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I. Introduction

Many Egyptologists have regarded the Eighteenth Dynasty as a largely Theban phenomenon. This view, which is now demonstrably mistaken, was based upon the overwhelming amount of surviving evidence from Thebes and the royal burials there. The fragmentary monuments of Memphis, Heliopolis, and the Delta sites, however, show that they were at least comparable to those of the southern city.

At present the Memphite monumental evidence from the later Eighteenth Dynasty is largely from Sakkara. However, a considerable number of religious foundations are referred to in administrative and biographical texts. Of these, Amenhotep III's temple called Nb-M₃t-R⁵-hnmt-Pth, "United with Ptah," must have been one of the most important.

II. The Chief Steward of Memphis, Amenhotep-Huy Son of Heby

The major source of information for the temple of Amenhotep III in Memphis is the lengthy text inscribed on a statue of the Steward of Memphis (imy-r pr [wr] n Mn-nfr), Amenhotep-Huy son of Heby.¹ This quartzite statue which was discovered by Flinders Petrie in 1912 within the temenos of the "Great Ptah Temple" and which is now in the Ashmolean Museum (no. 1913.163), is of a familiar type in which the official is shown as a scribe. Bernard Bothmer has suggested that the head of this statue may be identifiable with one in Boston (MFA 29.729),² although due to damage to the neck and shoulders of the torso, it is impossible to make a join between the two pieces.

A. H. Gardiner was the first to publish the long autobiographical text which begins on the papyrus roll on the lap and continues on the base of the statue.³ He later

³ The disposition of the texts is given in Petrie, Wainwright, and Gardiner, Tarkhan I, p. 33, par. 46, followed by translation and commentary pp. 33–36 (chap. 9). The hieroglyphic text is given in pls. 79–80.

* My thanks for their comments and bibliographical references to all those who have read this paper: G. Robins, A. Roberts, W. R. Johnson, C. Loeben, and H. S. Smith.

Most abbreviations used in the citations can be found in W. Helck and E. Otto, eds., Lexikon der Ägyptologie, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. x–xxxiv.
published some further comments on the text and revised some of his readings of it. W. C. Hayes also discussed the inscription along with all of the then known monuments of this important official, who lists among his titles Priest of Weret-Hekau, Overseer of the Priests in the House of Sakhmet, and Leader of the Festivals of Ptah-South-of-his-wall and of all the Gods of Memphis. Amenhotep-Huy's major office, however, was that of Chief Steward of Memphis. Of particular interest here, he was also ḫrp kꜣw.t, Controller of Works, and, more specifically, imy-r kꜣw.t m Ḥnmt-Pḥ, Overseer of Works in (the temple) "United-with-Ptah."

Hayes, believing the protestation of Amenhotep-Huy in his autobiographical text, thought that he was of humble origins and that his parents were possibly even peasants. Such social origins for officials are extremely doubtful, but the text is interesting as yet another example of the attribution to the king alone of the official's power regardless of his family background. Indeed, there seems to be a playing down of background in the later Eighteenth Dynasty. Aanen, the brother of Queen Tiye, makes no mention of their relationship in his tomb, although the royal couple were depicted there. Similarly, the parents of Amenhotep-Huy are called simply śb and nbt pr on the only one of his monuments where they are named. In the tomb of the Vizier Ramose at Thebes, however, Amenhotep-Huy is depicted with his wife Mey and described as the brother (sn.f) of Ramose. Amenhotep-Huy's father, Heby, is also shown there but with a second wife, Apuya. These two were the parents of Ramose, who was thus actually a half-brother to Amenhotep-Huy. Heby is given, among other titles, that of Mayor of Memphis, and his own father is now known to have been a Scribe of the Cattle of Amun. Clearly, this family was very powerful in the latter part of the reign of Amenhotep III, holding the offices of Royal Steward at Memphis and

---


6 To the seventeen monuments listed in ibid., pp. 10–12 and PM III, pp. 702–3 for objects from the, as yet unlocated, Saqqara tomb, see L. Habachi in MDAIK 22 (1967): 42–47 (an embalming table from Memphis); M. Dewachter, "L'Egypte dans les musées, châteaux, bibliothèques et sociétés savantes de province," BSFE (1985): 36 and fig. 3 (shabti sarcophagus); also the double-shabti Turin, Museo Egizio 2516, of the ss nsw imy-r pr wr Ḥwty and the sš nsw imy-r pr wr Ḥwty is probably to be attributed to this man and his son; see, most recently, G. T. Martin, "Shabtis of Private Persons in the Amarna Period," MDAIK 42 (1986): 109–29, esp. p. 119, no. 16. The shabti is more likely to have a Saqqara provenance than the Amarna tomb 10 suggested for it (see n. 18 below). The removal of objects from the tomb in the early nineteenth century is discussed in Hayes, "Writing-palette," pp. 12–16; and the tomb's form and location, ibid., pp. 16–18. The stela Manchester 5050 (W. M. F. Petrie, The Palace of Apries (Memphis II) [London, 1909], pp. 14 and 21 and pls. 18 and 25) is less certainly of this man. It was dedicated by a son named Play, who is not attested by the other known monuments of this family.

7 A complete list of titles can be found in Hayes, "Writing-palette," pp. 19–20; and W. Helck, Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches (Leiden and Cologne, 1958), pp. 483–84, and discussed there pp. 368–70; see also R. Hari, Répertoire onomastique amarnien, Aegyptiaca Helvetica, vol. 4 (Geneva, 1976), no. 48, Amenhotep II.

8 See Hayes, "Writing-palette," p. 22, from l. 7, "I was young and without kindred ..."; see also p. 23.

9 Briefly in my article "Violent Images of Queenship and the Royal Cult," Wepwawet 2 (1986): 1–9, p. 3.


11 N. de G. Davies, The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose (London, 1941), pls. 9, 11, 12, and 19.

12 Ibid., pls. 10, 11, 16.
the Vizierate of Upper Egypt. There is also some suggestion that they may have been related to Amenhotep son of Hapu.

Amenhotep-Huy was succeeded as Chief Steward of Memphis by his son, Apy, who served Akhenaten. His identification with the steward Apy who owned a tomb at Amarna is uncertain, although part of a lintel gives him the title Steward of Mn-nfr as well as a position in the palace in Akhetaten (imy-r pȝ ẖb n pr ḫb [nḥ ṭ̄d ṭḥ snb] m ẖt-lmt). The lintel (Berlin-DDR 21.597) is said to have come from ‘Amarna’ but may actually have originated at Sakkarah as did a number of other of his funerary monuments.

III. The Temple of Nb-M3t-Rc Called Hnmt Pṯḥ

The temple autobiography of the steward Amenhotep-Huy recounts his appointment as Overseer of Works in the new Memphite temple and gives information about the building and its provisions. “He promoted me (line 13) to direct the constructions in his ‘House-of-Millions-of-Years’, which he newly made in his cultivated land (bẖ)” in

---

13 Ramose is attested from year 30 (ḥb-sd scenes at Soleb) until the beginning of the reign of Akhenaten. Amenhotep was probably his older half-brother. For Ramose’s titles and monuments, see Davies, “Vizier Ramose,” pp. 42–43; Helck, Verwaltung, pp. 302–4, 442–43. Heby is probably the Mayor of Memphis with this name attested in year 5 of Amenhotep III; see ibid., p. 443; also Hari, Répertoire onomatique, no. 169 Heby and no. 219 Ramose (Hari gives incorrect relationships for this family). Davies discusses the relationships (pp. 1–3), distinguishing Heby and Heby. Meryyptah, the daughter of Amenhotep-Huy, he identifies as the wife of Ramose by the same name.

