named Murray. It is the very papyrus that Naville used in his edition of the Book of the Dead⁵ for BD 182. And it was also the main papyrus for my study of BD 182.⁶

P. Vatican 38 600 1/2 (Museo Gregoriano Egizio, Vatican): the papyrus of Amenemope, director of designers.⁷ This document is considered to be of Theban origin and is dated to the Eighteenth Dynasty. In the current state of things this papyrus seems to be the most ancient known version of BD 182.

P. London BM EA 9901 (British Museum, London): the papyrus of Hunefer, royal scribe. Hunefer was in office during the reign of Sethi I (Nineteenth Dynasty). In this case BD 182 is actually the final part of BD 183 (col. 41-45).

P. London BM EA 10554, or *Papyrus Greenfield* (British Museum, London): the papyrus of Nestanebtasheru. It dates from the end of the Twenty-first Dynasty and is in good condition (it was perhaps kept in a hollow statue of Osiris).⁸ Nestanebtasheru was the daughter of Panedjem II and Queen Neskhons, and she seemed to have had a very high rank in Amun’s priesthood. This papyrus was discovered by local people between 1871 and 1881 in the Cache of Deir el-Bahari (DB-320). It was then sold on the antiquities market and purchased by Mrs Edith Mary Greenfield, who offered it to the British Museum in 1910.

Slab E.3056 (Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, Brussels). This limestone slab (49 x 98 cm) is said to come from Memphis and, according to its palaeography, it dates from the Nineteenth Dynasty. It was purchased in 1907 by Jean Capart at the antiquities market. The inscription is damaged but BD 182 can be recognized from the twenty-one columns of text. A copy, transcription and translation of this text were published by Louis Speleers in 1923.⁹

---

¹ More references can be found in: Lucarelli: 79-92. Note that this article defends a view which diverges a little from the one I present in this paper.
² Naville 1886: 207-208.
³ This document presents a text and a vignette that are both complete and in good condition.
⁴ Naville 1886: 447-448; Gasse 1993:15-16.
⁵ This is a hypothesis supported by E. W. Budge in his publication of the funerary papyrus of Nestanebtasheru. See Budge1912.
⁶ Speleers 1923b: 61 and 152-154.
Block of Linköping (Stifts- och Landsbibliotek, Linköping). This stone (55 x 44 cm, 14 cm thick) dates from the Ramesside period, probably the Nineteenth Dynasty, and might come from the Saqqara necropolis. It was purchased in 1815 in Constantinople by S. F. Lidman and is currently kept in Linköping (Sweden). On the block are the remains of an engraved individual whose head and legs have been broken off. Nevertheless the figure is recognizable: it corresponds to the god Thoth (he wears a strip of cloth across his chest, as he is usually depicted on other representations). The stone only keeps the remains of three columns of text. But, thanks to comparisons with more complete versions, we see that once again we have here a version of BD 182.

Two stone fragments NME 37 (Stockholm Museum [possibly earlier in Collection Anastasi], Stockholm). They seem to come from the tomb of Pahemnetjer, chief director of craftsmen. These limestone blocks (55 x 91 cm) are dated from between the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty and the beginning of the Twentieth Dynasty. They are engraved with a human character (his belly and legs are still apparent), probably Pahemnetjer himself, depicted in the attitude of offering, and wearing a long and sophisticated cloth. Around him stand nine columns of text, which come from an abridged and slightly different version of BD 182.

Comparisons between the text written or engraved on these documents gave interesting results. More complete versions (Muthetepty, Amenemope and Nestanebtasheru) served to put the text of other sources back in the rightful sequence and to fill in missing parts. This also showed that, even if the text of BD 182 is quite the same in all the sources, some present a few more sequences. This is particularly the case for P. London BM EA 10554, Slab E.3056, the block from Linköping and the fragments from the tomb of Pahemnetjer. Besides, when these documents happen to present extra sequences, they seem to have followed the same original pattern.

Chapter 182 includes a text and a vignette. We will now look at both of them independently and try to spot out the peculiarities of each one.

The text of BD182

Formulae for the permanence of Osiris, for giving breath to the Tired-Heart by the activity of Thoth, who repels the enemies of Osiris, who came here when being in his transformations, (Thoth) who protects him (the deceased), who preserves him, who defends him in the necropolis. (Formulae) written by Thoth himself in order that the light shines on him (the deceased) every day.

---

10 Martin 1987; 40 no.104, pl. 39 no.104.
12 This tomb has not been traced yet. Porter and Moss 1981: 709.
The chapter begins with a title\textsuperscript{13} (as is the case for many chapters in the Book of the Dead). This title, partly written in red ink, expresses the goals of the spell.

