

# Rebirth of Temples under the Rule of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III Vocabulary

JADWIGA IWASZCZUK

**Abstract:** The restoration works during the *whm mswt* era under Senwosret I, undertaken on a large scale in the whole country, were the example to follow for Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. The reconstruction of monumental structures in both historical moments was performed, above all, in the case of the sacral architecture. This article deals with the vocabulary used by these kings to describe the destruction of the world and the recreation of the new order of the sacred landscape. By studying the vocabulary it was possible to realise the range of works initiated by Hatshepsut and continued by Thutmose III in almost all cult centres of Egypt.

**Keywords:** restoration of temples, sacred landscape, New Kingdom Egypt, Hatshepsut, Thutmose III

Jadwiga Iwaszczuk, Instytut Kultur Śródziemnomorskich i Orientalnych PAN, Warszawa;  
[jiwaszczuk@iksio.pan.pl](mailto:jiwaszczuk@iksio.pan.pl)

The main feature of the policy pursued by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III was building activity across the country. The same kind of work that was undertaken in the capital city on a large scale was also conducted in provincial cities. It seems that Hatshepsut started the restoration of the country and it was continued by her co-regent after her disappearance. The main target of these renovations were temples. On the basis of texts from the epoch it can be even said that both co-regents found temples ruined and built of mudbricks and left them constructed of masonry. The idea of renewal was expressed in their construction projects that have been recovered and partially reconstructed by archaeologists, and in the texts, which accompanied the rising buildings.

The language describing the range of building works of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III seems to be worth a closer look. It is important to stress that this kind of stylistics was not invented in the times of the early Eighteenth Dynasty, but was used much earlier during the reign of king Senwosret I. All these rulers suggested that the world they found was damaged to a large degree. Their role was therefore to reconstruct the ruined country, to rebuild and to renovate it, i.e. to establish Maat anew. This is reflected particularly well in

the vocabulary they used to depict the degradation of the existing world on the one hand and renovation of it on the other.

## A RUINED WORLD

Among many features that connect the reigns of Senwosret I, Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, there is the language that they used to describe the range of building works undertaken in the country full of chaos.

Egypt taken over by Senwosret I was still destroyed even after the introduction of the *wḥm mswt* era by Amenemhat I.<sup>1</sup> The names of Senwosret I suggest the same political program as these of Amenemhat I. Instead of *wḥm mswt* that appears in Horus, *Nbtj* and Gold Falcon names of Amenemhat I, Senwosret I introduced there *ḥnh mswt*.<sup>2</sup> Thus, it seems rather probable that Senwosret I inherited this concept from his father and continued the reconstruction of the country.

For the purposes of the royal ideology, the ruined world was represented in detail by the ancient authors who liked vivid language. There are three texts from Senwosret I's reign that reflect the image of ruined ritual landscape. First two come from Elephantine, one is a royal decree written on the temple wall and the other is carved on a private stela. The third text comes from Tod.

At the beginning of Senwosret I's reign the temple on Elephantine was in a very poor state according to the text preserved on the outer wall of the rebuilt edifice: *he found (gm.f) the great chapel (jwnn wr) as a mound of earth (j3wt nt t3) (there was) no knowledge of its wisdom, (...) (there was) no chamber in it for a w<sup>c</sup>b-priest, (there was) no place in it for a hm-nṯr-priest, (...) no gate, no door-leaves to seal chests [in it].*<sup>3</sup>

It seems that the royal inscription shows the real state of the sacred landscape on Elephantine, the same kind of information was presented also in a private text. *I found it [i.e. k3-chapel of Heqaib] much ruined (gmt.s w3st wr) claimed Sarenput I describing subsequently what had happened to this noble building: some parts of the chapel disappeared, its walls were ruined, (...) all chambers were full of rubble(?) and the earth swallowed its sanctuary, etc.*<sup>4</sup>

A similar picture emerges from the text inscribed on the wall of the temple in Tod from the reign of Senwosret I: *each of its chambers was filled with mud, (...) mounds of earth were on both their banks, (...) the holy place was completely forgotten, (...) enclosure walls were burnt with the fire, sea[ls broken], etc.*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Niviński 1996.

<sup>2</sup> Beckerath 1999: 82–83; Gundlach 2008: esp. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Schenkel 1975: Pl. 37, cf. 117–118 (translation). W. Helck translates *nn sp rh n 3s3f* as: *ohne daß man seine Rituale kannte* (Helck 1978: 71 [l. 18]).

<sup>4</sup> Habachi 1985: 36; Obsomer 1993: 115–117; Franke 1994: 213–214.

<sup>5</sup> Redford 1987: 42; Helck 1985: 48; Barbotin, Clère 1991: Pl. 32, cf. 9 (translation).

There are several texts from the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III that refer to the view of destroyed ritual landscape in the same way as those from the reign of Senwosret I and the language does not change from the beginning of Thutmose III's reign (i.e. the co-regency with Hatshepsut) to his late years.

The descriptions of temples written during the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III evoke a picture of complete destruction. The most informative text comes from the temple of the queen at Speos Artemidos. She ordered to engrave the following text on the entrance architrave: *the temple of the Lady of Ksj, which was fallen into ruin, the earth swallowed up its noble sanctuary, children danced upon the roof of her temple. [...] her conducted festivals were not appearing.*<sup>6</sup> Other temples that fell into ruin are quoted in the text from Speos Artemidos on the occasion of the renovation: the temples of Pakhet and others whose names are in *lacuna*.<sup>7</sup>

Thutmose III frequently recalls that he found particular constructions ruined or made of mudbrick. In the so-called small temple at Medinet Habu there is an inscription carved by the craftsmen of Thutmose III on one of the architraves. The king explains there what he does for the temple (*s<sup>c</sup>h<sup>c</sup>, smnh*) and as a reason for his action he mentions that *he found (it) ruined*.<sup>8</sup> In the temple of Ptah in Karnak the same ruler twice points out that he built the temple anew because it was *made of mudbrick, its columns and two gates being of wood and ruined*<sup>9</sup> and because *he found it (made) of mudbrick as (they were) formed by predecessors*.<sup>10</sup> On the walls of the temples in Semna and Kumma Thutmose III informs that he rebuilt the temple which *he found (made) of mudbrick and ruined*.<sup>11</sup> The beginning of such a sentence also appears on a column in the Wadjyt-hall, but its ending was not preserved.<sup>12</sup> In the fragment VII O of the *Annals of Thutmose III* the king announced that he had found it (the object is in *lacuna*) made of mudbrick and ruined (*w3j r w3sj*).<sup>13</sup> On stela CG 34012 from Karnak, the king gives the same explanation for the reconstruction of *hwt-ntr m j3btjw*.<sup>14</sup> On three stelae coming from Heliopolis and erected in the 47<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Thutmose III, he mentions that he found this temple ruined (*shrw dwt hr.f*).<sup>15</sup>

Inscriptions sometimes suggest causes for such devastation of the ritual landscape. The most frequent explanation was the activity of the Hyksos rulers. In Speos Artemidos Hatshepsut mentioned *the Asiatics that were in Avaris and ruled without Re* as perpetrators of destruction of roads and temples, which in consequence led to the suspension of the performance of cults, rituals and feasts.<sup>16</sup> Hatshepsut called the Medinet Habu

<sup>6</sup> Gardiner 1946: Pl. VI, cf. 46–47 (translation).

<sup>7</sup> Gardiner 1946: 47.

<sup>8</sup> *Urk.* IV, 882.13.

<sup>9</sup> *Urk.* IV, 765.12.

<sup>10</sup> *LD III*: Pls 52, 56; *Urk.* IV, 879.5; Grallert 2001: 157; Caminos 1998a: Pls 29, 38.

<sup>11</sup> *Urk.* IV, 197.17; Caminos 1998b: Pls 38–40.

<sup>12</sup> *Urk.* IV, 841.14.

<sup>13</sup> Grimal 2006: 594.

<sup>14</sup> Lacau 1909: 25, Pl. VIII (l. 4); *Urk.* IV, 834.12–14; Beckerath 1981: 42.

<sup>15</sup> *Urk.* IV, 832.16; Radwan 1981: 404, Fig. 1; Grallert 2001: 540; Collombert 2008–2010: 6–7, Figs 1–2.

<sup>16</sup> Gardiner 1946: 46–47.

temple a sacred place, which the kings of Lower Egypt (*bjtjw*) have [*ne*]glected,<sup>17</sup> and her temple at Deir el-Bahari a sacred place of the first time which was unknown to the kings of Lower Egypt (*bjtjw*).<sup>18</sup> In the Chapelle Rouge, the speech of Amun during the coronation was carved on the south outside wall. The god names the actions that should be completed by the queen and remarks: *to elaborate this what was fallen by the kings of Lower Egypt*.<sup>19</sup> These kings of Lower Egypt should probably be identified as the Hyksos rulers.

Yet another reason also appeared and should be firmly emphasised as being practical and much more clearly visible in the archaeological material. On the above-mentioned stela CG 34012, Thutmose III states that he has raised the banks around *hft-hr-nb.s* because water rose up to the level of the temple during the flood.<sup>20</sup> The fact of water invading the temple of Karnak is possibly suggested<sup>21</sup> by yet another text – *Texte de la Jeunesse* of Thutmose III.<sup>22</sup> The same motif appears in the inscription from Speos Artemidos.<sup>23</sup> The destruction caused by water was discussed in detail by Ch. Wallet-Lebrun<sup>24</sup>.

## RECREATION OF THE WORLD

The world damaged to such a degree had to be reconstructed. This imperative resulted, first of all, from the duties of the king towards gods. It is interesting, however, that this degradation was almost never mentioned by the previous rulers. That does not mean that they did nothing for the country and particularly for the temples of gods, but they did not stress it so strongly in the textual sphere as Hatshepsut and Thutmose III did. It is generally known that Ahmose re-opened the quarries of Tura to extract stone for new constructions around the country,<sup>25</sup> Amenhotep I restored celebration of rituals in Karnak<sup>26</sup> and Thutmose I renewed at least the temple in Abydos.<sup>27</sup> In all these cases the texts mentioning these actions are simple statements providing only basic information of what was done.

The language concerning this subject changed considerably during the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III by introducing some stylistic innovations. First of all, texts mentioning new constructions became much more frequent. It could result from increased effort of the rulers in this very field, but it also seems to accentuate the importance the kings associated with this form of activity. Of course, the factor of randomness of archaeological finds must be taken into account as well. However, the dedicatory inscriptions appeared

<sup>17</sup> *Urk.* IV, 883.6; *Epigraphic Survey 2009*: 23–24, Pl. 21.

<sup>18</sup> Gallert 2001: 403.

<sup>19</sup> Burgos, Larché 2006: 37, block 285.

<sup>20</sup> Lacau 1909: 25, Pl. VIII (l. 3); *Urk.* IV, 834.6–8; Beckerath 1981: 42, l. 3.

<sup>21</sup> The text is only partly preserved.