14 This is an assumption based on the representation of him in the tomb of Ramose; see Davies, “Vizier Ramose,” pp. 2–3 with nn. 5–6.


16 See M. Sandman, Texts from the Time of Akhenaten, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 8 (Brussels, 1938), p. 158; M. Cramer, MDAIK 9 (1940): 125 and pl. 20a; Ag. Inschr. II, p. 399; CoA III, p. 199(g).

17 So the register of the Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin. My thanks to W. Müller for help in the Ägyptische Sammlung.

18 The known monuments of Apy are given in Hayes, “Writing-palette,” p. 24, and Helck, Verwaltung, pp. 370 and 485; additional bibliography can be found in PM III 2, p. 704 (objects from unlocated Saqqara tomb, usually dated “temp. Tutankhamun”). The double-shabti in Turin (Museo Egizio 2516; see n. 6 above) is almost certainly to be attributed to this Apy. A suggested Amarna Tomb 10 provenance is perhaps less likely than the Saqqara tomb, which had a number of monuments made by Apy associating him with his father. Also from the Saqqara tomb may be the block in Jerusalem published by Martin in Corpus of Reliefs of the New Kingdom from the Memphite Necropolis and Lower Egypt I (London, 1987), no. 54, p. 25 and pl. 18. See also Hari, Répertoire onomatique, no. 31 Ipy II and Ipy VI. The letter from Apy to Akhenaten, dated to year 5, is discussed by E. F. Wente, “The Gurob Letter to Amenhotep IV,” Serapis 6 (1980): 209–15.

19 Written (11.2; 13 and restored 26) ḫȝ, Gardner translates as “cultivated land” but notes (p. 33, n. 2) “Lit. ‘ground liable to be inundated’.” A Memphite bẖ of Amenhotep III’s reign is discussed by H. Wild in “Une Stèle memphite du règne d’Aménophis III à Lausanne, Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Sauneron 1927–1976, vol. 1, Égypte pharaonique” (Cairo, 1979), pp. 305–18, esp. 312–15. A hieratic ostracon in the Louvre dating from year 42 of Ramesses II mentions a prince, Si-Montu, describing himself as [Overseer?] m bẖ n pr Wsr-Mȝt-Rc ‘sip n Rc ʾnh ṭḥ snb m Mn-nfr’. Gardner translated bẖ here as “orchard.” Helck, Verwaltung, pp. 168–69, suggests that bẖ here = ḫmw and that it refers to vineyards. He cites W. Spiegelberg, ZÄS 58 (1923), where various examples are given from the Ramessseum amphora, and they appear to relate to vineyards in the Delta; bẖ is also discussed in H. Frankfort and J. D. S. Pendlebury, The City of Akhenaten, pt. 2 (London, 1933), pp. 105–6 and ibid., pt. 3, pp. 167–68, where the association with vineyards is again suggested. In the Amenhotep-Huy text, bẖ may mean only land which was liable
the west of Hwt-k3-Pth (14) in the district of ‘nh-t3wy.” The definition of the temple as a “House-of-Millions-of-Years” is significant and indicates that it was of a type similar to the Theban “mortuary” temples and temples at Heliopolis, Abydos, and in Nubia.20 In these temples, the cults of the king (usually in the form of the royal k3) and the royal ancestors were associated with the presiding deity of the domain (pr).21

The name of the temple is given in line 1 as hwt Nb-M3-i-Rc hnmnt-Pth and later as hwt.f nt hnmnt-Pth (lines 25 and 34). Following the pattern of other temples of this type, the full description can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty as Hwt nt hhw m nnpwt Nb-M3-i-Rc-hnmnt-Pth m pr Pth.22

Temple names, including the element hnmnt, are familiar from Thebes in the Eighteenth Dynasty and later, most notably in the names of the “mortuary” temples of the Ramessides: hnmnt W3st (the Ramesseum) and hnmnt nh3 (Medinet Habu). As Harold Nelson commented in his study of Amun of “United-with-Eternity,”23 it is extremely difficult to approach any understanding of the exact meaning or implications of these names. Nelson suggested that “possessed of” in some cases24 was perhaps nearer the idea than the customary “united with.” He observed, however, that this could not apply in all instances, especially when a place-name is included (e.g., hnmnt W3st, hnmnt T3-wr). Nelson’s own preference, at least in relation to Medinet Habu, was “merged with,” but he felt that this has “perhaps too philosophical an implication.”

The major issue is whether it is the temple or the king himself which is to be conceived as “united with Ptah.” If it is the temple, it could refer to either a topographical relationship, i.e., that the Amenhotep III temple was physically adjacent to the main Ptah temple or to a situation in which the new temple was considered a spiritual and administrative appendage of the ancient sanctuary.25 As to the latter possibility, there is direct evidence that both the Theban temples (in relation to Amun) and the Amenhotep III temple were so conceived. The use of the feminine form in the temple name itself suggests that the epithet refers to the temple rather than the king.26 There is, however, a strong possibility that it was the king himself who was regarded as “united with” or “merged with” Ptah, thereby appearing as an hypostasis of the god.

---

20 Among the temples given this designation are the ëy-mnw of Thutmose III at Karnak, the temple of Sety I at Abydos, the Ramesseum, Abu Simbel, Medinet Habu, and temples of Ramesses III at Heliopolis named in Pap. Harris.


24 For example, possessed of “life” (‘nh), “joy” (rswt), eternity (nhb), “beauty” (nfrwt).

25 Alison Roberts suggests to me the possibility that the Amenhotep III temple was so attached because it owed to the Ptah temple its offerings and hence life.

26 While I cannot totally exclude the interpretation, what does it mean to have a temple “merged with nfrwt”? The tendency for the epithet “united-with-eternity” to be applied to Amun, while a late example, at least suggests the possibility that the temple occupant came to be considered as holder of the description. The temple of Ramesses III, as the name is preserved in Harris 5, 6 f. is hnm rswt m ëpt swt. This may be due, however, to late Egyptian
To illustrate briefly the use of \(hnmt(t)\) in other New Kingdom royal contexts: Hatshepsut added \(hnmt\ 3lmn\) to her nomen;\(^{27}\) Amenhotep III at the celebration of the \(hb-sd\) was called \(hnmr\ shmty.\)\(^{28}\) The term is also found in queens' titularies and epithets:\(^{29}\) Tiye is \(hnmt\ nsw\ H^r-m-M^3t\) in a \(hb-sd\) scene in the tomb of Kheruef at Thebes;\(^{30}\) Nefertiti is \(hnmt\ ity\) when she accompanies Ramesses II smiting foes at Abu Simbel.\(^{31}\) In all of these instances, the term seems to indicate that two (perhaps unequal) elements which retain their own physical identity are conjoined, one (the "lesser") acquiring the [magical?] power or potency of the other (the "greater"). So the king assumes the power of the double crown,\(^{32}\) Tiye and Nefertiti that of the respective king,\(^{33}\) Hatshepsut that of Amun, and, perhaps here, \(Nh-M^3t-r^*\) that of Ptah.