In addition to the title, the text of BD 182 is mainly composed of two parts\textsuperscript{14}. In the first one (end of col. 2 – beginning of col. 12, blue-framed on fig. 1) stands a text in which the god Thoth presents who he is and what he does. The peculiarity of this text comes from the construction of Thoth’s discourse. It is he who speaks, directly, using the first person singular. This should remind us of the special kind of texts called aretalogies\textsuperscript{15}. An aretalogy is a special kind of text in which a deity introduces himself/herself speaking in the first person singular. The other peculiarity of BD 182 is that the formula $ink\ Dhw tj$ is repeated ten

\textsuperscript{13} The papyri of Muthetepty (P. London BM EA 10010) and Amenemope (P. Vatican 38 600) both present a title; BD 182 on the papyrus of Nestanebtasheru (P. London BM EA 10554) begins directly with the expression $dd\ mdw$ (Recitation); BD 182 on the papyrus of Hunefer (P. London BM EA 9901) does not include any title for it has been added at the end of BD 183; for the rest of the sources taken in account in this study, i.e. Slab E.3056, the block of Linköping and the two stone fragments NME 37, it is difficult to determine whether they had any title or not since they are broken and the text is therefore partly lacking.

\textsuperscript{14} This fact appears clearly in the versions given by the papyri of Muthetepty, Amenemope, Nestanebtasheru. Even the preserved text of Slab E.3056 attests this division.

\textsuperscript{15} The most renowned of them are the Isis-aretalogies, known between the third century BC and the second century AD in the ancient Greek world. See for example Müller 1961; Bergman 1968.
times throughout this aretalogy of Thoth. One can also see that this aretalogy is divided into two halves. It seems that the first half expresses more who Thoth is, using therefore a row of epithets of the god. For example, col. 3-4 say:

I am Thoth, the excellent scribe, whose hands are pure, the master of the two horns, which repulses evil, the scribe of Maât, whose abomination is Isefet, he whose reed pens protected the Master of the Universe, the master of laws, words and writings, he whose words have founded the Two Banks.

and in col. 8-10:

I am Thoth, he that Ra praises, the master of power, he who restores him who created him, the great magician in the Bark of Millions, the master of laws, he who soothes the Two Lands, he whose effective formulae protected the one who fathered him, (…), I am Thoth, he who justifies Osiris against his enemies.

The second part insists on what he does, using a series of sentences indicating the actions he has accomplished for the deceased and also more generally for all mankind (col. 10-12, 19-22):

I am Thoth, he that Ra praises, he who announces dawn, he who discerns the future without making any error, he who leads Heaven, Earth and the Duat, he who creates life for mankind. I give the breath that is in the Hidden by the effective formulae which are on my mouth, so that Osiris is justified against his enemies.

I am Thoth. I have soothed Horus. I have soothed the Two Companions in their moment of anger. If I have come, it is for washing the blood after soothing the tumult and correcting for him any bad.

The second part (half of col. 19 – col. 26, yellow-framed on fig. 1) consists of a hymn to Osiris, introduced by the expression ind hr.k. This text begins with several epithets of the god. After that, wishes are addressed to him that he may live again and forever.

I would like to highlight here that the hymn to Osiris is framed by the two halves of the aretalogy of Thoth. I shall come back to that point later.

The vignette of BD182

I know of two examples presenting a vignette for BD 182. These are P. London BM EA 10010 (the papyrus of Muthetepty) and P. Luxor J 24 (papyrus of Ta-usret-en-per-nesut).
Since the papyrus of Muthetepty is the one on which the vignette is complete, it is the one on which I carried out my analysis.

The vignette of BD182 (fig. 2) is composed of three registers. The upper and lower ones consist of a row of protective genies or demons, equipped with knives, lizards or snakes. Some of them are represented standing while others are seated on a kind of throne. The middle register depicts the mummy of the deceased lying on a bed, inside a funerary shrine. Under the bed are represented three vessels used during the mummification. Behind the mummy’s head stands the goddess Nephthys, followed by two Sons of Horus, Amsit and Qebehsenuf. On the other side of the shrine are represented the goddess Isis and the two others Sons of Horus, Hapy and Duamutef.

![Fig. 2 – vignette of BD182 from BM EA 10010 (Naville I, 1886)](image)

---

21 This kind of furniture matches the hieroglyphic sign coded Q12.

22 In the Totenbuch Projekt database, P. Luxor J 24 is said to present a part of the vignette of BD 182 (it indeed includes only two registers and only three demons on the upper one). Nevertheless, if compared to the one on BM EA 10010, we may notice significant similarities. On the upper register are pictured three demons facing right: a human genie with the snw-sign on the head, seated and holding a snake-stick and a knife (the latter does not seem to appear in the depiction of this genie by Muthetepty’s. This could be a variation made in P. Luxor J 24 in an attempt to present the possible kinds of symbols.); a lion-headed demon standing and holding a snake-stick in each hand; and a canid-headed genie seated and holding a lizard in each hand. The first two stand on BM EA 10010, in the same order but on the lower register and facing left. The last one is on the upper register in both papyri, but facing right on BM EA 10010 and left on P. Luxor J 24. The second register shows the mummy surrounded by a canid-headed god holding a w3l-stick and a wꜢḥ-stick on its left, and a goddess holding a ‘nh-sign on its right.
Different analyses can be made considering the structure of this vignette. They can help to highlight particular display of the components of the picture and the links they can share with each other. In this paper I will present two examples of such analyses. In both cases only the upper and lower registers will be taken in account.