<sup>22</sup> Mariette-Bey 1875: Pl. 17 (l. 18); *Urk.* IV, 169.10–11; Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 115 [18/6R l. 33]; 1994: 231–232, n. 26.

<sup>23</sup> Gnirs 2006: 233–238.

<sup>24</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 1994: 223–256.

<sup>25</sup> *Urk.* IV, 24–25.

<sup>26</sup> Grimm 1994: 73–76.

<sup>27</sup> *Urk.* IV, 94.10–103.4.

much more often during the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III than during any other reign except for the rule of Seti I/Ramesses II.<sup>28</sup> Not only dedicatory, but also other kinds of inscriptions related to the building activity of these rulers were applied more often on the walls of temples, becoming part of ritual texts there.

#### PRIVATE SOURCES CONCERNING RENOVATION OF SACRAL BUILDINGS AND RITUALS

Descriptions of royal activity all over the country were not limited to royal sources but can also be found in private texts. Under Hatshepsut and Thutmose III's reign there were more private texts referring to the construction projects of the rulers than in other periods. They contain information related to the works undertaken in the whole country or the rationale behind the reconstruction works. The most famous of the private texts was inscribed on the statue of the royal official, Minmose<sup>29</sup> and shows the range of building works carried out during the reign of Thutmose III. No such document is attested for Hatshepsut. Minmose not only bore the titles of the overseer of all works of Upper and Lower Egypt and the royal scribe, but he was also the overseer of priests of Montu<sup>30</sup> and controlled works in all temples (*rw-prw*) of all gods named in the text.<sup>31</sup> He was also responsible for the same work during the reign of Thutmose III's successor, Amenhotep II.<sup>32</sup>

All other private inscriptions reflect the local character of building activity of royal officials. Ahmose Peniaty, whose activity is attested for the reigns of Amenhotep I through to Thutmose III, bore the titles of the overseer of works in the House of Amun during the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, as well as the overseer of works of three kings: Amenhotep I, Thutmose I and Thutmose II and the supervisor of works of Amun.<sup>33</sup> The stela of Djehuty, found in his tomb TT 11, shows the range of finishing works supervised by this official.<sup>34</sup> Puyemre mentioned on his statue Cairo CG 910 that he supervised some constructions in the enclosure of the Mut temple.<sup>35</sup> Senenmut, among many other duties, held the function of the overseer of works in some of the Theban temples.<sup>36</sup> During the sole reign of Thutmose III, works in Thebes were supervised by the vizier Rekhmire,<sup>37</sup> who also acted as the overseer of works and the overseer of temples of Upper and Lower Egypt,<sup>38</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Cf. i.a. Grallert 2001: 581.

<sup>29</sup> *Urk.* IV, 1441.1–1445.12.

<sup>30</sup> *Urk.* IV, 1441.12–13.

<sup>31</sup> *Urk.* IV, 1443.1–20.

<sup>32</sup> *Urk.* IV, 1448.4–19.

<sup>33</sup> *Urk.* IV, 51.1–3, 52.1–8; Glanville 1928: 296.

<sup>34</sup> Spiegelberg 1900: 118–119.

<sup>35</sup> *Urk.* IV, 521.10–14.

<sup>36</sup> *jmj-r3 k3t n(t) Jmn m Dsr-[dsr]w* (Dorman 1991: Pl. 67; Schulman 1987–1988: 66, 77, Fig. 4; Meyer 1982: 220); *jmj-r3 k3t n(t) Mwt m Jsrw* (Schulman 1987–1988: 63, Fig. 2); *hrp k3t m Jpt-swt* (Dorman 1991: 37, Text 7; 72, Pl. 31b); *jmj-r3 k3t nbt n(t) nswt m Pr-Jmn* (Dorman 1991: 136, Pls 70–71, 83a–b); *jmj-r3 k3t n(t) Jmn* (Dorman 1991: Pls 66–67, 78–79; Meyer 1982: 207, 329); *jmj-r3 k3t nbt n(t) Jmn* (Schulman 1987–1988: 63, 77, Figs 2, 4).

<sup>37</sup> *Urk.* IV, 1152.17, 1153.11, 1154.7, 12, 1159.15–16.

<sup>38</sup> *jmj-r3 rw-prw Šmꜣw Mhijt* (*Urk.* IV, 1151.14); *jmj-r3 k3t* (*Urk.* IV, 1151.13, 1159.14).

and in the whole country.<sup>39</sup> Another official, the King's Son and the overseer of the Southern Lands, Nehi, left an inscription in Semna with the royal decree according to which Nehi was obliged to bring stone for the temple in Semna as it was found constructed in mudbrick.<sup>40</sup> Menkheperaseneb supervised the works of craftsmen in the temple of Amun, being responsible for *smnh* of his monuments as the overseer of craftsmen and the overseer of works in *Wtswt-Jmn(?)*.<sup>41</sup> On the statue of Ahmose (JE 36412), the high priest from Heliopolis, another decree was carved, which confirms the act of encircling the Heliopolis temple complex with a wall and mentions that the temple was in a bad state of preservation and the king had to *sdsr* the House of Atum.<sup>42</sup>

The sources mentioned above show that the policy towards the building works changed under the rule of Thutmose III and that, at the end of his reign, the king granted much broader prerogatives to the officials than at the beginning of his rule. At that time the building works in temples all over Egypt were supervised by the highest officials in the country and more people were involved in the process of creating a new order in the sacred landscape. It also seems that the range and character of late royal building works demanded wider control by the highest officials. This was probably the case of the reign of Senwosret I, whose second vizier Mentuhotep was at the same time an overseer of all works of the king, acting in many places in Egypt, while his first vizier was not charged with any such duties.<sup>43</sup>

#### DUTIES OF THE KING

The best manifestations of renovation of the sacral world by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were dedicatory inscriptions placed on the walls of almost every new building. Their large number results not only from the fact that earlier temples were largely destroyed, but first of all from the desire of these two rulers to codify the world. This was the religious policy which also characterised the reigns of Nebhepetre Mentuhotep II,<sup>44</sup> Amenemhat I/Senwosret I<sup>45</sup> and Seti I/Ramesses II<sup>46</sup> to the same degree, and which was similarly expressed through the vocabulary all these kings used to describe their architectural works within temple enclosures.

Among many commandments of investiture given to queen Hatshepsut during her coronation, some are very informative: *you will exist for me to create offices, to fill the storehouses, to supply the offering tables, to lead the hand of w<sup>a</sup>b-priests according to their*

<sup>39</sup> *Urk.* IV, 1156.2–3.

<sup>40</sup> Caminos 1998a: Pl. 22.

<sup>41</sup> Davies 1933: Pl. X.

<sup>42</sup> Ghoneim 1994: 100.

<sup>43</sup> Simpson 1991: 331–340; Obsomer 1995: 159–189.

<sup>44</sup> Blumenthal 1970: 112 [C1.2, C1.3], 113 [C1.6, C1.8], 114 [C1.10], 115 [C1.14], 116 [C1.19], 117 [C1.22, C1.24], 122 [C2.11], 124 [C2.15, C2.17], 125 [C2.24], 127 [C2.28], 128 [C3.2], 129 [C3.3–5], 132 [C3.14], 140 [C6.6–7], 141 [C6.10]; Grallert 2001.

<sup>45</sup> Grallert 2001.

<sup>46</sup> Grallert 2001.

*duties, (...) to enlarge offering tables, (...) to make work without neglecting of sandstone and granite, to create my temple, to repeat birth (whm mswt) for it in white beautiful limestone from  $\epsilon$ nw anew...*<sup>47</sup> In inscriptions sculpted on walls of many cult buildings, gods instructed the king that the building activity, the restoration of old temples and erection of new ones, is one of the most important responsibilities of kingship. On the western wall of the so-called Birth Portico in the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, the gods of Egypt, whom the queen had visited with her divine father, are depicted as saying to her: *you will see your instructions in the land which is in your possession, you will restore (srwd) what was decaying, you will raise your monuments in your temples, you will enrich your altars of him who begot you.*<sup>48</sup> Royal duties were bestowed upon the king even before the coronation, as it is clearly stated by Amun-Re-Kamutef in his speech to Hatshepsut preserved in the Southern Chamber of Amun in her temple at Deir el-Bahari: *for since you had been in the nest I knew that you would make for me monuments, fill my temples in all good things of Two Lands.*<sup>49</sup> The fulfilment of this duty was so important that Hatshepsut's building activity became part of her epithets: *M $\epsilon$ t-k $\epsilon$ -R $\epsilon$  daughter of my body, beloved, the one who has built my house, made firm the temple of god, made firm (my) names, supplied altars*<sup>50</sup> or *M $\epsilon$ t-k $\epsilon$ -R $\epsilon$  (...) the one who has built (my) house, made firm (my) sanctuary and sanctified my divine seat.*<sup>51</sup> The pieces of information referring to the building act were also introduced into religious texts in some temples.<sup>52</sup>

#### ATTRIBUTES OF A PERFECT *MNW*

Monuments (*mnw*) made for gods should have some qualities to be worth of being an article in the transaction between gods and the king. The sentence that often appears behind the god during the performance of rituals is: *I gave you all life, stability, prosperity, all joy with me as reward for*<sup>53</sup> *this monument good, great, pure, firm and splendid (dj.n.j n.k  $\epsilon$ nh  $\underline{d}$   $\underline{d}$  w $\epsilon$ s nb [...] nb  $\epsilon$ wt-jb nb hr.j m hswt [mnw] pn nfr  $\epsilon$ 3 w $\epsilon$ b rwd mnh).*<sup>54</sup> This sentence contains all the qualities required for a ritual building of that time on the one hand, while they constitute a collection of activities (in causative form) that the king should undertake to please gods on the other. They seem to be standard actions for every ruler of Egypt, but

<sup>47</sup> Burgos, Larché 2006: 37, block 285.

<sup>48</sup> Naville 1898: Pl. LVII (l. 9).

<sup>49</sup> Naville 1906: Pl. CXXXI.

<sup>50</sup> Naville 1906: Pl. CXXXII.

<sup>51</sup> Naville 1895: Pl. XIX.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Beaux *et al.* 2012: Pls 9, 31; Petrie 1896: Pl. XIII.

<sup>53</sup> *m hswt* is sometimes replaced with *m jw $\epsilon$*  (e.g. Naville 1895: Pls 16, 24; *Epigraphic Survey* 2009: Pl. 11).

<sup>54</sup> Caminos 1998a: Pl. 37. This formula, more or less developed, can be found in many temples of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, e.g. Semna (Caminos 1998a: Pl. 37, 40); Kumma (Caminos 1998b: Pl. 33, 38); Amada (Aly, Abdel Hamid, Dewachter 1967: Pl. N4–6); Deir el-Bahari (Naville 1895: Pls 16, 22, 24; 1898: Pl. 84; 1906: Pl. 139; Beaux *et al.* 2012: Pls 31, 32); Medinet Habu, Eighteenth Dynasty temple (*Epigraphic Survey* 2009: Pl. 11); Karnak, Akhmenu (Pécoil 2000: Pl. 95); Karnak, Chapelle Rouge (Burgos, Larché 2006: 76, block 196; 226, block 134).

in reality these formulae can be much more often found in the temples of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III than in those of any other king. In the Middle Kingdom *mnw* bore several of these features, first of all, they were described as *nfr*, less frequently as *w<sup>c3</sup>b<sup>55</sup>* – but the modification of the early Thutmose era was to describe it as *rw<sup>d</sup>*, *c3* and *mn<sup>h</sup>*. These perfection features of the royal monuments erected for gods will be presented here in order of the frequency of their appearance.