Throughout the text (lines 1, 22, 45), the name of the king is written with a single sign \(\setlength{\unitlength}{3mm} \begin{picture}(1,1)\put(0,0){\line(1,0){1}}\end{picture}\) and without cartouche. These instances refer to either the temple name or statue, i.e., a cultic context. Writing of the name as a single sign and without cartouche is common on seals of Amenhotep III's reign,\(^{34}\) although less well attested from monumental inscriptions.\(^{35}\) Akhenaten, Tutankhamun, and Ramesses II all have their names written without cartouche when they appear in a divine form.\(^{36}\) Anaglyphic statue groups of the royal name are also known from the reign of Amenhotep III.\(^{37}\) In

---

\(^{27}\) This necessarily brief discussion of \(hnmt\) is merely a suggestion based upon a small amount of material. A fuller, and more rigorous, examination of all uses of the term might suggest a different interpretation. Also see my brief allusion in "Violent Images," \(^{2}\) esp. n. 20. Suffice it to say, "united with" does not embrace all of the associations the Egyptians would have understood.

\(^{28}\) The Epigraphic Survey, The Tomb of Kheruef, OIP 102 (Chicago, 1980), pp. 26; cf. \(hnmt\ nfr\ hdt\), a title frequently used by queens and princesses of the time of Amenemhat II until Hatshepsut (L. Troy, Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myst and History, Boreas 14 [Uppsala, 1986], Register B, pp. 180–97 D3/1); for \(hnmt\ hdt\), see KR II, 480.13.14.

\(^{29}\) See Troy, Queenship, Register B: A1/26; A1/29–30 (see n. 30 below); A1/33; A2/10 \(hnmt\ \text{rtsw},\) Nefertiti; A2/15, \(hnmt\ nfrw.s,\) Nefertiti; A3/8 (see n. 31 below); A3/9 \(hnmt\ Hr.s;\) A3/10 \(hnmt\ lb nsw,\) Ptolemaic; B2/29; B4/13 \(hnmt\ hswt\) Nefertiti; D3/1.

\(^{30}\) Epigraphic Survey, The Tomb of Kheruef, pl. 49. Troy reads the name as \(H^r-m-Sw.\)

\(^{31}\) Troy, Queenship, A3/8; see Ch. Desroches-Noblecourt and Ch. Kuentz, Le Petit Temple d’Abou Simbel, CEDAE Mémoires, vol. 2, Planches (Cairo, 1968), pl. 33. It is interesting to note that in this scene the king accompanied by the \(k^2\)-standard, as he is in the parallel scene pl. 36, although this may be due to the very lengthy titulary of the queen here, the \(k^3\) presumably being understood as present. This type of scene I noted in "Violent Images." For the queen in this scene in the role of Maet, see Troy, Queenship, p. 64.

---


\(^{33}\) In both baldachin scenes and smiting scenes the queen appears like Maet, as the companion of Re, discussion of which can be found in Troy, Queenship, p. 61.

\(^{34}\) See the Malkata jar sealings in Hayes, "Inscriptions from the Palace of Amenhotep III," JNES 10 (1951): 35–40, 82–104, 156–83, 231–42, fig. 25 E, F, and comments p. 158 and n. 280, citing further examples; also fig. 30, VIII, a brick stamp; also many document sealings, fig. 31, S10–11, S18–19, S22–23, S25–27, S29–31, S33, S36, S40; fig. 32, S46–47, S49, S62–63, S65–74, S76–79, S81, S83, S85–88; fig. 33, S89, S90, S94. In many of the document sealings, the solar disk is written directly over the head but not resting on it. \(Nh-M^3t\) also appears as a single group with white crown (S64), double crown (S80, S91), and \(hpr\) (S52).

\(^{35}\) See, however, A. Varille, "Un Colosse d'Amonophis III dans les carrières d'Assouan," RD 2 (1935): 175–76 on a text at Aswan referring to a \(twt\) \(\setlength{\unitlength}{3mm} \begin{picture}(1,1)\put(0,0){\line(1,0){1}}\end{picture}\) \(\text{n}\) \(hnmt,\) "Nh-M^3t-r^*\) \(R^*-n-bk\)," in which the king's name is written as a single sign.


\(^{37}\) See Habachi in The Tomb of Kheruef, text, p. 20, nn. 16 and 17, a statue formerly Berlin 2293, destroyed during World War II. Although such writings are very frequent in the Tutankhamun jewelry, large-scale statues are more common from the reign of Ramesses II, either as free-standing groups (Habachi, Features of the Deification of Ramesses II [Glückstadt, 1969], pp. 38–39, fig. 27) or as votive
line 7 the name is written normally and within a cartouche where it refers to the ruler within a temporal/historical context.

**THE TEMPLE OF N.B-M3'T-R' AND THE DOMAIN OF PTAH**

The relationship of the temple of Amenhotep III to the pr-domain of Ptah in Memphis is stated in the Amenhotep-Huy inscription and a parallel drawn with the "mortuary" temples and Amun domain at Thebes. In his discussion of the text, Gardiner\(^{38}\) considered this administrative relationship between the Theban temples and the domain of Amun and the implications of a similar situation being revealed by this text.\(^{39}\)

His Majesty caused this hwt-mansion to be on the endowment (hr sdf\(\tilde{s}\))\(^{40}\) of the hwt-mansion of Ptah in every writing belonging to it, like the hwtw-mansions of the Kings of Upper and Lower Egypt which are beside his father Amun in the Southern City, it being under the authority of every Steward of the king [who there shall be].

Exactly how this relationship functioned in practice is rather less clear. Nelson discusses the new offerings established by Ramesses III at Medinet Habu, which are headed by those to Amun in Karnak.\(^{41}\) But as Nelson says, this may well refer to an image (or images) of the Amun of Karnak "within" (hry ib) Medinet Habu, this deity being referred to in the temple's inscriptions. The Amenhotep-Huy text is equally vague in its reference to the new daily offerings established by the king, which are made to Ptah-south-of-his-wall and to "the gods of [this] House." The inscription does not specify whether Ptah is meant here to indicate the cult image of the god in the main Memphite sanctuary or, as is perhaps more likely, an image in the new temple.

Amenhotep III's temple "United-with-Ptah" is explicitly stated to be under the control of the Chief Steward of Memphis and all future Stewards. As such, it must have provided an additional income for the holder of that office, although why it should be given to the Royal Stewards is not detailed.\(^{42}\) Amenhotep-Huy, is not,
however, given the title “Steward of Hnmt-Pth.” Apy, Amenhotep-Huy’s son and successor as Steward of Memphis, is not recorded as holding a title associating him with this temple or corresponding constructions of Akhenaten and Tutankhamun. An official of Ramesses II, however, held an identical post.