Vertical reading

The first example of analysis, which I term ‘vertical reading’ (see fig. 3), deals with the layout of the demons in both upper and lower registers. In this case, the comparison between both registers is based on a mirror symmetry, whose axis is constituted by the middle register. When we look at the two central pairs of demons (canid-headed and ram-headed demons above; lion-headed [?] and orycteropus-headed [?] demons below), we notice that the four of them hold two identical symbols (two lizards, two knives or two snakes). As for the four other pairs of demons, they are symmetrically laid out. Furthermore their distribution comprises here a chiasmus so that the order of symbols is reversed: the one-symbol-holder above (first character) goes with the second one below; the two-symbol-holder (second character of the upper register) matches the first one of the lower register; the no-symbol-holder (fifth demon above) matches the sixth one below and finally, the one-symbol-holder (sixth character of the upper register) goes with the fifth one below.

Fig. 3 – layout of the vignette
**Linear reading**

I name the second example ‘linear reading’ (see fig. 4). When considering the symbols (three are here at stake: the snake, the lizard and the knife) held by the demons, one can remark that their succession is the same in both registers. The reading follows the direction pointed by the arrows. In each register we begin with the sequence here marked by dark blue, which gathers four identical symbols: lizards are represented on the upper register, and snakes on the lower one. This sequence is interrupted in both registers by a different symbol (dark-framed): the upper register presents no symbol (for practical reasons I will speak here of an ‘empty symbol’) while the lower one shows a knife. Then a new group of three identical symbols can be spotted (it is coloured in turquoise in both registers): lizards occupy the upper register and knives figure on the lower one. Both registers end with an isolated symbol, which I framed in red: we notice a snake above and an ‘empty symbol’ below.

It is thus obvious to me that the demons which compose both registers correspond to a specific organization, to an accurate design planned by the composer or the craftsman of this vignette. The construction of the image is in this case far from coincidence and, in my opinion, was worth highlighting.

Fig. 4 – succession of symbols (see arrows)
The link between the text and the vignette

We come now to the point of this discussion: the question of the links between the text and the image.

First of all, if we examine the structure of both text and vignette, we can notice that the same structure appears. In the second part of this paper, I showed that the text of BD 182 can be divided into two parts, which comprise an aretalogy of Thoth on the one hand, and a hymn to Osiris on the other. Furthermore the latter is framed by the aretalogy text. In the same way, I pointed that the vignette is also composed of two parts: the mummy of the deceased, presented under its shrine, and, all around it, a set of demons and deities such as Isis, Nephthys and the Sons of Horus.

The themes that are evoked in BD 182 are also another element that can be analysed. My analysis points out two main themes: the protection of the deceased, and his rebirth.

The idea of protection appears quite obviously in the text: it is the very role of the god. He acts for the benefit of the deceased to protect him against his potential enemies in the Netherworld. On the vignette, this theme is reflected by the demons positioned in the upper and lower registers. Such demons appear as statues in kings’ tombs. Some of them have holes pierced in their hands. It is therefore possible that these statues were once holding things, like snakes, lizards or knives. The position of the demons on the vignette of BD 182 seems to follow the position of the mummy. On BM EA 10010, they are represented facing left, towards the head of the mummy. On P. Luxor J24, the position of the mummy is reversed (right-facing) and the demons are here also looking in the direction of it (facing right). This fact does not seem a coincidence to me.

On the vignette from the papyrus of Muthetepty, one of the demons is even represented frontally, with his face turned to the outside of the image. If we project ourselves into a three-dimensional version of this vignette, we must consider that they are stationed so as to form a fence in order to protect the deceased, placed behind them. In another way, in a two-dimensional view, this manner of representing the demon may enhance the magical and performative nature of documents such as the Book of the Dead. The frontal look and its meaning were discussed by Roland Tefnin in an article of 2008. It tends to provoke fright and intimidation and can be used as a means of protection (apotropaic figure). For instance, this motif is namely to be found in the representations of the demon Bes (always frontal-looking). All the same the facing demon on the vignette of BD 182 would look directly into the eyes of anyone who holds the papyrus. As such, the rightful owner would have nothing to fear. The meaning of this frontality matches and enhances the theme of protection at issue.