- *s<sup>c3</sup>*

In the group of words describing royal building activity, the verb *s<sup>c3</sup>* (*to increase*) appears very rarely (**Tab. 1**). It is also not very popular as an attribute of a sacral building. It seems that to enlarge the temple was not so important as to equip it with other qualities. This observation is compatible with what is known from archaeological sources: at the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, temples, and especially temples in the province, were relatively small.

**Tab. 1.** The occurrences of *s<sup>c3</sup>*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Thutmose III	Karnak, courtyard of the VI pylon, stela CG 34012	?	Lacau 1909: 25, 31
Thutmose III	Karnak, in front of VII pylon, south face, stela CG 34011	<i>sh-nt<sup>r</sup></i> (?)	Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 161 (l. 20)
Thutmose III	Karnak, <i>Annals of Thutmose III</i> , fragment VIII	<i>mnw</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 750.11 [VIII.22]

The verb *s<sup>c3</sup>* appears only three times, always in contexts concerning the creation of a new sacral order during the reign of Thutmose III. On stela CG 34012 the king says: *I did it for him on the platform of sandstone by which I exalted and very enlarged [...]*.<sup>56</sup> The text of stela CG 34011 enumerates a group of buildings, among them a structure made of sandstone that was enlarged but, because of a lacuna, the identification of the building is difficult.<sup>57</sup> In the *Annals of Thutmose III*, preserved on the south wall of the courtyard of the VI pylon, the king explains: *...after all splendour was found by My Majesty in enlargement of the monument...*<sup>58</sup> All these examples come from Karnak and can be dated to the sole reign of the king.

- *snfr*

The popularity of the word *snfr* referring to royal monuments (**Tab. 2**) increased in the later years of Thutmose III and was used subsequently by Thutmose rulers in similar

<sup>55</sup> Lacau, Chevrier 1969: Pls 22 (sc. 21), 23 (sc. 24), 32 (sc. 12'), 11 (D2').

<sup>56</sup> *Urk.* IV, 834.8; Beckerath 1981: 42, 44.

<sup>57</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 161 (l. 20), 162 (commentary).

<sup>58</sup> *Urk.* IV, 750.11 [VIII.22].



contexts.<sup>59</sup> As rightly noted by G. Björkman<sup>60</sup> and repeated by P. Laskowski,<sup>61</sup> the king used this word to describe his deeds aiming at honouring his ancestors: Thutmose III proclaimed that he beautified, i.e. restored, the statues of Amenhotep I<sup>62</sup> and Thutmose II<sup>63</sup> (both erected in front of the VIII pylon in Karnak) and the temple of his father Thutmose II in Asfun.<sup>64</sup> Observing that *snfr* in royal building context was used only by Thutmose III, Amenhotep II and Thutmose IV, P. Laskowski suggested that this word constituted one of the ways of legitimization of an uncertain(?) rule of these kings.<sup>65</sup> After D. Laboury,<sup>66</sup> he proposed to translate the verb *snfr* as *to make perfect* and if related to royal activity the object of the action must concern the deceased king – as *royal activity – including building activity – cannot be completed before the king is dead*.<sup>67</sup> P. Laskowski also remarks that this word describes one of the duties of the king.<sup>68</sup>

**Tab. 2.** The occurrences of *snfr*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Thutmose III	Karnak, in front of VIII pylon, statue of Amenhotep I	<i>twt</i>	<i>Urk. IV</i> , 605.16–17
Thutmose III	Karnak, in front of VIII pylon, statue of Thutmose II	<i>twt</i>	<i>Urk. IV</i> , 606.2
Thutmose III	Asfun, temple of Thutmose II	<i>hwt</i>	Weigall 1908: 108

• *srwd*

Among the instructions given by gods during the journey Hatshepsut undertook with her father in her early years, there is a reference to *srwd* of what was decaying (*sbt*) and, in consequence, an obligation to raise monuments in temples and enrich altars of gods.<sup>69</sup>

The verb is also attested in the north chapel of the Akhmenu on the east wall, in the scene of great offering (*wdn htpw rdjt m<sup>3</sup>t 3t*) addressed to the assembly of gods.<sup>70</sup> In their answer directed to the benefactor, the gods enumerate building activities, which the king did for them, offering him in return life and prosperity with them. One of these building activities was *srwd* – the object of this action is, however, missing now.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Björkman 1971: 46–47.

<sup>60</sup> Björkman 1971: 46.

<sup>61</sup> Laskowski 2003: 93–95; 2006: 222–223.

<sup>62</sup> *Urk. IV*, 605.16–17; Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 148 [18/6 AW].

<sup>63</sup> *Urk. IV*, 606.2; Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 149 [18/6 AX].

<sup>64</sup> Weigall 1908: 108.

<sup>65</sup> Laskowski 2003: 93.

<sup>66</sup> Laboury 1998: 30.

<sup>67</sup> Laskowski 2003: 94–95.

<sup>68</sup> Laskowski 2003: 94; 2006: 223.

<sup>69</sup> Naville 1898: Pl. LVII (l. 9).

<sup>70</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pls 112–113.

<sup>71</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pls 112–113.

The verb *srwd* appears also in the inscription on the false door at the west wall of the Palace of Maat in Karnak, but here the context is also lost, part of the inscription missing.<sup>72</sup>

In the dedicatory inscription carved on a wall in the temple of Ptah, the king explains that he ‘created’ the temple of Ptah (*ḥwt Pth*) anew, as it was made of mudbrick and at the end he *srwd the splendid monument*.<sup>73</sup> The same circumstances justify the reason for *srwd* of the temple in Semna.<sup>74</sup> This sequence of works is perpetuated in the inscription on the east wall of the north chapel in the Akhmenu, where the assembly of gods offers to the king all life and prosperity with them for *building (kd) temples for them, srwd [...] and making offerings for them*.<sup>75</sup>

The verb *srwd* in the texts of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III is used almost exclusively for actions undertaken in respect to the whole structure (**Tab. 3**). The word comes from *rwḏ*, which means *strong, firm*<sup>76</sup> and its basic meaning is *to make firm, endure*.<sup>77</sup> If the reason for the activity was given, there was no doubt that making *srwd* resulted from the destruction or at least from the bad state of preservation of the construction. *Srwd* seems to describe then the process of making the building firm by changing the kind of material from weak (mudbrick) to strong (stone, and more precisely, sandstone) to achieve a work that can endure eternally.

**Tab. 3.** The occurrences of *srwd*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Deir el-Bahari, Djoser-djeseru, Birth Portico, west wall	<i>sbt</i>	Naville 1898: Pl. LVII (l. 9)
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Semna, west wall exterior face	<i>pr</i>	Caminos 1998a: Pls 38–40
Thutmose III	Karnak, Palace of Maat, west wall, at the false door	?	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 868.7
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, north chapel, east wall	<i>pr</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pls 112–113
Thutmose III	Karnak, Ptah temple	<i>ḥwt-ntr</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 879.9

• *smnh*

The verb *smnh* was probably the most frequently used in the building context. It describes constructions made in the provinces as well as in Karnak (**Tab. 4**). Most often, it is

<sup>72</sup> *Urk.* IV, 868.7.

<sup>73</sup> *Urk.* IV, 879.9.

<sup>74</sup> Caminos 1998a: Pls 38–40.

<sup>75</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pls 112–113.

<sup>76</sup> TLA lemma no. 400633 (31 October 2012).

<sup>77</sup> TLA lemma no. 139340 (31 October 2012).

connected with the name of material used: *m jnr ḥd nfr n ɛnw*,<sup>78</sup> *m jnr n rwdt*,<sup>79</sup> *m šs*,<sup>80</sup> although the character of work is also mentioned: *m mnw nfrw*,<sup>81</sup> and *m k3t nhḥ*,<sup>82</sup> *m k3t dt*.<sup>83</sup> If *smnh* is involved, it usually appears after the verbs *kdj*<sup>84</sup> *kr jr*.<sup>85</sup> In the second register of the south external wall of the Chapelle Rouge, in the coronation text of Hatshepsut the queen says: *my heart pronounced as its plan to smnh temples of gods more than these that were ordered by the ancestors*.<sup>86</sup> The temple (*hwt-ntr*<sup>87</sup> or *pr*<sup>88</sup>), probably as a general name for places of gods, was also the object of being *smnh*. It seems important to stress that almost all sanctuaries (*jwnn*) dated to the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were *smnh*.<sup>89</sup> The word is also used to designate the place of actual stay of the god, considering that apart from *jwnn*, also *hm dsr*<sup>90</sup> and *sh-ntr*<sup>91</sup> were *smnh*.

**Tab. 4.** The occurrences of *smnh*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Karnak, Chapelle Rouge, Historical text, blocks 285 and 24	col. 7. <i>hwt-ntr</i> col. 14. <i>ḥwwt nw ntrw</i>	Burgos, Larché 2006: 37
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Buhen, exterior north wall	<i>jwnn</i>	Caminos 1974: Pl. 29 (vol. II)
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Deir el-Bahari, Djoser-djeseru, North Chamber of Amun, west wall	<i>jwnn</i>	Naville 1895: Pl. XIX
Thutmose III	Karnak, Palace of Maat, Room XVI	<i>jwnn</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 854.9
Thutmose III	Karnak, Palace of Maat, west wall, close to false door	<i>pr</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 868.6
Thutmose III	Karnak, Palace of Maat, south external wall, <i>Texte de la Jeunesse</i>	<i>mnw m Jpt-swt</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 162.15
Thutmose III	Karnak, Wadjyt-hall, column	?	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 842.17
Thutmose III	Karnak, Wadjyt-hall, column	<i>r-pr</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 843.1

<sup>78</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pl. 105.

<sup>79</sup> *Urk.* IV, 842.17.

<sup>80</sup> Nims 1969: Fig. 7 (l. 20).

<sup>81</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pl. 105.

<sup>82</sup> *Urk.* IV, 882.12.

<sup>83</sup> *Urk.* IV, 879.8.

<sup>84</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pls 105, 106; Naville 1895: Pl. 19.

<sup>85</sup> *Urk.* IV, 882.12; *Epigraphic Survey 2009*: Pl. 23.

<sup>86</sup> Burgos, Larché 2006: 37.

<sup>87</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pls 105, 106; Burgos, Larché 2006: 37; *Urk.* IV, 879.8.

<sup>88</sup> *Urk.* IV, 864.16, 868.6; *Epigraphic Survey 2009*: Pl. 23.