As the domains of Amun at Thebes and Ptah at Memphis, so also that most august of the Heliopolitan fanes, of Re-Harakhty-Atum, possessed its satellite “Houses-of-Millions-of-Years.” Such a system prevailed also in the smaller “provincial” towns. While these “subsidiary” temples at Thebes, Heliopolis, and Memphis were all somehow administratively related to the main sanctuaries of Amun, Re, and Ptah, they were also physically within their neighborhoods. The relationship of the temples of Ramesses II in Nubia to their respective pr-domains, therefore, presents an interesting problem. The three latest temples constructed by the king, es-Sebua, Gerf Hussein, and ed-Derr, are each described as “the House of Ramesses within the pr-domain of Amun/Ptah/Re.” Whether this means that they were actually in some way under the jurisdiction of the Egyptian cult centers is unfortunately far from clear. The Nauri decree of Sety I is usually interpreted as indicative of a connection between the king’s Abydos temple and land interests in Upper Nubia. Similarly, it has been suggested that the gold production of Nubia was partly, if not entirely, controlled by the temple

recorded on Malkata labels (Hayes, “Inscriptions,” p. 98, labels 3 and 58 [a]; also on p. 100 and 102), and a statue in Leiden, which Hayes thought was associated with the Memphite temple, although the evidence is not specific.

None such are as yet known, although both kings did erect temples in the Memphite region. Of interest from the late Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Dynasties is evidence for the cults of Old Kingdom rulers, in some cases associated with their pyramids. Particularly favored appears to have been Teti I, who is shown as acting in interregnum on a stela in Boston (MFA 25.635; see D. Dunham, “Four New Kingdom Monuments in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston,” JE 21 [1935]: 148–49, pl. 17, 2) and being worshiped within his pyramid (Marrellse Chateau Borély 21); see D. Wildung, “Die Kneiffigur am Opferbecken: Überlegungen zur Funktion altägyptischer Plastik,” Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst 36 [1985]: 31 ff., Beleg. 13, figs. 23 and 25). On the latter, the king is called Teti-mer-yn-Pth, written with and without cartouche.

J. Berlandini, “La Pyramide <ruinée> de Sakkarar-Nord et Menkaou Lor,” BSFE 83 (1978): 24–35, gives four examples of late Eighteenth Dynasty reliefs from Saqqara with representations of Old Kingdom rulers. The kings worshiped included Djoser, Userkaf, Djedkare, Neferkare, Menkhauhor, and Teti. It is worth pointing out that the kings depicted in the royal statue processions at the Min Festival in the Ramesses (CEDAE Ramesseum XI, pls. 9–11) and Medinet Habu show Meni, Nebhepetre, and the rulers of the Eighteenth Dynasty. Statues depicted in private tombs include, in addition, the rulers of the Seventeenth Dynasty as well as many queens and royal children. This suggests that the royal ancestor cults in Thebes focused on Meni as the founder of the state, on Nebhepetre as founder of the Middle Kingdom, and on the more recent rulers buried in the Theban necropolis. The extent to which these royal ancestor cults were promoted in the later Eighteenth Dynasty, and their relationship to or influence by “Amarna” or “Post-Amarnia” religious trends is beyond the scope of this article. For some royal ancestor cults at Akhetaten, see J. D. S. Pendelbury, The City of Akhenaten, p. 200, sec. 4.

See Gardiner, Wilbour Papyrus, vol. 2, p. 12. Gardiner comments on Yahudiyyeh and Atar-en-Naby as “outside” the city, but surely this indicates only that the pr-domain of Re actually covered the whole of the nome of Heliopolis, if not more. Egyptian “towns,” in any case, hardly conformed to our modern notions.


Cf., however, Gardiner, ibid., pp. 153–54, §237, an hwt of Ramesses II “Beloved-like-Re,” which Gardiner tentatively proposed (p. 12) to be at or near Kom Medinet Ghurab at the entrance to the Fayum, although this is not certain.

of Amun at Karnak. While in terms of precious commodities such as gold the connection would be viable, it is difficult to see how in practice this would work for temples such as Gerf Hussein, es-Sebua, or ed-Derr, which presumably had neither large or particularly productive land Holdings nor direct control of precious commodity production. The name given to the temple-town of Amara, Hnmt W bracket st, similarly suggests a connection with Thebes or the Ramessum. Indeed, in this light it is worth considering the inclusion of Soleb temple (if the identification is correct) among the monuments listed on the stela of Amenhotep III (Cairo 34025 recto) originally from Kom el-Heitan. The temple described is said to be “on the ground of Amun”; however, all of the other works of the king referred to are within the Theban region.

As has been argued elsewhere, the temple-towns in Nubia provided the basis for a redistributive economy similar to Egypt’s, as well as being the centers for the propagation of Egyptian kingship ideologies. Were the ties between Egypt and Nubia somehow strengthened by creating a spiritual link between the temples and the major cult centers within Egypt itself?

THE BUILDING, ITS ENDOWMENTS, AND ITS STATUES

Amenhotep describes the temple structure in the conventional language of royal building texts (lines 15-17), giving little indication of its actual size or form. W bracket p-brick-priests and the hm ntr prophets were appointed from among the children of the nobles of Memphis, and the temple was endowed with estates and cattle (lines 19-20). Unfortunately, the details are not recorded in the text, which gives the impression of being a shortened version of the king’s own dedicatory inscription.

Labels from some of the Malkata wine jars record wine of the Memphite foundation of Amenhotep III of year 26, indicating that the estates were functioning even if the temple itself had not been completed. Other jars from Malkata contained wine of year 37 from the estate.

48 The idea has been based very largely on the title “Overseer of the Gold Lands of Amun,” which was used by a number of Viceroy.
49 Unless they were given interests in the mines, or levied duty on Nile transport, for which there is no evidence.
50 The name is attested only in Twentieth Dynasty texts from Amara.
51 Cairo 34025 (recto); see PM II 2, pp. 447-48, Helek, Urk. IV 1646-57 (562), the relevant section 1655-56. The reference to a temple named H bracket m-M bracket M bracket 3 bracket n was taken by Helek (ibid., and Haeny, “Fonction religieuse,” p. 115, n. 18) to be the Soleb temple, while Varille believed another temple in the Karnak complex was meant. The Monthu temple of Amenhotep III in North Karnak (PM II 2, pp. 1-10) has this name, although if it was a Monthu temple, there is no reason that it should have been included in the dedications to Amun (textual evidence suggests that originally it may have been a temple to Amun and only later became associated with Monthu). The description of the temple on the stela as a hwt n hhw m rnapw may be significant here.
52 The stela is, in effect, the building works of the king within the domain of Amun and presumably a similar inscription(s) recorded his building works for Ptah and other deities.
53 See again my article “Politics, Economics, and Ideology,” p. 29 and pp. 43-47 (III), with references.
54 The description of the temple is rather characteristic of Egyptian building texts; see, for example, the Amenhotep III stela (Cairo 34025) and the Soleb building texts Urk. IV, 1750-52 (588 A-F). It is worth noting that the Memphite temple is not mentioned in the enumeration of Amenhotep III’s building works on Cairo 34025 (see n. 52 above) or any other monument of the king discovered so far.
55 See Hayes, “Inscriptions,” fig. 4, no. 3.
56 Ibid., fig. 6, no. 58, and discussion of the estate pp. 98-99.
One might speculate that architecturally *Hnmt-Pth* resembled the king’s other major temples at Luxor, Kom el-Heitan, and Soleb, all of which share certain similar features.\(^{57}\)