The second theme that we may find in this chapter is the rebirth of the deceased. In the text, it appears in the hymn to Osiris, which intends to make the god gain eternal life in the Netherworld and win over his enemies through a row of statements and wishes. On the vignette we can find this idea on the three registers. For example, two of the symbols in the hands of the demons, namely lizards and snakes, may be linked to the idea of rebirth and regeneration. But the main register that shows the deceased’s rebirth is the middle one. It is established that in the funerary conceptions the deceased may very often become assimilated

---

23 The version of BD 182 given by the papyrus of Nestanebtasheru is also divided into two parts (the aretalogy of Thoth and the hymn to Osiris) but in this case the first one does not frame the other: the hymn simply follows the aretalogy. This may come from the fact that P. BM EA 10554 has no vignette that matches BD 182 (the two vignettes sketched above the text relate to BD 153a and 153b).
24 See for example: Taylor 2010: 200-201.
to the god Osiris. This fact is reinforced by the presence of Isis and Nephthys on each side of the mummy.

Let us also examine the mummy more closely. It lies on a bed decorated with lion heads. In the ancient Egyptian traditions concerning death and afterlife, we know of three kinds of funerary beds. The first kind is hippopotamus-headed and linked to the goddess Taweret, who is in charge of pregnant women, birth and new-borns. This fact works quite well with the re-birth of the deceased after his/her death. The second kind has cow heads and is related to Hathor as mother goddess. And finally, the third kind is the one that is depicted on the vignette of BD 182: a lion-headed bed. It has to do with the idea of solar rebirth. Let us not forget that one of the main goals of the spells from the Book of the Dead is to ensure that the deceased will come up every day like the sun in the sky. Indeed, this is where the Egyptian name of the Book of the Dead originates:  r m prt m hrw (Book of Coming Forth by Day). Since the sun rises every morning, it constitutes a good guarantee for the deceased. And thus the theme of rebirth is clearly expressed on the vignette as well.

Conclusions

The comparison between the text of BD 182 and its related vignette allowed me to highlight some of its particularities. Firstly through their structure: one part framing the other; secondly through the themes and ideas expressed in both text and picture: the protection of the deceased (the mummy on the vignette, Osiris in the text) on the one hand, and his rebirth on the other. Besides this, I have shown that the image-building was based on a certain organization of its components (a symmetry between both registers, and a repeated pattern for the succession of the symbols held by the demons).

The main feature of BD 182 is to present the figure of the deceased surrounded by a protective power. This protective power is expressed through two rows of demons on the vignette, and by the god Thoth in the text. Furthermore, such an embracing structure makes one think of another well-known image in ancient Egypt: the protecting vulture-goddess with outspread wings, represented on sarcophagi. This general view of the composition of the chapter seems to be confirmed by the title of the chapter itself. The deceased is indeed to be given the breath of life, and to be protected from his enemies in the Netherworld. Yet it is exactly what is at stake in both components of BD 182.

Thereby the vignette of BD 182 must be regarded not only as an illustration for the text but also as an alternative and independent version of it. As such, this vignette could be separated from the text without losing its efficiency.

Much research has been done on the chapters of the Book of the Dead, either on the texts or on the vignettes. However, few deal with both text and image and analyse the links these two aspects actually share with each other. This is why such a study is interesting: considering the text and the image – when a chapter includes both – should give us a better understanding of said chapter. This is what I intend to do in my PhD work: analyse the links between texts and vignettes in a selection of chapters of the Book of the Dead dated from the New Kingdom.

26 Some chapters of the Book of the Dead indeed do express this idea. BD 1’s title is accurate on that matter:  h.t-t m rl w n.w pr.t m hrw st.w s.th.w pr.t h.t m hr-t-nfr (Beginning for going out by day, of the praises and recitations for going in and out of the necropolis). BD 2, 10, 65 and 68 express the same idea. As does BD 17’s title:  h.t-t s.th.w pr.t h.t m hr-t-nfr th.t m lnmt.t nfr.t pr.t m hrw m hpr.w nb.w mrf=f (Beginning of the praises and recitations for going in and out of the necropolis, for becoming an nfr in the beautiful West, for going forth by day, taking any shape that he wishes). See also Faulkner 1985: 12; Carrier 2009: XX.
A last point I would like to discuss here is whether Thoth is regarded as a true deity in the text of BD 182 or not. Thoth used to be said not to be a real god here but the deceased speaking instead of the god (the deceased would thus here be presented as assimilated to Thoth). But following my analysis and the structure that I have highlighted, I cannot help but disagree with this view. The study of the structure shows that both text and vignette comprise two parts. One depicts the deceased (in the form of the mummy on the image, and through the god Osiris in the text), the other requires the intervention of a deity that uses a protective power to the benefit of the deceased. That is what we find on the vignette, especially on the two registers occupied by the demons, the goddesses Isis and Nephthys and the Four Sons of Horus. To see Thoth as the deceased playing a divine role would thus imply that he actually protects himself by his own action (which is not of divine origin). Yet the structure of the vignette requires the action of a true deity with protective powers in the text as well. Therefore we have to consider Thoth as a true god, and not as the deceased assimilated to him.
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Did the political upheaval during the Late Bronze Age cause a change in the form of Egyptian control in the Levant? An analysis of the changes in the political landscape of the Levant during the late New Kingdom.