<sup>89</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 112 [18/6Q]; Caminos 1974: Pl. 29 (vol. II); Naville 1895: Pl. 19. Only on the *Poetic Stela* of Thutmose III (CG 34010) *jwnn* is used in different context (Lacau 1909: 19 [l. 3]).

<sup>90</sup> *Urk.* IV, 881.12. For the word *hm*, see: Studer 1996: 326–329.

<sup>91</sup> Nims 1969: Fig. 7 (l. 20).

Thutmose III	Karnak, courtyard of the VI pylon, stela CG 34012	<i>Hft.t-hr-nb.s st jb jt.j</i>	Lacau 1909: 25, 31
Thutmose III	Karnak, granite bark sanctuary, north(?) exterior wall	col. 17. <i>Jmn-ꜥ3-hꜥw</i> col. 20. <i>sh-ntr</i>	Nims 1969: Fig. 7 (ll. 17 and 20)
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu	<i>pr msw</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 864.16
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>hwt-ntr</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 105
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>hwt-ntr</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 106
Thutmose III	Karnak, Ptah temple	<i>hwt-ntr</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 879.8
Thutmose III	Medinet Habu, architrave	<i>st.f dsrt nt sp tpj</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 882.12
Thutmose III	Medinet Habu, architrave	<i>hm dsr</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 881.12
Thutmose III	Medinet Habu, room L, north wall	<i>pr</i>	<i>Epigraphic Survey 2009:</i> Pl. 23

Ch. Wallet-Lebrun noticed that the meaning of *smnh* is not *to embellish*<sup>92</sup> but *to make strong, firm*<sup>93</sup> and was strictly related to the use of sandstone. According to her, this verb in the building context meant *to (re)construct firmly* the temple using granite and sandstone.<sup>94</sup> It seems, however, that this word was used to stress that the reconstructed building was a dwelling of a god or even his sanctuary, and, contrary to what Ch. Wallet-Lebrun suggested, not only sandstone was mentioned as a material for *smnh*, but limestone and calcite as well.

Moreover, some further arguments can be deduced from private sources. Menkheperaseneb informs that he supervised works of craftsmen in the temple of Amun, and two various materials are listed on this occasion: lapis-lazuli and turquoise (part of the text is lost). Next he asserts that he is the confident of the king in making *smnh* of the latter's monuments as the overseer of craftsmen and overseer of works of Amun.<sup>95</sup> The same materials are mentioned in the incomplete text preserved on the second stela of the supervisor of craftsmen Djehuti, who lived under Hatshepsut. He enumerates four items, gold, silver, lapis-lazuli and turquoise, in the biographical part of the very fragmentary inscription listing duties bestowed upon him by the king.<sup>96</sup> These materials belong to the traditional gifts offered to the king on the occasion of New Year's Festival.<sup>97</sup> The same set of precious materials occurs as the equipment of the newly built temple, Akhmenu, as attested in the dedicatory inscription of this building.<sup>98</sup> Tribute was also paid in these materials, as

<sup>92</sup> TLA lemma no. 135360 (31 October 2012).

<sup>93</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 1994: 228.

<sup>94</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 1994: 231.

<sup>95</sup> Davies 1933: Pl. X.

<sup>96</sup> *Urk.* IV, 436.16.

<sup>97</sup> I.e. *Urk.* IV, 455.14; Davies 1933: Pl. IV.

<sup>98</sup> Gardiner 1952: 14, Pl. III.

recorded for the year 29<sup>th</sup> in the *Annals of Thutmose III*.<sup>99</sup> It should also be stressed that these items belonged to the temple's equipment, as stated by Ineni, who supervised the storerooms in Karnak where precious stones and metals as well as incense were stored.<sup>100</sup> The same function was accorded to Hapuseneb in later years,<sup>101</sup> and under the sole rule of Thutmose III – to Menkheperreseneb.<sup>102</sup> They all mentioned gold, silver, lapis-lazuli and turquoise, as the materials kept in the treasury. The importance of one of these items, namely turquoise, can be determined: it was one of the most expensive precious stones, used almost exclusively for cultic purposes,<sup>103</sup> and Hatshepsut spared no effort to obtain it, sending an expedition to Wadi Maghara.<sup>104</sup> According to private sources, it seems probable that the word *smnh* was used to describe the providing the sanctuary with all products, stone and precious materials necessary to its functioning. It explains the expression used on one of the architraves of Akhmenu, where Amun-Re addresses the king: *build my house (pr), smnh my temple (hwt-ntr) with perfect monuments*.<sup>105</sup>

• *sw<sup>c</sup>b*

To be *w<sup>c</sup>b* (*pure*) in the ritual context was of the greatest importance in ancient Egypt:<sup>106</sup> the formula *jw w<sup>c</sup>b* appears on the doors of temples,<sup>107</sup> and the priests having access to the inner parts were called *w<sup>c</sup>bw*,<sup>108</sup> while the purification formulae constituted a part of daily ritual, where the purity of performers and products was referred to in most of the spells.<sup>109</sup> It seems then that this word, when used to describe a king's action related to a temple, meant more than all other words under discussion. The basic meaning of *w<sup>c</sup>b* is *to be pure*,<sup>110</sup> i.e. to be prepared for performance of rituals and, in larger sense, to be back to the beginning of the creation of the world.<sup>111</sup>

From the material collected by J.L. Gee, who studied different aspects of ritual purity, it appears that the purification of the building was strongly connected with its rebuilding.<sup>112</sup> In most inscriptions, the reason for reconstruction and, in consequence, purification of a temple, was its destruction. The new sacral structure required, of course, the purification but such formulae appear in texts much less frequently being probably too

<sup>99</sup> *Urk.* IV, 686.4–10.

<sup>100</sup> *Urk.* IV, 70.17–71.5; Dziobek 1992: 38.

<sup>101</sup> *Urk.* IV, 476.13; Delvaux 1988: 57 (l. 9), Pl. 2.3.

<sup>102</sup> Davies 1933: Pl. X (TT 86).

<sup>103</sup> Helck 1969: 51–52.

<sup>104</sup> Gardiner, Peet 1917: 74; Gardiner, Peet, Černý 1955: Pl. XIV.44.

<sup>105</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pl. 105.

<sup>106</sup> Gee 1998: esp. 7–14 (Purification of Sacred Space) and 14–29 (Purity as Entrance Requirement).

<sup>107</sup> Caminos 1974: Pl. 22 (vol. I); Pls 12, 15 (vol. II); Beaux *et al.* 2012: Pl. 1.

<sup>108</sup> Braun 2013: 191–303.

<sup>109</sup> Braun 2013.

<sup>110</sup> TLA lemma no. 400114 (31 October 2012).

<sup>111</sup> Fairman 1954–1955: 173. The ritual of purification of the temple constituted a part of the opening of the mouth ceremony: Traunecker 1992: 255; Blackman, Fairman 1946: 87–90.

<sup>112</sup> Gee 1998: 8–13.

obvious to be mentioned.<sup>113</sup> It should be noted that in J.L. Gee's collection of descriptions referring to the purification of a temple, a majority can be dated to the times of the sole reign of Thutmose III.<sup>114</sup>

Although Thutmose III built so many new sacral buildings, there are only nine royal texts known so far in which he orders to purify the structure: three in Karnak and six in Heliopolis (**Tab. 5**). The inscription preserved on stela CG 34012, coming from the courtyard of the VI pylon of the temple of Amun in Karnak, informs that having found the walls of enclosure made of brick and fallen down, the king ordered, among others, to enlarge the 'this house' and to purify it (*swsh r pr pn sw<sup>c</sup>b sw*).<sup>115</sup> It is not specified which construction was meant, most probably it was the structure mentioned at the beginning of the text, and especially its part called *hwt-ntr jbtj r-pr pn*, quoted in the previous line. The text further communicates *I constructed this place which is in the enclosure to build monuments in it for the sake of purifying this house of my father A[mun of J]pt-sw<sup>t</sup> which I did anew*.<sup>116</sup> On stela CG 34013 coming from the temple of Ptah in Karnak the king reports: *I purified for him his great seat (sw<sup>c</sup>b.j n.f st.f wrt)*.<sup>117</sup> *Sw<sup>c</sup>b* is also mentioned twice in the *Annals of Thutmose III* (fragments VII D and I), but the context of its use remains unclear.<sup>118</sup>

**Tab. 5.** The occurrences of *sw<sup>c</sup>b*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Thutmose III	Karnak, courtyard of the VI pylon, stela CG 34012	l. 4: <i>r-pr</i> l. 5: <i>r-pr</i>	Lacau 1909: 25 (ll. 4, 5)
Thutmose III	Karnak, temple of Ptah, stela CG 34013	<i>st.f wrt</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 766.7
Thutmose III	Karnak, <i>Annals of Thutmose III</i> , fragments VII D and I	?	Grimal 2009: 110, Pl. 13 (fragment VII D); 117, Pl. 14 (fragment VII I)
Thutmose III	Heliopolis, three stelae	<i>pr R<sup>c</sup></i>	Radwan 1981: 403–407; Collombert 2008–2010: 5–13
Thutmose III	Heliopolis, 2 plaques	<i>Jwnw</i>	Raue 1999: 303–304
Thutmose III	scarab	<i>pr R<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 554, no. 35

The inscription found on the stelae dated to the 47<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Thutmose III informs that the king decided to encircle the temple (*pr*) with a wall when he purified Heliopolis and the House of Re (*hft sw<sup>c</sup>b Jwnw Pr R<sup>c</sup>*). All this was done to *dismiss the evil (sh<sup>r</sup> dwt hr)* because *His Majesty found this house fallen into decay (gm.n hm.f r-pr pn w3j r mrh)*.<sup>119</sup> This information was apparently of such importance that the same text was carved on at

<sup>113</sup> Gee 1998: 8–13.

<sup>114</sup> Gee 1998: 8–9.

<sup>115</sup> Beckerath 1981: 44, Fig. 1 (l. 4).

<sup>116</sup> *Urk.* IV, 835.5–7.

<sup>117</sup> *Urk.* IV, 766.7.

<sup>118</sup> Grimal 2009: 110, Pl. 13 (fragment VII D); 117, Pl. 14 (fragment VII I).

<sup>119</sup> Radwan 1981: 404, Fig. 1; Collombert 2008–2010: 7, Figs 1–3.

least three stelae which were, most probably, erected in the vicinity of Heliopolis.<sup>120</sup> On this occasion a scarab with the inscription *Mn-hpr-R<sup>c</sup> is the one who purifies the House of Re forever (Mn-hpr-R<sup>c</sup> sw<sup>c</sup>b Pr R<sup>c</sup> dt)* was also made.<sup>121</sup> On two plaques of Thutmose III the inscription says: *Mn-hpr-R<sup>c</sup> is the one who purifies Jwnw*.<sup>122</sup> The recollection of the rebuilding and purification of the temple in Heliopolis had survived even in the memory of royal officials, as it was noticed above.<sup>123</sup> Taking into consideration all above-mentioned sources, the significance of the royal action cannot be underestimated. Almost nothing is known about the functioning of this cultic centre during the co-regency of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III and it remained almost unnoticed in sources from the reign of Hatshepsut.<sup>124</sup> Moreover, hardly any objects connected to the cult were found there,<sup>125</sup> and it seems even that the role of Atum was partially transferred to Amun.<sup>126</sup> Thus, the deeds of Thutmose III, who decided to rebuild, purify and sanctify the temple complex in Heliopolis, give the impression of a new direction in religious policy introduced during the late years of this king.