The temple had a named statue of the king, a feature found in some of the Theban “mortuary” temples as well as in “cult” temples.\(^{58}\) Amenhotep-Huy himself endowed this statue:

(22) Now behold, I appointed property by written deed out of my fields, my serfs, and my cattle on behalf of the *twt*-statue of *Nbt-M\(^{53} t-Rc* whose name is [united-with-Ptah?] (\(p^5\ twt\ n\ ns\ twt\ bity\ Nbt-M\(^{53} t-Rc\) nty\ rnf\ f\ ...\)) (23) which his majesty [had made] for his father Ptah in this *pr*-sanctuary. Specification of the same: fields, 210 arouras in the northern province, and lands, 220 arouras of what had been given to me by the favor of the king.\(^{59}\)

Total, fields [430] arouras.

[in addition to . . .] (24) . . . 10 . . . 1,000 egg-laying geese, 1,000 pigs, 1,000 young(?), pigs. His majesty praised me on account of it, inasmuch as I appeared excellent in his heart.

These lavish donations to the royal statue were rewarded with the king’s gift of the statue of Amenhotep-Huy on which the text is carved, permission to set it up within the new temple, and a grant of offerings from the royal cult.

(1) (This statue was) given as a favor [from the king] (and placed) in the House of *Nbt-M\(^{53} t-Rc* (called) *Hnmt-Pth*.

(25) His Majesty gave me divine offerings of that which had come forth from before his *hnty*-statue in his *hwt*-House “United-with-Ptah” [which he made in (26) his cultivated land west of] *Hwt-k3-Pth*. When moreover the god has sated himself with his possessions and this *twt*-statue (also) has received its meals, then provisions shall be caused to go up before this humble servant by the hand of the lector who is in his *pr*-house, and the \(w^b\)-priest of the hour shall make offering . . . .

The daily offerings are then listed (lines 27–31). The contractual impression is confirmed by the closing part of the text.

(36) I have not made mention of more than my own belongings, I have not demanded aught (37) over and above; forasmuch as I appointed property by written deed for this *twt*-statue of the king which is in (38) his house [\(hwt.f\)] in exchange for his giving to me divine offerings that come in and came forth from (39) before his *hnty*-statue after the ritual sacrifice has been made, so as to establish my provisions for (40) future generations to come.

Two royal statues are referred to in the text, using the designations *twt* and *hnty*. Egyptian texts commonly use three different words to describe various types of statues: *twt*, *hnty*, and *s\$mw\ hwl*. Assuming that the Egyptians themselves used the terminology precisely, however, we do not know what exactly each specifies.

The word *twt* is usually taken simply to mean a “statue,”\(^{60}\) and the form *twt\ 3* to specify a “colossus.”\(^{61}\) *Hnty* is usually translated as “processional statue” and thought

\(^{57}\) To speculate is, however, all one can do, at least until further evidence is forthcoming.

\(^{58}\) For example, the Colossi of Memnon and the statue before Karnak tenth pylon, the fallen colossus of Ramesses II in the Ramesseum, and at Luxor before the first pylon and in the first courtyard.

\(^{59}\) Gardiner’s correction of his original translation in “Ramessean Texts,” p. 59, n. 6.

\(^{60}\) *Twt* can refer to two dimensional images as well as statues.

\(^{61}\) So, for example, the Memnon colossi and the statue referred to in the Aswan graffiti (n. 353 above) and also the statue before the Luxor pylon; see Habachi, “Deification of Ramesses II,” pl. 9a.
to refer to the statue kept within the shrine of the sacred bark. Similarly, ssnw hwi is also thought to apply to a statue kept within a bark-shrine.

In the Amenhotep-Huy inscription, the statue to which his donation of land and property is made is described as p3 twt n nswt bity Nb-M3't-Rc nty rn.f [. . . name destroyed]. This may have been a colossus which stood at the entrance or in the forecourt of the temple. Named colossi of Amenhotep III are preserved at Karnak and Kom el-Heitan, and others are known from inscriptions and fragments. Similar statues of later rulers, most notably Ramesses II, are known from a number of different sites in Egypt and Nubia. These colossi, discussed by Labib Habachi, acted as intermediaries, had their own priesthoods and chantresses, and owned estates.

A number of statue names are recorded in texts and on statues, some of which associate a king with the chief deity of a temple or town, while others associate him with the solar deities and proclaim his universal rule. The name of Amenhotep III’s statue is not preserved in the Amenhotep-Huy text, but it was almost certainly, like the temple itself, called hnm(t)-Pth, “United-with-Ptah.”

The second statue referred to in the Amenhotep-Huy text is probably the cult statue of the temple, kept within the sanctuary or sacred bark. This was the hnt(y), and it was the reversion of the offerings made to this statue that Amenhotep-Huy’s statue received and which then passed to his mortuary cult.

Gardiner interprets the reversion of the offerings differently, understanding them as first presented to the statue of Ptah, then to that of Pharaoh, and finally going to the mortuary cult. Amenhotep-Huy refers twice (lines 25 and 39) to the offerings coming from the hnty-statue of the king but does not seem to record offerings to the twt-statue of the king to which the donation of land was actually made. The reference in

---

62 But cf. the Luxor first court, where the statue is designated a hnty wr, ibid., pl. 11b, p. 19, fig. 13.
64 The named colossi of Amenhotep III are: “Monthu of the Rulers,” the statue at Karnak tenth pylon; see PM II\(^2\), p. 189 (587); Habachi, “Deification of Ramesses II,” pls. 13a and 15b; P. Clère, L. Ménassa, and P. Deleuze in Karnak V, 1970–72 (Cairo, 1975), pp. 159–66: “Ruler of the Rulers,” the Colossi of Memnon; see PM II\(^1\), pp. 449–50, for references.
65 Two graffiti at Aswan record the cutting of a statue called “Re of the Rulers”; see n. 35 above. The graffiti of Men and Bak, also at Aswan, has the representation of a statue called “Ruler of the Rulers,” perhaps one of the Colossi of Memnon.
66 Named statues of Sety I, Ramesses II (from Nubia, Thebes, Memphis, Heliopolis, Bubastis, Pi-Ramesse; see Habachi, “Deification of Ramesses II,” passim) and Ramesses III (from Memphis; see A. Schulman, “A Cult of Ramesses III at Memphis,” JNES 22 [1963]: 177–84), are all known.
67 For example, the estate of the statue of Ramesses II “mery Atum” at Nefrusy; see Gardiner, “Ramesseide Texts,” pp. 58 ff., §5; the statue of Ramesses VI at Aniba (see n. 70 below); for a statue of Ramesses III and its priesthood at Memphis, see again Schulman, “Cult of Ramesses III,” pp. 177–84, and Helck, “Zum Kult an Königstatuen,” JNES 25 (1966): 32–41. These estates, of course, provided offerings for the statues and, ultimately, income for their priesthoods.
68 Ruler of the Rulers, Re/Sun of the Rulers, Ruler of the Two Lands, Monthu of the Rulers, Monthu in the Two Lands.
69 For the possibility of such a relationship between statue and temple names, cf. the lion of Ramesses II from Benha and the chapel there, both called mwty ml Hr; see my thesis “Nb-M3’t-Rc: Lord of Nubia,” §3 and n. 35 above. The temple foundation, the hwty-house of Ramesses-mery-Amun beloved like Ptah (mr ml Pth), recorded in the Wilbour Papyrus, and a statue of the same name in Pap. Leiden 348 (vs. 7, 6–8), a letter of Kawiser (see n. 96 below). Kawiser reports that “the lieutenant commander of the army, Nodjme, is come to Pi-Ptah and [has] brought a twt-statue of Pharaoh L.P.H., and he is introducing it into the temple [called] ‘House of Ptah south of his wall, Lord of Ankhtowe’, to allow its name to be known: Ramesses-mery-Amun (L.P.H.)-Beloved-like-Ptah.”
line 26 to *twt pn* is here taken as meaning the statue of Amenhotep-Huy itself on which the text is carved.