By Edward Mushett Cole, University of Birmingham.

Abstract

Egypt was in control of the Levant from the early Eighteenth Dynasty through to the middle of the Twentieth Dynasty. It maintained this control, at least during the Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Dynasties, through a network of vassal states reinforced by Egyptian garrisons. However, during the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Dynasties the geo-political landscape of the eastern Mediterranean underwent radical changes. Many of Egypt’s major diplomatic partners collapsed and there was even an attempted invasion of Egypt itself by the Sea Peoples via the Levant. Following this attempted invasion the pattern of physical structures associated with Egyptian rule in the region changed, which has led to suggestions that the nature of Egyptian control over the region had also been altered. In this paper I will examine the features of the landscape of authority in the Levant under Egyptian rule, and any changes to its style, from the reign of Merneptah to the period following the Sea Peoples invasion in the reign of Ramesses III. This examination will provide the evidence with which to assess whether alterations in the political landscapes were designed to present a new style of Egyptian rule over the Levant and, if so, the form which this new system may have taken.

Introduction and Definitions

In this paper I will examine a slightly different ‘ritual’ landscape to those discussed in the other papers presented at the Birmingham Egyptology symposium, one of the ritual of politics. Whilst not forming a traditional ‘ritual’ landscape as commonly understood, political control has many of the facets that we would ascribe to other ritual practices: specific buildings associated with its practice, repeated actions designed to reinforce acceptance, and the construction of meaning through wider landscapes. In this particular case the landscape under discussion is the political landscape of the Levant, from the reign of Merneptah in the late Nineteenth Dynasty until after the Sea Peoples’ invasion of Year 8 in Ramesses III’s reign at the start of the Twentieth Dynasty, with the aim of this paper being to assess whether the observable alterations to this landscape were markers of a change in the form of Egyptian rule over the region. Traditionally these changes have been seen as evidence of the increasing weakness of Egypt, but I will argue here that the modifications were less a function of such weakness, and more a deliberate shift of Egyptian priorities in the region towards a focus on the economically viable areas and a new defensive strategy.

By the start of Merneptah’s reign the Levant had been under Egyptian control for nearly 250 years with an extensive system of Egyptian bases established throughout the region, but with actual control technically remaining in the hands of Canaanite vassals based

---

in the major towns of the region. Following the peace treaty between the Egyptians and the Hittites under Ramesses II there seem to have been few external threats against the region. During Merneptah’s reign some of Egypt’s vassals attempted a rebellion, quite probably at the time of the Libyan invasion in his Year 5 and thus, like the rebellion in Nubia that year, they attempted to take advantage of the preoccupation of the Egyptian army with repelling that invasion. This rebellion appears to have been rapidly crushed and Egyptian control restored, as recorded on the ‘Israel stela’. Despite dynastic issues, including at least one civil war, Merneptah’s successors seem to have maintained control over the Levant as they are attested at various sites across the region.

This control appears to have remained in place into the early Twentieth Dynasty, despite a Libyan invasion of Egypt in Ramesses III’s Year 5 that provided very similar conditions to those under which the vassals’ rebellion in Merneptah’s reign occurred. An extended period of drought, however, was present throughout the late Nineteenth Dynasty and into the Twentieth Dynasty, dramatically reducing agricultural production across the region. Within roughly the same time period a series of destructions across the region also appear to have occurred, culminating in an attempted invasion of Egypt itself during the reign of Ramesses III, probably by the Sea Peoples. Many of the Late Bronze Age Canaanite towns across the whole of the Levant were destroyed and replaced by towns with a radically different material culture. The location of Egyptian bases also changed, with many of those used in the Nineteenth Dynasty abandoned. This situation then appears to have remained stable for the remainder of Ramesses III’s reign and into that of Ramesses IV, in spite of a further Libyan invasion again diverting resources away from the area.

Before continuing to an examination of the political landscapes under the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties it is important that I provide some definitions of key terms that I will be employing throughout the rest of the paper. These are:

Politics or Political: These terms encompass four key relationships central to the maintenance, production and overthrow of sovereign authority:
- Geo-Political Relationships (Ruler-Ruler);
- Between Ruler and Subject (Ruler-Ruled);
- The connections between the elite and their links to other social groups;
- Relations between different government institutions.

For the purposes of this paper I will be focusing on the first two of these, paying particular attention to the second.

Authority: This is based on the relationship between a space or place and the agents who use or experience it. Fundamentally it rests on two processes, the ability/power to direct others and the recognition of these commands as being legitimate.

Land: The geographic features present in the Levant.