#### DIFFERENT FACES OF RENOVATION

To describe the reconstruction of temples under Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, the variants of phrases *m3w(t)*, *wḥm mnw*, *sdsr* and *hbs mnw* were used. The exact meaning of some of these words remains difficult to define and the range of works hidden behind them is worth discussing.

##### • *m3w / m m3w(t)*

The most popular among the words referring to reconstruction of sacral buildings during the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were *m3w* and *m m3w(t)* (*anew*) (**Tab. 6**). They are attested in Buhen,<sup>127</sup> Coptos,<sup>128</sup> the Theban region (Karnak,<sup>129</sup> Deir el-Bahari,<sup>130</sup> Medinet Habu<sup>131</sup>), Armant,<sup>132</sup> Speos Artemidos<sup>133</sup> and Heliopolis.<sup>134</sup>

<sup>120</sup> Staatliches Museen zu Berlin, 1634 (Radwan 1981: 403–405, Fig. 1, Pl. 61a; *Urk.* IV, 832.12–16) and two stelae in Musée d'art et d'histoire de Genève, A 2010-9-02 and A 2010-9-03 (Collombert 2008–2010: 5–13).

<sup>121</sup> Newberry 1906: Pl. 28.14; Raue 1999: 304 and literature there.

<sup>122</sup> Raue 1999: 303–304 and literature there.

<sup>123</sup> Statue of Ahmose, Egyptian Museum, CG 589 (Borchardt 1925: 144; Moursi 1972: 52–56 (§ 32); Ghoneim 1994: 100–101; Raue 1999: 150).

<sup>124</sup> Only one person connected to the temple in Heliopolis is attested in sources: Raue 1999: 437–438.

<sup>125</sup> Canopic jar of Mnevis, Musée d'art et d'histoire de Genève, 19488 (Guarnori 1982: 20–22).

<sup>126</sup> Myśliwiec 1979; Iwaszczuk 2014: 178.

<sup>127</sup> Karkowski 1981: Pl. 25.

<sup>128</sup> Petrie 1896: Pl. XII.2.

<sup>129</sup> Grallert 2001: 263, 267, 270–279, 281, 282; Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 101 [18/6J], 115 [18/6R, ll. 25, 38], 119 [18/6T], 121 [18/6V], 124 [18/6Y, AA], 126 [18/6AD, AE], 128 [18/6AG, AH, AI], 129 [18/6AK], 151 [18/6AZ], 163 [18/6AAE].

<sup>130</sup> Grallert 2001: 402.

<sup>131</sup> Grallert 2001: 364, 384.

<sup>132</sup> Gardiner 1955: Pl. X.3.

<sup>133</sup> Gardiner 1946: Pl. VI (l. 18).

<sup>134</sup> Raue 1999: 148.

**Tab. 6.** The occurrences of *m3w* / *m m3w(t)*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Karnak, Chapelle Rouge, Historical text, blocks 258 and 84	col. 7. <i>hwt-ntr</i> col. 14. <i>hwwt nw</i> <i>ntrw</i>	Burgos, Larché 2006: 37
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Deir el-Bahari, Upper Terrace, architrave	<i>hwt-ntr</i>	Karkowski 1983: 149
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Speos Artemidos, architrave	<i>hwt-ntr n nbt Kjs</i>	Gardiner 1946: Pl. VI (l. 18)
Thutmose III	Karnak, Wadjyt-hall, column	<i>p3 w3dw 4</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 843.10
Thutmose III	Karnak, Wadjyt-hall, column	<i>w3dw</i>	Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 92 [18/6C]
Thutmose III	Karnak, vestibule of the VI pylon, jamb north (J) and south (I)	<i>mmw n jt.f</i> <i>3-hpr-k3-Rc</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 847.12
Thutmose III	Karnak, vestibule of the bark sanctuary, north wall	?	Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 104 [18/6 L1]
Thutmose III	Karnak, courtyard of the VI pylon, stela CG 34012	<i>r-pr pn n jt.j [Jmn</i> <i>m J]pt-swt</i>	Lacau 1909: 25 l. 5
Thutmose III	Karnak, bark sanctuary	?	Grallert 2001: 270 (l. x+16) [T3/KS009]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Palace of Maat, south external wall, <i>Texte de la</i> <i>Jeunesse</i>	25. ? 32. ? 42. ? 43. <i>twt</i> 47. <i>mnht</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 166.7, 169.5, 171.16, 172.16, 173.14, 174.4, 175.3
Thutmose III	Karnak, temple of Ptah, stela CG 34013	<i>hwt-ntr</i>	Lacau 1909: 28 (l. 5)
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, south external wall	[ <i>s</i> ] <i>h</i>	Grallert 2001: 279 [T3/Kn003, l. 81]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, south storerooms, corridor, south wall	<i>hwt 3t nt hhw m</i> <i>rnpwt</i>	Grallert 2001: 276 [T3/Wf050]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu [found in Luxor]	<i>hwt 3t Mn-hpr-</i> <i>-Rc-3h-mnw</i>	Grallert 2001: 278 [T3/Wf078]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, offering table	<i>hwt 3t Mn-hpr-</i> <i>-Rc-3h-mnw</i>	Grallert 2001: 279 [T3/Wf031]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, offering table	<i>hwt 3t Mn-hpr-</i> <i>-Rc-3h-mnw</i>	Grallert 2001: 279 [T3/Wf034]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, offering stand	<i>hwt 3t Mn-hpr-</i> <i>-Rc-3h-mnw</i>	Grallert 2001: 279 [T3/Wf035]



Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, offering stand	<i>hwt-ꜣ3(t) Mn-hpr-Rꜥ-3h-mnw</i>	Grallert 2001: 279 [T3/Wf032]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, entrance, column	<i>hwt-ꜣ3t 3h-mnw</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 1
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, column 2 east	<i>hrt-jb spst</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 12
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, column 7 west	<i>hrt-jb spst</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 15
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>hrt-jb</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 88
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>hrt-jb</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 89
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>hrt-jb</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 99
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>hrt-jb</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 100
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>hwt-ꜣ3t</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 107
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>3h-mnw</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 108
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, column	<i>hwt-ntr ꜣ3t Mn-hpr-Rꜥ-3h-mnw</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 858 [a, c]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, column	<i>hwt-ꜣ3t 3h-mnw</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 859.1–5
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, granite stand, Cairo	<i>hwt-ꜣ3t Mn-hpr-Rꜥ-3h-mnw</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 865.15
Thutmose III	Karnak, Sokarian rooms, hypostyle hall, column 25	?	Grallert 2001: 275 [T3/Wf054]; Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 124 [18/6 AA]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Sokarian rooms, hypostyle hall, column 30	<i>hwt-ntr ꜣ3t</i>	Grallert 2001: 275 [T3/Wf057]; Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 124 [18/6 Y]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Sokarian rooms, hypostyle hall, column	<i>hwt-ntr ꜣ3t Mn-hpr-Rꜥ-3h-mnw</i>	Grallert 2001: 275 [T3/Wf055]
Thutmose III	Karnak, temple of Ptah, courtyard, south wall	<i>hwt Pth</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 879.2
Thutmose III	Karnak, temple of Ptah	<i>hwt Pth</i>	Grallert 2001: 281 [T3/KS005]
Thutmose III	Medinet Habu, architrave	<i>hm dsr</i>	Grallert 2001: 364 [T3/Wf085]

Thutmose III	Medinet Habu, architrave	<i>hm</i>	<i>Urk. IV, 881.12</i>
Thutmose III	Koptos, block	<i>r-pr</i>	Petrie 1896: Pl. XIII
Thutmose III	Buhen, column	<i>jmnw špsw</i>	Caminos: 1974, Pl. 95 (vol. I)
Thutmose III	Buhen, architrave	<i>hwt-ntr</i>	Karkowski 1981: Pl. 25
Thutmose III	Armant, block	<i>hwt</i>	Gardiner 1955: Pl. X.3

It seems that when the king spoke about making a building ‘anew’, he announced that he really rebuilt the structure. *M m3wt* was applied both to the whole building and to its parts (**Tab. 6**). The excavations at Thutmoside sites show that royal declarations were reliable, and confirmation of dedicatory inscriptions is sometimes found in private sources. Taking this into consideration, the dedicatory inscription placed on the architrave from the Upper Courtyard of the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari may seem surprising as it says: *King of Lower and Upper Egypt ʿ3-hpr-n-R<sup>c</sup>* [in original text: *M3<sup>c</sup>t-k3-R<sup>c</sup>*], *he made it as his monument for his father Amun-Re Lord of Thrones of Two Lands, i.e. erecting for him the temple of god anew (m m3wt)*.<sup>135</sup> There is no other indication that there was any earlier temple in the same place. Perhaps the text refers to the temple of Amenhotep I which was dismantled by Hatshepsut<sup>136</sup> or indeed Thutmose II started to erect his temple in the same place, as suggested by Z. Wisoeki,<sup>137</sup> although the latter hypothesis seems very difficult to prove.

The phrase *m m3wt* was introduced into dedicatory inscriptions by many rulers, starting from Senwosret I,<sup>138</sup> but only under Seti I and Ramesses II it was used as frequently as during the reign of Hatshepsut and especially of Thutmose III. It is generally known that Seti I and, after his death, Ramesses II performed a great restoration across the country, renovating constructions destroyed by Akhenaten’s followers. Such a frequent use of the *m m3wt* formula (together with the other ones mentioned in this article) as well as archaeological data reveal a great renovation action also under the rule of the Thutmoside rulers.

• *wḥm mnw / wḥm sm3wj mnw / sm3wj*

The phrase *wḥm mnw* (*to repeat monument*) was used only for the minor constructions inside a temple, first of all doors, but also obelisks (**Tab. 7** and **8**). The earliest attestation of *wḥm mnw* appears on the limestone block forming part of the door jamb made by Hatshepsut and built later by Thutmose III into the foundation of the Ptah temple. The first column of the text starts with the regular dedicatory inscription: *M3<sup>c</sup>t-k3-R<sup>c</sup> jr.n.s m [...]*, in the second column the nomen of Hatshepsut and the epithet of the queen, *wḥmt*

<sup>135</sup> Karkowski 1983: 149, Fig. 6.

<sup>136</sup> Winlock 1928: 30; Arnold 1979: 67, Pls 42, 44.

<sup>137</sup> Wisoeki 1986: 228.

<sup>138</sup> Grallert 2001: 243, 539.