The contract between the king and Amenhotep-Huy recalls the donation by Pennut of land to endow a cult statue of Ramesses VI at Aniba.\(^70\) Pennut's donation was presumably to reduce tax liability on the land and to make it inalienable. By making himself sole priest of the statue, he continued to enjoy the revenues, and the intention was doubtless that his family should continue to hold the office, thereby retaining the land but not strictly in private possession. The exchange of land for offerings in the Amenhotep-Huy text allowed an equivalent of the estate's revenue to accrue to Amenhotep-Huy's mortuary priest in perpetuity. If the role of mortuary priest was actually performed by his son, this would be a way of keeping the, quite clearly substantial, income within the family.

Amenhotep-Huy makes it clear (in lines 23, 44, and 46) that the endowment of the statue is made from land given by Amenhotep III to him personally and has *not* been taken from the estates attached to the office of Steward of Memphis, or those attached to the temple. He addresses his successors and tells them that he has not deprived them of any part of their income. The text concludes (lines 41–49) with imprecations against those who obstruct the recession of offerings and blessings for those who aid them.

**THE CULTS OF THE TEMPLE**

The Amenhotep-Huy text refers to the completion of the temple and the institution of offerings (line 18) to "Ptah *rsy inbw.f* and to the gods of [this] House" (*ntrw nw *Hwt* [*pn*]). While the temple is elsewhere identified as an appendage of the main temple of Ptah in Memphis, it is likely that a cult image of "Ptah-south-of-his-wall" also resided in the temple. Nelson's fundamental study of the "Amun of 'United-with-Eternity'" and other late New Kingdom "mortuary" cults at Thebes showed that the main cult image in those temples was of the king as an hypostasis of Amun.\(^71\) This indeed, as L. Bell has recently argued, may date back to at least the time of Thutmose III.\(^72\) Confirmation of such a royal association with Amun at this early date is to be found in the Eighteenth Dynasty temple at Medinet Habu. Here, on the side walls of Room VI, the *Twn-mwt.f* priest makes an offering to Thutmose III accompanied by a small figure of Meryetre-Hatshepsut,\(^73\) whereas on the back wall the king is shown making offerings twice to Amun. A similar decoration is to be found in Room XXV of

---

\(^70\) This text has been extensively discussed, most recently by Helck, "Die Stiftung des *Pn-nwt* von Aniba," *BaS* I (1986): 24–37, where a bibliography and comparative material can be found.

\(^71\) Nelson, "Identity of Amon-Re," pp. 142–43. The statue of "Osiris Ramesses (I)," as Bell suggested, probably occupied the shrine of the Amun Bark; see idem, "Cult of the Deified Tutankhamun," p. 36. Sety I is likewise depicted on the false door of his chapel as Osiris. Nelson, "Identity of Amon-Re," p. 151, discusses the question of whether the statue was the Osirid king during his lifetime or only after his death, but see comments of Bell, "Luxor Temple and the Cult of the Royal KA," *JNES* 44 (1985): 280, n. 146. See also the comments of Stadelmann, "Totentempel," p. 104, n. 11.

\(^72\) Bell, "Cult of the Deified Tutankhamun," p. 36 and n. 134.

\(^73\) U. Hölscher, *The Temples of the Eighteenth Dynasty*, OIP 41 (Chicago, 1939), p. 47; *PM II*², p. 471, scenes 72, 73, and 74.
the Akh-menu of Thutmose III at Karnak. These scenes would seem to indicate a parallel to the Ramesses I and Sety I reliefs at Gurnah.

In addition to the major cult image, the Theban temples contained other statues of Amun, these, it would seem, usually being a form of the Amun of Karnak, hry ib, the particular temple. Besides the presiding deity of the domain, “Houses-of-Millions-of-Years” usually include chapels or suites for a number of other deities. Clearly, the priorities vary according to where the temple is situated. At Thebes, the major sanctuaries are for Amun, Mut, and Khonsu, whereas in the Sety I temple at Abydos, although Amun occupies the axial sanctuary (without Mut and Khonsu), the triad of Osiris, Isis, and Horus are each provided with their own sanctuaries and a second suite at the back of the temple. The additional deities incorporated in this type of temple are usually Sokar, Ptah, and Re-Harakhty, with a chapel for the king and the king’s father or the royal ancestors. The evidence for Heliopolis and Memphis is unfortunately largely confined to temple names, so the subsidiary cults are less well attested. It would seem likely, however, that in these cities the leading role would have been taken by Ptah and Re-Harakhty(-Atum) and their respective triads.

The temples of Ramesses II in Nubia, while falling into the category of “Houses-of-Millions-of-Years,” display some individual characteristics. They are, however, dominated by the cults of Amen-Re, Re-Harakhty, Ptah(-Tatenen), and the king, each of whom is given preeminence within his own domain.

An association with the hb-sd is another characteristic of many of the “Houses-of-Millions-of-Years” and was particularly emphasized in Amenhotep III’s temples at Kom el-Heitan and Soleb. While there is no direct evidence to support the idea, it is possible that the temple “United-with-Ptah” was connected with Amenhotep III’s celebration of the hb-sd at Memphis?

The hb-sd was given special prominence in the reign of Amenhotep III, and evidence indicates that it was celebrated, with varying degrees of elaboration, at a number of

---

74 PM II, p. 118, scene 382: unpublished, noted by me; see again my article “Violent Images.” This suite (Rooms XXIII–XXV) is surely the ka-chapel of the Akh-menu.


76 See Haeny, ibid., p. 113.

77 In this suite there are three chapels, one each for Isis and Horus, and the central one for the king, who has “replaced,” i.e., become, Osiris.

78 Sokar, on the south side of the temple (e.g., the Akh-Menu Rooms XVI–XXII), although Haeny suggested that in the Kom el-Heitan temple of Amenhotep III Ptah-Sokar occupied the side north of the axis. A distinction should be drawn between a chapel dedicated to Sokar, or used to house the Henu-bark, and the suite in which the king becomes Sokar-Osiris. At Medinet Habu, for example, the chapel of the Henu-bark is on the north side of the first hypostyle (Room 122), while the suite is on the southern side of the second hypostyle (Rooms 150–54).