---

4 Smith 1997: 85.
5 Morris 2005: 376.
6 Davies 1997: 173-188.
9 Smith 2003: 26, 104.
Landscape: This is land that has been and is transformed through human activity or perception.11

The Political Landscapes of the Levant

Nineteenth Dynasty Landscape

As can be seen from the map of the region (see Figure 1) the Egyptians had a presence at a large number of sites across the Levant in the Nineteenth Dynasty. Despite this, their rule was based upon a series of vassal states located in the main Canaanite towns. Control over these vassals was maintained through a series of lightly fortified ‘residences’ in the major towns.12 The residences were further supported by a series of major fortresses either side of the road across the Sinai, along with another fortress in the north at Beth Shan where the coast road turned inland.13 Finally there was a series of lightly fortified outposts in the southern Levant in addition to way-stations along the Sinai section of this road which protected supplies and water sources, the maintenance of which allowed rapid movement along the main roads.14

Examination of this landscape reveals some important aspects about the nature of Egyptian rule over the Levant in the Nineteenth Dynasty. It indicates that Egyptian rule was based on control of a series of Canaanite vassal city states through the residences located in the major towns. In many ways this map reflects two political landscapes, that of the Canaanite rulers of the towns and that of the Egyptian imperial institutions overlaid onto this landscape, emphasising Egyptian superiority. The combination of a permanent Egyptian presence in the form of a lightly fortified residence to ensure the vassals’ continued loyalty

13 Ussishkin 2008: 205.
and the residences’ location within a day’s travel of each other helped to enforce Egyptian authority. The existence of all of these Egyptian bases created a landscape in which the reminders of Egyptian rule were ever present, whether travelling along the main routes or in the major towns. In this the Egyptians came close to achieving ‘geographic universality’, where an institution or authority has an imminent presence everywhere which serves as a constant reminder of its power and ability to intervene.\textsuperscript{15} That this was effective is reflected not just in the Egyptian control of the region for roughly three centuries, but also in Merneptah’s quick suppression of the rebellion when it did appear. Not only did not all of the vassal states rebel, but the design of the Egyptian political landscape allowed troops to move quickly to suppress those that did.

The landscape under the Nineteenth Dynasty also shows that the Levant was considered as an external territory, albeit one that was relatively safe from attack. The actual border of Egypt was marked with large scale fortresses and close monitoring of those who were attempting to pass across in either direction.\textsuperscript{16} Additionally, the border of Egyptian controlled territory was considered to be much further to the north in southern Lebanon and Syria, reflected in the relative lack of fortification and the spacing of Egyptian bases in the region which allowed for rapid transit and supply of large forces moving north towards the border with the Hittites.

Figure 2: The landscape of the Sinai and Levant under the Twentieth Dynasty, black squares denote known Egyptian bases, clear squares are probable Egyptian bases, clear squares with a cross are dubious Egyptian bases and clear circles are towns or cities (Morris 2005: 716; 717 with some modification by the author).

\textit{Twentieth Dynasty Landscape}

As the second map immediately demonstrates (see Figure 2), the landscape in the Twentieth Dynasty has dramatically changed from that under Merneptah. Some of the Egyptian bases

\textsuperscript{15} Smith 2003: 109.

\textsuperscript{16} As recorded in the border journal preserved on P. Anastasi III from Merneptah’s reign and P. Anastasi VI from either his or his son Sety II’s reign, detailing who had passed through one of the border fortresses to and from the Levant (Gardiner 1961: 274; Redford 1992: 228, 318; Morris 2005: 478-489).
have disappeared and only a few new positions have replaced them, and most of those are not located in major population centres. In addition to these changes many of the Canaanite city states have been destroyed, particularly those along the coast. The material culture of the settlements built over the destruction layer shows a clear break from the previous Canaanite settlement with the majority having strong Aegean influences, seen as marking the settlement of the Sea Peoples/Philistines in the south after their defeat by Ramesses III. The Egyptian bases appear to be located around this Philistine zone, in the areas where the remaining vassal Canaanite city states continued intact. They are also located in strategic positions to monitor the main trade routes through the region and the main agriculturally productive areas. The surviving or newly constructed bases were now, mostly, larger than those of the Nineteenth Dynasty and were also more heavily fortified. Several also had an Egyptian temple built within their walls.

There appear to have been a number of reasons for the disappearance of Egyptian bases between the reign of Merneptah and sometime after Year 8 of Ramesses III. Whilst some were certainly destroyed as a result of the Sea Peoples, whether through raids or invasion, others appear to have been intentionally abandoned, particularly the way-stations along the road across the Sinai. Whether this was done in advance of the Sea Peoples’ invasion or afterwards remains a topic of debate related to that regarding the location of Ramesses III’s victories against them.