*mnw*, are mentioned.<sup>139</sup> This may be interpreted in connection with another inscription, preserved on the gate of the temple of Ptah, and giving the name of the door: *sb3 Mn-hpr-Rc whm mnw n jt.f*.<sup>140</sup> It is likely that the fragment from the time of Hatshepsut can also be considered as the door name, probably of similar function and possibly coming from similar location of the dismantled temple. On the east face of the shaft of the northern obelisk of Hatshepsut, Amun states: *it is your father who gave the instructions of making firm the obelisks and you will repeat the monuments (whm mnw)*.<sup>141</sup>

**Tab. 7.** The occurrences of *whm mnw*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Karnak, Ptah temple, gate	?	Thiers, Zignani 2011: 20 [lower right]
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Karnak, obelisk of Thutmose I	<i>thmw</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 358.9
Thutmose III	Karnak, Palace of Maat, false door	<i>ꜥꜥ = sb3 m pr Jmn</i>	Grallert 2001: 270 [T3/Wf064]
Thutmose III	Karnak, Ptah temple, gate	<i>sb3</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 880.1
Thutmose III	Karnak, Ptah temple, gate	<i>sb3</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 880.1 ( <i>whm sm3wj mnw</i> )

**Tab. 8.** The occurrences of *sm3wj*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>r-pr</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 105
Thutmose III	Karnak, Ptah temple, gate	<i>sb3</i>	<i>Urk.</i> IV, 880.1–2, 6

The next example of *whm mnw* from the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III is found on the false door represented on the wall of the Palace of Maat: *making for him the stela 'Mn-hpr-Rc is the one who repeats the monument' in the House of Amun*.<sup>142</sup>

*Whm mnw* also appears in the name of another gate of Thutmose III in the temple of Ptah in Karnak: *whm sm3wj mnw n jt.f jn Dhwtj-ms-sm3-hpr*.<sup>143</sup> The verb *sm3wj*, very rarely used in building inscriptions of the Thutmoside era, becomes popular in texts of this type during the reign of Seti I and Ramesses II.<sup>144</sup> On the architrave from the Heretib in

<sup>139</sup> Thiers, Zignani 2011: 20 [lower right].

<sup>140</sup> *Urk.* IV, 880.1.

<sup>141</sup> *Urk.* IV, 358.9.

<sup>142</sup> Barguet 1962: 127.

<sup>143</sup> *Urk.* IV, 880.1–2.

<sup>144</sup> Grallert 2001.

the Akhmenu Amun ascribes to the king *making firm* (*smnh*) the house of his father and *renovating* (*sm3wj*) his temple (*r-pr*).<sup>145</sup> It still remains a subject of discussion whether the temples of Ptah and the Akhmenu in Karnak replaced any older constructions erected by Hatshepsut.

Once again *wḥm mnw* is attested under the rule of Amenhotep III on stela CG 34025, and there again it describes the repeating the construction of the gate (*sb3*).<sup>146</sup>

The formula *wḥm mnw* is translated as *to reconstruct*.<sup>147</sup> G. Björkman translated this phrase in the context of the stela of Amenhotep III: *he made still another monument*, treating this activity as ‘multiplying’ not ‘reconstruction’.<sup>148</sup> Ch. Wallet-Lebrun, giving the example of obelisk of Hatshepsut, explained that *wḥm* does not require earlier destruction and she is also convinced that the king announcing *wḥm mnw* in fact realises it.<sup>149</sup>

It is difficult to decide whether *wḥm mnw* refers to an attachment to tradition or was, in fact, the act of reconstruction by repetition. It is interesting to note that this phrase had already been used before Hatshepsut and it formed the Two Ladies name of Kamose.<sup>150</sup> It was, therefore, a political or even religious declaration of the king.

• *sḏsr* / *jrt ḏsrt*

The verb *sḏsr* (*to sanctify*)<sup>151</sup> was connected with other activities, such as: *ḳdj* (*to build*), *sḥꜥ* (*to erect*) or *jrj mnw* (*to make monuments*). This connection can indicate that *sḏsr* was an act performed for the newly built or rebuilt temple. Moreover, it concerned, like *smnh*, the inner parts of the temple or the temple itself, possibly understood here as a sacred construction in general. The elements that could be *sḏsr* differ from these that could be *smnh*: only *st* (*r ntrw*), *3ḥt* and also *ḥwt-ntr*, *r-pr* and *pr* could be an object of *sḏsr* (**Tab. 9**).

**Tab. 9.** The occurrences of *sḏsr/jrt ḏsrt*.

Date	Site	Structure	Literature
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Deir el-Bahari, Djoser-djeseru, Birth Portico, southern wall	<i>prw</i>	Naville 1896: Pl. LXVI
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Deir el-Bahari, Djoser-djeseru, North Chamber of Amun, west wall	<i>st</i>	Naville 1895: Pl. XIX
Hatshepsut/ /Thutmose III	Speos Artemidos, architrave	<i>ḥwt-ntr n nbt Kjs</i>	Gardiner 1946: Pl. VI (l. 18)
Thutmose III	Karnak, courtyard of the VI pylon, stela CG 34012	<i>3ḥt</i>	Lacau 1909: 25

<sup>145</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pl. 105.

<sup>146</sup> *Urk.* IV, 1151.5.

<sup>147</sup> TLA lemma no. 400725 (31 October 2012); Badawy 1957: 73.

<sup>148</sup> Björkman 1971: 104.

<sup>149</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 1994: 227–228, n. 12.

<sup>150</sup> von Beckerath 1999: 130–131.

<sup>151</sup> TLA lemma no. 150930 (31 October 2012).

Thutmose III	Karnak, Palace of Maat, south exterior wall, <i>Texte de la Jeunesse</i>	<i>r-pr</i>	<i>Urk. IV, 169.10</i>
Thutmose III	Karnak, Akhmenu, Heretib, architrave	<i>st r ntrw</i>	Pécoil 2000: Pl. 96
Thutmose III	Karnak, <i>Annals of Thutmose III</i> , fragment VII D	<i>hwt-ntr</i>	Grimal 2009: 109–112 (l. 4) ( <i>jr t dsrt</i> )
Thutmose III	Medinet Habu, room L, north wall	<i>st r ntrw</i>	<i>Epigraphic Survey 2009</i> : Pl. 23

*Sdsr* occurs in the inscription on the south wall of the so-called Birth Portico in the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, in the speech of Amun to the Ennead, but the context of this verb remains unknown, being in a *lacuna*: [*build*] *your temples and sanctify* [*your*] *houses*.<sup>152</sup>

On the west wall of the North Chamber of Amun in the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, the queen is called by Amun: *the one who builds* (*kd*t) [*my*] *house, who makes firm* (*smnh*(t)) [*my*] *sanctuary, who sanctifies* (*sdsrt*) *my divine seat* (*st.j dsrt*).<sup>153</sup>

During the reign of Hatshepsut, once again *sdsr* was used in the context of a rebuilt construction. In Speos Artemidos' long inscription carved on the architrave, Hatshepsut states: *I sanctified* (*sdsr*) *it after I had built it anew and fashioned her serpent-image of gold* [...].<sup>154</sup>

In Medinet Habu, *sdsr* is mentioned on the north wall of room L, where Amun addresses Thutmose III: *you made* (*jr*) *for me beautiful monuments, made firm* (*smnh*) *my house and sanctified* (*sdsr*) *my seat*.<sup>155</sup>

In the *Texte de la Jeunesse*, Thutmose III declares: [*I made it as my monument for*] *my father Amun-Re in Jpt-swt making for him monuments anew, surpassing the predecessors, sanctifying for him his temple*.<sup>156</sup>

In the already mentioned fragment of stela CG 34012, Thutmose III names the acts he did, and among them: *erecting* (*s<sup>c</sup>h<sup>c</sup>*) *the sanctuary, sanctifying* (*sdsr*) *the 3ht and making firm* (*smnh*) *Hft.t-hr-nb.s*.<sup>157</sup>

Another example of *sdsr* is found on the architrave of the Heretib-hall in the Akhmenu. The king there is labelled with the epithet: *the one who sanctified the seat of gods* (*sdsr st r ntrw*).<sup>158</sup>

In the fragment VII D of the *Annals of Thutmose III*, it is written about the king: *he sanctifies* (*sdsr*) *the temple of god according to the plan of hwt-k3*.<sup>159</sup>

<sup>152</sup> Naville 1896: Pl. XLVI.

<sup>153</sup> Naville 1895: Pl. 19.

<sup>154</sup> Gardiner 1946: Pl. VI (l. 18).

<sup>155</sup> *Epigraphic Survey 2009*: Pl. 23.

<sup>156</sup> *Urk. IV, 169.10*.

<sup>157</sup> Lacau 1909: 25.

<sup>158</sup> Pécoil 2000: Pl. 96.

<sup>159</sup> Grimal 2009: 110.

To sum up, one may conclude the verb *sḏsr* denotes an activity performed after a building work. The *Annals of Thutmose III* suggest that there was a plan according to which the sacral building could be sanctified and the *Speos Artemidos* text indicates that one of the forms of sanctifying of the monuments was the fashioning the god's image. If the 'sanctifying' is taken into account it refers to the 'seat of god', the most intimate place of the temple. The act of *sḏsr* was usually preceded by *smnh* of the sanctuary. The act of sanctifying the seat of gods seems to be important, at least twice it appears as an epithet of the king.

• *ḥbs mnw*

This phrase was inscribed on the gate of Thutmose III in the vestibule of the VI pylon. The reason for constructing the gate by the king is explained there: *to ḥbs monument of his father ʕ3-ḥpr-k3-Rʕ*.<sup>160</sup> According to A. Badawy, *ḥbs* means to *fill in, to cover with sand, to mask a building with an extension*.<sup>161</sup> Ch. Wallet-Lebrun proposed to translate it: *litt. « habiller », soit le « chemiser » des architects ; ce, afin de protéger, et donc le préserver, un element*.<sup>162</sup> R.O. Faulkner gives only one meaning to this verb when it refers to a building activity: *furnish house*.<sup>163</sup>

The phrase does not usually appear in a building context. During the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, the above-mentioned example is one of only two known. The erection of the monument described by Thutmose III as being *ḥbs*, was in fact started by Hatshepsut and completed by himself, which is confirmed by foundation deposits.<sup>164</sup>

For the second time the phrase is attested on the column erected by Thutmose III in the Wadjyt-hall in Karnak; in the partially preserved inscription, it is mentioned that the action has to be undertaken *to place statues of My Majesty to ḥsb the statues of ʕ3-ḥpr-k3-Rʕ*.<sup>165</sup> It is known that Thutmose III actually placed his statues in the Wadjyt-hall, in front of the statues of Thutmose I, consequently hiding them. So, probably the translations of the term as *to mask*,<sup>166</sup> as proposed by Ch. Wallet-Lebrun, or *to hide, cover up*, as proposed by R.O. Faulkner<sup>167</sup> are the best equivalents for describing this type of building activity.<sup>168</sup> This is the only word used in the building texts with respect to the action that protect the old structure without suggesting its reconstruction at the same time.