79 Ptah has chapels at Abydos (Room J) and Medinet Habu (Room 120), both adjacent to those of the king. The Nubian temples include him directly among the sanctuary statues.

80 Re-Harakhty, on the north side of the temple. Plans of the Theban “mortuary” temples with some of the suites marked can be found in Hölscher, The Mortuary Temple of Ramses III, pt. 1, OIP 54 (Chicago, 1941), p. 22 and pl. 2. The altar courts are marked in yellow. See also Stadelmann, “Totentempel,” p. 311, fig. 2.

81 For the “contiguous temples” as elements of the “mortuary” temples associated with the worship of the Osirian king, see Hölscher, Mortuary Temple, marked in red. The bark chapel of the king’s father, and the royal suites are marked in Stadelmann, “Totentempel,” p. 311, fig. 2.

82 The worship of the royal ancestors may be directly in the form of the king’s father (as in the Sety I temple at Qurna, which, of course, was specifically motivated) or more generally in the form of the king lists, as in the Akh-Menu and the Abydos temples.

83 These temples are discussed in my thesis.

different towns.\textsuperscript{85} While the Theban celebration is particularly well known,\textsuperscript{86} the peculiarly Memphite nature of the festival, and its ancient association with the city and Ptah-Tatenen, suggest that Amenhotep III may have enacted it there on a lavish scale.\textsuperscript{87}

The Steward Amenhotep-Huy held office around the time of the first $hb$-$sd$ in year 30,\textsuperscript{88} and the Memphite temple, like that at Soleb, may well have been completed about the same time.

There may have been some connection in this temple between the emphasis upon the intermediary role of the king at the $hb$-$sd$ and the role of Ptah as Hearer of Petitions. At Soleb, the intermediary role is apparent through the naming of the gate into the first courtyard as “the great gateway of Amenhotep-$hk^3$ $W^3st$ [the name of which is] $Nb$-$M^3\tau$-$R'$-who-hears-petitions.”\textsuperscript{89}

The Memphite temple probably contained statues of Ptah with the king’s features, similar to two discovered at Karnak, apparently in the petition temple at the Eastern Gate.\textsuperscript{90}

THE CULT IN LATER TIMES AND THE TEMPLE OF RAMESSES-MERY-AMUN CALLED “UNITED-WITH-THE-$M^3\tau$-OF-PТАH”

Evidence for the continuation of the cult of Amenhotep III at Memphis into the reign of Ramesses II is found in Papyrus Sallier IV (verso 1, 8).\textsuperscript{91} Here, among an invocation of all the gods of the city, is found “Ptah who is under his moringa tree of $Nb$-$M^3\tau$-$R'$-united-with-Pтah.” This indicates that the twt-statue, or perhaps cult image, if not the temple itself, still existed during this reign.\textsuperscript{92} “Ptah who is under his moringa tree” is the characteristic form of the god in Memphis.

\textsuperscript{85} See Gardiner, “Horus the Behdetite,” \textit{JEA} 30 (1944): 60, for the festivals of Ramesses II and III at Pi-Ramesse (taken by Gardiner to be Tanis); see also the Festival Hall of Osorkon II at Bubastis, and statues of Amenhotep II, etc., from Elephantine.

\textsuperscript{86} The Theban celebration is known from the Malkata labels and sealings published by Hayes (“Inscriptions”).

\textsuperscript{87} For Memphis as the usual center for the enactment of the $sd$-festival, see Gardiner, “The Delta Residence of the Ramessides,” \textit{JEA} 5 (1918): 193, who cites Pap. Harris 49, 10–12 (the first festival of Ramesses III); idem, “Horus the Behdetite,” \textit{JEA} 30 (1944): 27 and n. 2 and p. 28, n. 1; see also idem, \textit{Wilbour Papyrus}, vol. 2, p. 13. Ramesses II’s Decree, or Blessing, of Ptah, recorded in versions at Abu Simbel, Amara West, Karnak, and Aksha (\textit{KRI} II, pp. 258–81, no. 68), also indicates a Memphite celebration of the festival and the building of a temple in association with it (ibid., p. 280, ll. 34–35 of Abu Simbel text = \textit{BAR} III, 5413).\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{88} Attested on ten Malkata jar labels of years 30 and 31; see Hayes, “Inscriptions,” p. 110 and fig. 20.


\textsuperscript{90} Karnak Ptah statues in Turin, nos. 86 and 87; see PM II, p. 215; texts \textit{Urk.} IV, 1755–56 (595, 596). One statue describes the king as beloved of “Ptah Foremost of the House of Gold” and the other as beloved of “Ptah Lord of $M^3\tau$, the Great God, Lord of $sd$ Festivals, $hry$ $lb$ the Hall of Annals.” Cf. T. G. H. James, \textit{The British Museum: Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae, etc.}, pt. 9 (London, 1970), pp. 5–6, pl. 3, 2 (no. 91), a black granite statue base from Karnak inscribed for $Nb$-$M^3\tau$-$R'$ as beloved of Maet $hry$ $lb$ the Hall of the Annals, which James suggests may be a companion to the Ptah statue.

\textsuperscript{91} Gardiner, \textit{Late Egyptian Miscellanies} (Brussels, 1937), pp. 88–92, on p. 89, l. 10; R. A. Caminos, \textit{Late Egyptian Miscellanies} (London, 1954), pp. 333–49, comments on pp. 339–40. The reference of Twentieth Dynasty or later date in the Griffith fragments (see Gardiner in \textit{JEA} 27 [1941]: 69) is probably to the Theban temple.

\textsuperscript{92} There is some evidence from Thebes that with the building of a new $hw$ $n$ $hwo$ $m$ $rm$ $pt$ and the lapse of the older temples, the cult image was transferred; see Nelson, “Identity of Amon-Re,” p. 147 on the bark of Ramesses II at Medinet Habu.
Comparatively few monuments of Amenhotep III are recorded from Mit Rahina and its vicinity, and many of these were reused as building material in ancient times. The extensive building works of Ramesses II in the area may have seen the dismantling of his predecessor’s temple and use of its stone in his own constructions.

Of the temples of Ramesses II at Memphis, well known from both textual and archaeological sources, one may have been the direct successor to Amenhotep III’s foundation. During some part of the reign of Ramesses II, a second Amenhotep called Huy served as Chief Steward of Memphis. This man, known from several monuments, was a Royal Scribe and Steward in the “House of Ramesses-tery-Amun [called] ‘United-with-the-\textit{M}^{3}\text{ti}-of-Ptah’,” \textit{(Hwt R\text{2}-ms-sw-mry-\textit{Imn hntt-M}^{3}\text{ti}-n-Pth)}. The parallelism in the name of the two foundations, and their both being placed under the control of the Steward of Memphis, suggest the possibility that the Ramesside temple replaced the earlier one.