Significance of the Changed Landscape

Having established that there was a clear change in the political landscape between Merneptah’s reign and the period following the Sea Peoples’ invasion it is now pertinent to discuss what these changes mean in terms of Egypt’s control over the region. Previous attempts to explain the changes to the landscape have viewed them as a result of the Egyptians’ weakened status, with this marking the beginning of the political and social decline of Egypt. Instead, I see the changes to the Canaanite landscape and the value of land in the region as causing a conscious re-organisation of the priorities of the Egyptian administration over the Levant, focusing upon areas deemed productive, in order to maintain their geographic universality in those areas. This is reflected in the alterations to the Egyptians’ political landscape in the region.

The changes in the Egyptian political landscape appear to demonstrate an increased emphasis on control of economic resources by the Egyptians. This is visible in the placement of Egyptian bases near the main trade routes through the region, the establishment

24 Possible reasons for these forts to disappear include Egyptian withdrawal from the region, whether as a product of internal problems or economic weakness (Weinstein 1992: 147; Morris 2005: 709, 711), uprisings by foreign troops in Egyptian service (see Weinstein 1992: 147-148), or earthquakes (see Nur and Cline 2000 and Cline 2011).  
of trade settlements at some bases, particularly Tell es-Sa'idiyeh, and the maintenance of contact with the remaining Canaanite city states. This focus is further supported by the votive bowls found at various sites, such as at Deir el-Balah, Tel Sera' and Lachish, which record large amounts of grain being given to the Egyptian authorities as tax.

This structure does not appear to be very different, however, from the previous landscape, where the Egyptians were directly supervising the Canaanite towns that controlled the countryside and were also monitoring the trade routes. Where a difference between the two occurs it is as a result of the changes to both the land and the landscape between the reigns of Merneptah and Ramesses III. The land of the region would have been fundamentally altered by the extended drought that occurred during this period, which would have limited the areas where agricultural production would have produced a surplus. As a result of both the drought and the intervention of the Sea Peoples many of the city states that Egypt had used to control the region had collapsed, changing the landscape and necessitating the Egyptians’ greater involvement in tax collection to ensure that they received the taxes. Perhaps, as Morris suggests, this led them to try to integrate the region more thoroughly into the Egyptian administration by establishing temples to oversee this production as in Egypt. They may also have had to directly supervise this process in order to protect these agricultural areas from nomadic groups who, being more affected by the drought, might have threatened such areas in search of access to guaranteed food sources.

By focusing resources on the bases here, in the more populated areas, the Egyptians would also have maintained a form of geographic universality which helped to impose their authority on the region. With bases covering the still productive agricultural areas and the main routes through the region, images of Egyptian authority would have remained present for the majority of people living there, an impression reinforced by the regular patrols that these bases sent out. This focus on populated areas may explain the lack of interest in the territory which suffered destruction by the Sea Peoples, visible in the lack of a significant Egyptian presence as detailed in the second map, as it remained only lightly populated, with the exception of the towns.

It is not necessary for this article to become involved in the debate as to whether Ramesses III settled the Sea Peoples in this area of the southern Levant after his victory over them, or whether they settled there themselves. It is important, however, for this paper to comment on the apparent assumption that the new Philistine cities within this territory

30 This is apparent from the map where some of the Egyptian bases remained within these surviving Canaanite towns, such as at Lachish and Tel el-Farah (Morris 2005: 713; Ussishkin 2008: 207-211), but also in the evidence of Egyptian artefacts from sites without such a formal Egyptian presence such as Megiddo (see Ussishkin 2008: 204; Weinstein 2012: 169-170).
35 Morris 2005: 714-715. Although Egyptian temples had a primarily religious function, during the New Kingdom they also had an important administrative role, particularly in the production and collection of agricultural resources, as is clearly visible in documents such as the Wilbour Papyrus (Gardiner 1948: 297; Haring 1997: 18).
36 Finkelstein 2013: 168.
37 Although there is no direct evidence that such patrols were mounted by the Egyptian bases in the Levant, evidence for them from similar forts in Nubia (see Wente 1990: 68), and the fortresses at Egypt’s border (see Redford 1992: 228, 318; Morris 2005: 496), strongly suggests that the Egyptian bases in the Levant would have carried out similar practices.
reached their full extent within moments of being established, along with a full population, suggested to be around 25,000,\(^{40}\) and were thus able to remain outside Egyptian control—despite evidence suggesting that the countryside around these towns remained depopulated for a long period.\(^{41}\)

It is improbable that Ramesses III, a highly active king who is known to have led another campaign in the Levant against the Shasu, would have allowed a hostile but defeated force to settle in territory which he would have considered his, without ensuring some form of control over them.\(^{42}\) This suggests, therefore, that there are other reasons behind why Ramesses III did not place Egyptian bases in the Philistine towns. One possibility is that this region, devastated by the advance of the Sea Peoples, was no longer deemed worth the cost of direct monitoring by the Egyptian administration. If the initial Philistine settlements were small scale, as is more probable based on the Philistines’ supposed migration from elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean, and they had limited production of trade or agricultural products, then there would be few reasons for the Egyptians to establish bases in the region. Instead Ramesses III may have been content to have bases around this zone to monitor the area, which would also have provided the opportunity for the Egyptians to establish more direct control if the necessity arose. By the time this became necessary, however, the diversion of resources to deal with internal problems appears to have prevented it,\(^{43}\) allowing the Philistine cities to ultimately develop outside Egyptian control.