<sup>160</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 101.

<sup>161</sup> Badawy 1957: 72–73.

<sup>162</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 102.

<sup>163</sup> Faulkner 1991: 167.

<sup>164</sup> Burgos, Larché 2008: 84; Mensan 2007: 21–22, 24.

<sup>165</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 94 [18/6 D].

<sup>166</sup> Wallet-Lebrun 2009: 95.

<sup>167</sup> Faulkner 1991: 167.

<sup>168</sup> In the Old Kingdom building dipinto, the word *ḥbs* appears in the context which suggests the translation *to coat* (Dobrev 1994: 152–153). I would like to thank Dr. Andrzej Ćwiek for this remark.

## REBIRTH OF TEMPLES

The subject of rebirth, *wḥm mswt*, studied earlier by A. Niwiński,<sup>169</sup> appeared in the literature in relation to the reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III thanks to A. Gnirs.<sup>170</sup> According to Gnirs, Hatshepsut and Thutmose III treated themselves as *Gründer eines neuen, heilbringenden Zeitalters*.<sup>171</sup> She sees *wḥm mswt* as recreation of tradition by copying old patterns and motifs, especially those from the early Twelfth Dynasty. The references to literature and culture of that period were inspired by similar political situation, e.g. the need for legitimisation which was expressed, among others, in erection of temples.<sup>172</sup>

When rulers introduced the *wḥm mswt* era, they added this term to their names and thus incorporated it into their political program.<sup>173</sup> It was also the case of Thutmose III, whose Horus Name as *Hr-wḥm-mswt* is attested on papyrus Berlin 3049.<sup>174</sup>

The phrase *wḥm mswt* was considered by P. Lacau and H. Chevrier as a description of the statue, although there is no determinative to precise the meaning of the term. They translated the sentence on the architrave of Senwosret I as: *les statues ont été renouvelées pour toi*.<sup>175</sup> Once again they rendered *mswt* as *statues* in their publication of the Chapelle Rouge.<sup>176</sup> P. Barguet translated it literally, as *répéter les naissances*.<sup>177</sup> Ch. Wallet-Lebrun suggested understanding *mswt* as *fabrication*.

*Wḥm mswt* as a description of building activity appears in the texts during the reign of Senwosret I. On architrave C2' of the Chapelle Blanche, Thoth speaks to Kamutef: *birth was repeated (wḥm mswt) for you for the second time in this monument of Hpr-k3-Rc, he expanded all your seats, which you occupy in your name Hprj*.<sup>178</sup>

The term *wḥm mswt* was used by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III until the end of the king's sole reign. In Semna, on the exterior face of the east wall, Isis addressed the king: *how perfect is this durable monument which you [made for] the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Hc-k3w-Rc for the first time. You repeated [birth] (wḥm [mswt]) for the second time in the durable monument when you ordered for it numerous wdḥw-offerings*.<sup>179</sup> The same text is repeated above the representation of the royal barque, preserved on the inner face of the inner wall.<sup>180</sup>

In the Palace of Maat in Karnak, on the wall transferred to room XII, Amun-Re described Hatshepsut as *the one who built my house, illuminated my name for the first time repeating birth (wḥm mswt) [...] in this durable monument*.<sup>181</sup>

<sup>169</sup> Niwiński 1996.

<sup>170</sup> Gnirs 2006: 261; 2013: 169–173.

<sup>171</sup> Gnirs 2006: 261.

<sup>172</sup> Gnirs 2013: 69–73.

<sup>173</sup> Niwiński 1996.

<sup>174</sup> Vernus 1979: 176–184.

<sup>175</sup> Lacau, Chevrier 1956: 48.

<sup>176</sup> Lacau, Chevrier 1977: 127.

<sup>177</sup> Barguet 1962: 150.

<sup>178</sup> Lacau, Chevrier 1956: 48; 1969: Pl. 11.

<sup>179</sup> Caminos 1998a: Pl. 29.

<sup>180</sup> Caminos 1998a: Pl. 52.

<sup>181</sup> Barguet 1962: 150; Hamza 1991–1992: 39, Fig. 2.

In the already mentioned historical inscription carved on the exterior south wall of the Chapelle Rouge, the god addresses the queen giving her, among others, the instruction *to make work without neglecting of sandstone and granite, to create my temple, to repeat birth (wḥm mswt) for it in white beautiful limestone from ʿnw anew*.<sup>182</sup>

In Buhen, on the stela dated to the 23<sup>rd</sup> year of Thutmose III, the king declares: *I built his house, I constructed his monuments according as he caused that I took possession of two banks (...) (I am) the one who perpetuates names, fashions offering loaves, perpetuates name of every god, he repeated birth (wḥm mswt) in them*.<sup>183</sup> ‘Them’ means probably all of these activities, for the nearest plural noun is too far to be taken into account. According to the later stela Cairo CG 34014, coming from Buhen and dated to 35<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Thutmose III, the king ordered to create a barque(?) of electrum, silver and copper in *which he repeats birth (wḥm mswt) for the second time*.<sup>184</sup>

In the inscription carved on the block coming from the temple at Koptos, the god addressed the king: *you erected Koptos anew, my temple (r-pr), for which you repeated birth (wḥm mswt)*.<sup>185</sup>

The last inscription recalling *wḥm mswt* is attested in the temple at Ellesiya with the date of the 51<sup>st</sup> year of Thutmose III: it is a copy of the stela of the 23<sup>rd</sup> year of this king from Buhen.<sup>186</sup>

Not all the above-mentioned examples are strictly connected to building activity, but construction seems to be one of these activities that were needed to create the newly born religious reality, and this had not changed since the reign of Senwosret I. Only the ruling king was able to cause *wḥm mswt*. ‘Repeating birth’ referred to gods<sup>187</sup> and venerated royal ancestors (Semna) as well as to the renovation of temples (Chapelle Rouge, Koptos) together with their equipment (Semna, Buhen) and the cult performed there (Buhen), i.e. to the place, tools and object of the cult. It seems that a necessary condition of the repetition of birth, apart from the building work, was the perpetuation of the name (Palace of Maat, Buhen, Ellesiya). It appears that *wḥm mswt* was an action undertaken to re-establish the sacred landscape and the order of the world. In Koptos two terms which suggest returning to the beginning of the creation were used in reference to *wḥm mswt*: *m m3wt* and *jrt mjtt ḏr p3wt t3*.<sup>188</sup> *Wḥm mswt* was not a cyclic action, and its number was limited; in Semna and Buhen it took place for the second time. Maybe the reason for this activity could be better understood from the text preserved on the south exterior wall of the Chapelle Rouge: *to repeat birth (wḥm mswt) for it in white beautiful limestone from ʿnw anew, to develop this what was fallen by the kings of Lower Egypt*.<sup>189</sup>

<sup>182</sup> Burgos, Larché 2006: 37, block 285.

<sup>183</sup> Caminos 1974: 49, Pl. 61 (vol. I).

<sup>184</sup> Lacau 1909: 30–31.

<sup>185</sup> Petrie 1896: Pl. XIII/2.

<sup>186</sup> *Urk.* IV, 812.17.

<sup>187</sup> The text from the Hathor shrine at Deir el-Bahari speaks about the joy of the people because of rebirth (*wḥm mswt*) of Hathor during the festival (Naville 1901: Pl. LXXXIX).

<sup>188</sup> Petrie 1896: Pl. XIII/2.

<sup>189</sup> Burgos, Larché 2006: 37, block 285.



## SUMMARY

The repetition of birth, *whm mswt*, seems to be an overall reconstruction of the sacred landscape, which was expressed very clearly in the text from Speos Artemidos. At the end of the reign of Thutmose III, probably all temples were erected anew, at least those that can be attested archaeologically. Such a picture emerges from both royal and private sources. It has been stressed by many authors that the renewing of monuments, which is one of the important features of the *whm mswt* era, brought Thutmose III the legitimisation of power.<sup>190</sup>

The reconstruction of the destroyed religious realm was the work to be made on all levels of religious activity, but the construction of new temples was the foundation of the process. The work was organised on a very big scale. It is evident from the sources that some activities were characteristic for the beginning of restoration process under the rule of Hatshepsut, and that the work progressing the action was extended upon the whole country. Administrative supervision appeared to be indispensable.

The unique character of renovation of the sacred landscape was emphasized by the use of specific language which evolved during this short period of reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.

New words were introduced to the language of building inscriptions, such as *srwḏ*, *sḥ3* and *smnh*, possibly to accentuate the range of destruction and indicate structures that required to be restored, made firm and equipped. *Sḥ3* was not a priority during the reign of Hatshepsut; it was Thutmose III who introduced it to the building vocabulary.

During the earlier phase of rebuilding activity, it was necessary to restore destroyed monuments, and thus the monumental building programme was initiated. Most of the vocabulary is applicable for activities of both co-rulers, but there are some words characteristic for the sole reign of Thutmose III only, namely: *sḥ3*, *snfr*, *sm3wj* and *swḥb*. The presence of words *sḥ3* and *snfr* in this sequence seems obvious, for at the beginning of the work there was simply no time to restore minor objects such as statues, or to enlarge what was already under construction. *Sm3wj* could be possibly a new word used by Thutmose III to designate a replacement of Hatshepsut's constructions. A special significance should also be given to *swḥb*, namely as indication in a change of the religious policy, attested in later years of the king.

It appears that it is possible to reconstruct the sequence of building works in some cases. The first activity was the construction itself and the words *kd*, *jr*, *sḥḥ* and *whm mswt* were used. The next step was to *smnh* the construction, especially its inner part (i.e. architrave in the Akhmenu, historical text in the Chapelle Rouge, column in the Wadjyt-hall, architrave in Medinet Habu). After *smnh*, two activities could usually be undertaken: *srwḏ* (i.e. courtyard of the temple of Ptah in Karnak) or *sdsr* (i.e. North Chamber of Amun at Deir el-Bahari, room L in Medinet Habu), but once, on stela CG 34012, *sdsr* precedes *smnh*. However, in this case, concerned are probably three different constructions within

<sup>190</sup> Björkman 1971: 95–96; Gnirs 2013: 170; Morkot 2003: 197.

one enclosure. There is also an example of the Speos Artemidos temple, where *sdsr* goes directly after *kd*, and in another fragment on stela CG 34012, *sw<sup>c</sup>b* going directly after *kd*. The sequence *kd* – *smnh* – *sdsr* seems to be fully logical if these words are well understood as *to build* – *to provide* – *to sanctify*, but the presence of word *srwd* (*to make firm*) in place of *sdsr* remains a mystery.

### Acknowledgments

This study has been conducted within the research project of the National Science Centre no. 2012/05/N/HS3/01733 ‘Province of Egypt from Sinai to the First Cataract during the reign of Hatshepsut.’