Although other specific references are lacking, it may be this Ramesside temple which is mentioned in Pap. Leiden 348, a letter of Kawiser to Bekentpah. In one section (vs. 6, 6–7), Kawiser raises the subject of grain rations “for the soldiers and the ‘Apiur who are dragging stone to the great pylon of . . . Ramesses-tery-Amun (l.p.h.) [the name of which is] ‘Beloved-of-Maat’.” R. A. Caminos, while commenting that \textit{pr} or \textit{hwt nfr} would not fit the traces at the end of line 6 and that no temple or similar institution is known from other sources, draws attention to “Beloved of \textit{M}^{3}\text{ti}” as the name of a royal palace in Anastasi II 5, 6. The name need not, however, be that of the temple itself. The individual elements of a temple usually carried names different from, although related to, that of the building. “Beloved of \textit{M}^{3}\text{ti}” seems quite possible

\textsuperscript{93} For relief blocks excavated by Petrie now in Boston, see W. M. F. Petrie, E. Mackay, and G. A. Wainwright, \textit{Meydum and Memphis III} (London, 1910), p. 39, pl. 29, nos. 2–3; for a granite column suggested to be from an Amenhotep III temple at Memphis, see James, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts}, pl. 2 (no. 64) and comments pp. 4–5. See also J. Bourriau, “Three Monuments from the Fitzwilliam Museum,” \textit{JEA} 68 (1982): 55–56 and supplementary note in “Brief Communications” in \textit{JEA} 69 (1983): 163: a statue in the Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge [E.82.1913] on which the king is described as “beloved” of Ptah and of Sakhmet. The cartouche with the name Amenhotep on the front of the statue has been erased, while that of \textit{Nb-M}^{3}\text{ti}-\textit{R}\text{2} on the back pillar, has not, leading Bourriau to suggest that the statue stood against a wall. This may, however, be another example of the well-attested erasure of the nomen while leaving the prenomen (cf. Dunham, \textit{The Barkal Temples} (Boston, 1970), pl. 25d, p. 19, fig. 5; James, \textit{Hieroglyphic Texts}, pl. 1.1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and pl. III, 1, all Sakhmet statues, some with later restorations of the name Amenhotep; see comments of James, ibid., pp. 1 ff.; also H. Brunner, “Sokar im Totentempel Amenophis III.,” in \textit{Festschrift Elmar Edel 12. März 1979}, AAT 1 [Bamberg, 1979], p. 65 and pl. 1, from Kom el-Heitan; also at Soleb and Luxor temples, throughout).

\textsuperscript{94} The Kom el-Heitan temple, even if ruined through natural causes, was pillaged for stone for the building of Merneptah’s temple and much statuary later removed to Medinet Habu. As Gardiner points out \textit{(Wilbour Papyrus}, vol. 2, pp. 11–12), no fields are found belonging to the cults of Thutmose III or Amenhotep III in the Wilbour Papyrus, although some smaller Eighteenth Dynasty foundations still existed in the Twentieth as independent institutions. There are indications for the continued existence of the cult of Amenhotep III (see again my article, “Violent Images,” p. 5 and n. 58) if not the temple (but see n. 91 above). See again also Gardiner, \textit{Wilbour Papyrus}, vol. 2, \textsection 69, p. 135, where the Ramessum seems to possess only 5 aouras; see Gardner’s comments.

\textsuperscript{95} A. Badawi, “\textit{Zwei Denkmäler des grossen Gau-}

\textsuperscript{96} Gardiner, \textit{Late Egyptian Miscellanea}, pp. 133 ff.; Caminos, \textit{Late Egyptian Miscellanea}, pp. 491 ff.

\textsuperscript{97} Caminos, ibid., p. 494.

\textsuperscript{98} A hymn in praise of the pharaoh, temple Merneptah. A second version of this, substituting the prenomen of Sety II appears in Pap. Anastasi IV.
as a name for the main pylon of a temple called “United-with-the- M3t-of-Ptah,” especially if, in suggesting it to be a royal cult temple, it is remembered that mry M3t was the Horus name of Ramesses II.99 The work on this pylon is said to be “under the authority of the Chief of the Madjoy, Amenemone.”100 On a broken naophorous statue (Cairo 1077), Amenemone is given the title “Overseer of Works for the pylon of Ramesses-mery-Amun.”101 Here, the statue within the shrine supported by Amenemone is a figure of Ptah, but the inscription describes it as “The Perfect God, Wsr-M3t-Rc-mry-Pth.” This is presumably a representation of a statue within a shrine which stood within the temple and which represented the king as a hypostasis of the god.102 Amenemone, like Amenhotep III’s steward, was doubtless permitted to set up his own statue within the court of the new temple in the construction of which he had been involved.

Two well-preserved colossi of Ramesses II, and fragments of others, are known from the area of the “Great Ptah Temple” at Mit Rahina.103 One of these, of granite, now stands in front of Cairo Railway Station.104 This figure wears a double crown which is flanked by wsr-sceptres and m3t-feathers and was probably surmounted by a solar disk,105 thereby creating the king’s prenomen. Habachi argued that the projecting fragments of stone on the front of the crown were not traces of an uraeus but of a figure of Ptah standing on the mr-sign, designating the statue as Wsr-M3t-Rc-mry-Pth. The king is also given this epithet on the pectoral, shoulder cartouches, and dorsal pillar inscription, thus confirming the statue’s name.

It is difficult to identify the temple hnm-t-M3t-n-Pth with any of those of Ramesses II within the pr Pth referred to in either the Wilbour or Harris Papyri. Is it possible that the so-called Great Ptah Temple at Mit Rahina is, in fact, this temple? Ramesses II built his temple on land which was relatively newly created, and it is therefore unlikely to have been a renewal of the ancient cult temple of the god. In this area of Memphis, the temple and “palace” of Merneptah were later built, and Ramesses III established a statue cult of himself, suggesting a district associated with the royal cults in the later New Kingdom. It was, significantly, within the temenos of the “Great Ptah Temple” that the statue of Amenhotep III’s steward was discovered, suggesting an original location in this general area and a reuse of earlier material. It is interesting that the statue was re-established in the later temple, perhaps an act of piety by Ramesses II’s steward to a predecessor in office.

---

100 This Chief of the Madjoy and his family are well known from a number of monuments and were influential in the first half of the reign of Ramesses II; G. A. Gaballa and K. A. Kitchen, “Ramesside Varia 1,” CqE 43/86 (1968): 259–70, no. 2, pp. 263–69.
101 L. Borchart, Statuen und Statuetten IV (Cairo, 1934), p. 47.
102 Presumably a statue within a shrine, although two colossi of Ramesses as mry Ptḥ rsy ḫ nbw.f, similar to the statue held by Amenemone are known from the temple; see G. Daressy, Statues de divinités (Cairo, 1906), pl. 25, pp. 116–17, 38.429 and 38.430.
103 PM III2, pp. 831 ff., for this temple.
105 Compare the statue of “Ramesses beloved of Re” at Wadi es-Sebua. The solar disk and mr sign are clearly visible in H. Gauthier, Le Temple de Ouadi es-Sebū (Cairo, 1912), pls. 14a–b, 15b.
106 The uraeus, in any case, usually begins on the nms, its tail curling up the crown. In this instance, there is no uraeus on the nms.