This explanation appears to be supported by the evidence within the region for the change in settlement patterns in the Philistine countryside, with villages moving to higher elevations and becoming primarily subsistence settlements, unable to provide the level of tax return that the Egyptians might have deemed worthwhile.\(^{44}\) It also correlates with the Egyptians’ increasing focus on control of economic resources,\(^{45}\) with them choosing to concentrate on areas where such resources could be more easily retrieved and where the rural population was easier to monitor. This, in turn, could be connected with the change to fewer, larger and more fortified bases, as this made constructing a new base a significant investment of resources and thus something unlikely to be placed in an area of limited economic value.\(^{46}\)

The change in the levels of fortification at the Egyptian bases is noticeable at all of the sites from the Twentieth Dynasty, with some having walls seven metres or more in depth, as

---

\(^{40}\) Stager 1998: 344; more realistic figures proposed by other scholars number the new arrivals at only a few thousand, as in Finkelstein 2000: 172.

\(^{41}\) This depopulation of the countryside is clear from archaeological surveys which reveal that there was a significant reduction in the quantity of built-up areas in the territory controlled by the Philistines (Finkelstein 1996: 231-232; 2000: 169-170). Even the key Philistine cities appear to have started off relatively small, with the ceramic evidence from Ekron suggesting that the first phase of Philistine occupation was limited to within the limits of the Late Bronze Age city (Dothan 2000: 147).

\(^{42}\) As argued by Morris 2005: 705.


\(^{44}\) Nakhai 2008: 123-124, 130.


\(^{46}\) An example of this process is the refortified Egyptian base of Beth Shan. During the Nineteenth Dynasty it was originally constructed in a form similar to the residences that were placed in Canaanite towns (see Morris 2005: 390), but in the Twentieth Dynasty its size and fortifications were increased creating a large garrison town (Weinstein 2012:168). That it was worth making such significant improvements in its defences is almost certainly its control over significant areas of arable land as well as supervision of the city state of Megiddo (Morris 2005: 390; Ussishkin 2008: 204-205; Weinstein 2012: 170-171). Another example of the increasing fortification of key sites is that of Tell el-Retabah where the previous single wall of the Nineteenth Dynasty was replaced by two walls under Ramesses III and the newly constructed fortified gate was later rebuilt to limit the passage of people to one at a time (Morris 2005: 740-741; more details in n. 47 below). This increase in defences would also have increased the cost of construction and maintenance of these bases in both physical materials and amount of labour required (both for construction and to man them) making them more expensive than their Nineteenth Dynasty predecessors.
well as having their entranceways heavily restricted. These alterations have been suggested as reflecting the Egyptians’ attempts to re-impose their authority on the region following a withdrawal to fight the Sea Peoples. However, instead of being the result of a need to re-impose their authority, I suggest that it should be seen as a product of Egypt having suffered a major invasion which had made them aware that many of the bases previously used, particularly the way-stations across the Sinai, were inadequate when dealing with such threats. Similarly, the Egyptians would also have been aware of the breakdown of the diplomatic network of the Late Bronze Age. The eastern Mediterranean was no longer dominated by a few large states with relatively stable borders, but a series of smaller states, presenting a more volatile and uncertain world and increasing the possibility of further attacks upon Egyptian territory. The increased fortification of bases was thus a response to an understanding of the wider changes across the whole eastern Mediterranean and their importance to Egyptian security.

Conclusion

I have presented evidence in this paper demonstrating that the landscape of the Levant after Year 8 of Ramesses III’s reign reflects both continuity and change in the form of Egyptian rule compared to the reign of Merneptah. The continuity came from Egyptian contact with the surviving Canaanite city states and a focus on the economic exploitation of the region. The changes between the political landscape under Merneptah and that under Ramesses III indicate an intensification of that exploitation, with economically unproductive areas (such as the area under Philistine control) deemed not worth Egyptian resources. This is supported by the increased presence of Egyptian bases in the productive countryside and the increased cost of each base as a result of every base’s increased level of fortification. The high levels of fortification now visible at these bases exemplify the Egyptians’ reaction to the changed nature of the geo-political framework following the end of the Late Bronze Age, and their understanding that the previous system of small scattered bases would not be adequate to maintain Egyptian authority in such an era. Overall it is clear that alterations in this political landscape reveal a new form of Egyptian rule, not one created by hurried attempts to maintain control over remaining territory before ultimately collapsing, but instead one made by a series of conscious decisions to maintain Egyptian authority over a region which had undergone major changes.
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