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Andrzej Ćwiek, Professor Ewa Laskowska-Kusztal, Professor Karol Myśliwiec, and Filip Taterka for their valuable comments and discussion. A would like to thank also Barbara Majchrzak for correcting my English.

### Bibliography

- Aly, M., Abdel Hamid, F., Dewachter, M. 1967: Le temple d’Amada. IV. Dessins, *Collection Scientifique du CEDAE*, Le Caire
- Arnold, Di. 1979: The Temple of Mentuhotep at Deir el-Bahari, *MMAEE* 21, New York
- Badawy, A. 1957: Philological Evidence about Methods of Construction in Ancient Egypt, *ASAE* LIV, 51–74
- Barbotin, Ch., Clère, J.-J. 1991: L’inscription de Sésostris I<sup>er</sup> à Tod, *BIFAO* 91, 1–32
- Barguet, P. 1962: Le temple d’Amon-Rê à Karnak. Essai d’exégèse, *RAPH* 21, Le Caire
- Beaux, N., Karkowski, J., Majerus, E., Pollin, G. 2012: La chapelle d’Hathor. Temple d’Hatchepsout à Deir el-Bahari I. Vestibule et sanctuaires 3. Planches, *MIFAO* 129/3, Le Caire
- Beckerath, J. von 1981: Ein Wunder des Amun bei der Tempelgründung in Karnak, *MDAIK* 37, 41–49
- Beckerath, J. von 1999: Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen, *MÄS* 49, Mainz a/Rhein
- Björkman, G. 1971: Kings at Karnak. A Study of the Treatment of the Monuments of Royal Predecessors in the Early New Kingdom, *Boreas* 2, Uppsala
- Blackman, A.M., Fairman, H.W. 1946: The Consecration of an Egyptian Temple according to the Use of Edfu, *JEA* 32, 75–91
- Blumenthal, E. 1970: Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königtum des Mittleren Reiches I. Die Phraseologie, *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse* 61/1, Berlin
- Borchardt, L. 1925: Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire N<sup>os</sup> 1–1294. Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten im Museum von Kairo 2, Berlin
- Braun, N.S. 2013: Pharao und Priester – Sakrale Affirmation von Herrschaft durch Kultvollzug. Das *Tägliche Kultbildritual* im Neuen Reich und der Dritten Zwischenzeit, *Philippika* 23, Wiesbaden

- Burgos, F., Larché, F. 2006: La chapelle Rouge. Le sanctuaire de barque d'Hatshepsout I. Fac-similés et photographies des scènes, Paris
- Burgos, F., Larché, F. 2008: La chapelle Rouge. Le sanctuaire de barque d'Hatshepsout II, Paris
- Caminos, R.A. 1974: The New-Kingdom Temples of Buhen I–II, *ASEg* 33–34, London
- Caminos, R.A. 1998a: Semna-Kumma I: The Temple of Semna, *ASEg* 37, London
- Caminos, R.A. 1998b: Semna-Kumma I: The Temple of Kemma, *ASEg* 38, London
- Collombert, Ph. 2008–2010: Les stèles d'enceinte de Thoutmosis III à Héliopolis, *BSEG* 28, 5–13
- Davies, N. de G. 1933: The Tombs of Menkheperasonb, Amenmosē, and Another (Nos. 86, 112, 42, 226), *TTS* 5, London
- Delvaux, L. 1988: La statue Louvre A 134 du Premier Prophète d'Amon Hapouseneb, *SAK* 15, 53–67
- Dobrev, V. 1994: Observations sur quelques marques de la pyramide de Pépi Ier, [*in:*] Berger, C., Clerc, G., Grimal, N. (Eds), Hommages à Jean Leclant I, *BiEtud* 106/1, Cairo, 147–158
- Dorman, P.F. 1991: The Tombs of Senenmut. The Architecture and Decoration of Tomb 71 and 353, *PMMA* 24, New York
- Dziobek, E. 1992: Das Grab des Ineni. Theben Nr. 81, *ArchVer* 68, Mainz a/Rhein
- Epigraphic Survey 2009: The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IX. The Eighteenth Dynasty Temple I. The Inner Sanctuaries*, *OIP* 136, Chicago 2009
- Fairman, H.W. 1954–1955: Worship and Festivals in an Egyptian Temple, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 37, 165–203
- Faulkner, R.O. 1991: A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, Oxford
- Franke, D. 1994: Das Heiligtum des Heqaib auf Elephantine. Geschichte eines Provinzheiligtums im Mittleren Reich, *SAGA* 9, Heidelberg
- Gardiner, A.H. 1946: Davies's Copy of the Great Speos Artemidos Inscription, *JEA* 32, 43–56
- Gardiner, A.H. 1952: Tuthmosis III Returns Thanks to Amūn, *JEA* 38, 6–23
- Gardiner, A.H. 1955: Blocks from the temple of Tuthmosis III at Armant, [*in:*] Breccia, E. (Ed.), Studi in memoria di Ippolito Rossellini nel primo centenario della morte (4 giugno 1843 – 4 giugno 1943) II, Pisa, 91–98
- Gardiner, A.H., Peet, T.E. 1917: The Inscriptions of Sinai. Part I. Introduction and Plates, *MEEF* 36, London
- Gardiner, A.H., Peet, T.E., Černý, J. 1955: The Inscriptions of Sinai. Part II. Translations and Commentary, *MEES* 45, London
- Gee, J.L. 1998: The Requirements of Ritual Purity in Ancient Egypt, unpublished PhD thesis, Yale University
- Ghoneim, W. 1994: Eine Statue des Prinzen und Hohepriesters von Heliopolis Ahmes (Cairo JE 36412), *SAK* 21, 95–106
- Glanville, S.R.K. 1928: The Letters of Aaḥmōse of Peniati, *JEA* XIV, 294–312
- Gnirs, A.M. 2006: Das Motiv des Bürgerkriegs in Merikare und Neferti. Zur Literatur der 18. Dynastie, [*in:*] Moers, G. et al. (Eds), *jn.t dr.w* – Festschrift für Friedrich Junge I, Göttingen, 207–265

- Gnirs, A.M. 2013: Zum Verhältnis von Literatur und Geschichte in der 18. Dynastie, [*in:*] Bickel, S. (Ed.), *Vergangenheit und Zukunft. Studien zum historischen Bewusstsein in der Thutmosidenzeit*, *AegHelv* 22, Basel, 127–186
- Grallert, S. 2001: Bauen – Stiften – Weißen. Ägyptische Bau- und Restaurierungsinchriften von den Anfängen bis zur 30. Dynastie I, *ADAIK* 18, Berlin
- Grimal, N. 2006: Civilisation pharaonique: archéologie, philologie et histoire, *ACF*, 581–602
- Grimal, N. 2009: Nouveaux fragments des Annales de Thoutmosis III à Karnak, [*in:*] Rößler-Köhler, U., Tawfik, T. (Eds), *Die ihr vorbeigehen werdet... Wenn Gräber, Tempel und Statuen sprechen. Gedenkschrift für Prof. Dr. Sayed Tawfik Ahmed*, *SDAIK* 16, Berlin-New York, 105–120
- Grimm, A. 1994: Zur kalendarischen Fixierung des jhhj-(Freuden-)Festes nach dem Kalender des Königs Amenophis I. aus Karnak, *GM* 143, 73–76
- Guarnori, S. 1982: Les vases canopes du Musée d'art et histoire de Genève, *BSEG* 6, 19–42
- Gundlach, R. 2008: Die Königsideologie Sesostris' I. anhand seiner Titulatur, *Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen* 7, Wiesbaden
- Habachi, L. 1985: Elephantine IV. The Sanctuary of Heqaib. Text, *ArchVer* 33, Mainz a/Rhein
- Hamza, U.R. 1991–1992: Some Remarks Concerning Chapel XII of Hatshepsut at Karnak Temple, *JSSEA* XXI–XXII, 37–40
- Helck, W. 1969: Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reiches (Teil VI), *Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 4, Wiesbaden
- Helck, W. 1978: Die Weihinschrift Sesostris' I. am Satet-Tempel von Elephantine, *MDAIK* 34, 69–78
- Helck, W. 1985: Politische Spannungen zu Beginn des Mittleren Reiches, [*in:*] Ägypten Dauer und Wandel. Symposium anlässlich des 75jährigen Bestehens des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo am 10. und 11. Oktober 1982, *SDAIK* 18, Mainz a/Rhein, 45–52
- Iwaszczuk, J. 2014: The Legacy of Senwosret I During the Reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, *EtudTrav* XXVII, 161–178
- Karkowski, J. 1981: The Pharaonic Inscriptions from Faras, *Faras* V, Varsovie
- Karkowski, J. 1983: The Arrangement of the Architraves in Hatshepsut's Temple at Deir el-Bahari, *EtudTrav* XIII, 139–153
- Laboury, D. 1998: La statuare de Thoutmosis III: Essai d'interprétation d'un portrait royal dans son contexte historique, *AegLeod* 5, Liège
- Lacau, P. 1909: Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire N<sup>os</sup> 34001–34064. Stèles du Nouvel Empire I, Le Caire
- Lacau, P., Chevrier, H. 1956: Une chapelle de Sesostris I<sup>er</sup> à Karnak, Le Caire
- Lacau, P., Chevrier, H. 1969: Une chapelle de Sesostris I<sup>er</sup> à Karnak. Planches, Le Caire
- Lacau, P., Chevrier, H. 1977: Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak I, Le Caire
- Laskowski, P. 2003: Meaning of the Verb *snfr* in the Building Records of the Thutmose Period, [*in:*] Popielska-Grzybowska, J. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Second Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists. Egypt 2001: Perspectives of Research* Warsaw 5–7 March 2001, Warsaw, 91–95

- Laskowski, P. 2006: Monumental Architecture and the Royal Building Program of Thutmose III, [in:] Cline, E.H., O'Connor, D. (Eds), Thutmose III. A New Biography, Ann Arbor, 183–237
- Mariette-Bey, A. 1875: Karnak. Études topographiques et archéologiques avec un appendice comprenant les principaux textes hiéroglyphiques découverts ou recueillis pendant les fouilles exécutées à Karnak, Leipzig
- Mensan, R. 2007: Tuthmosid foundation deposits at Karnak, *EgArch* 30, 21–25
- Meyer, Ch. 1982: Senenmut. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung, *HÄS* 2, Hamburg
- Morkot, R. 2003: Archaism and Innovation in Art from the New Kingdom to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, [in:] Tait, J. (Ed.), 'Never Had the Like Occurred'. Egypt's view of its past, London, 79–99
- Moursi, M.I. 1972: Die Hohenpriester des Sonnengottes von der Frühzeit Ägyptens bis zum Ende des Neuen Reiches, *MÄS* 26, Berlin
- Myśliwiec, K. 1982: Amon, Atum and Aton: the Evolution of the Heliopolitan Influences in Thebes, [in:] *L'Égyptologie en 1979. Axes prioritaires de recherches II. Actes du colloque CNRS n° 595*, Paris 1982, 285–289
- Naville, E. 1895: The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part I. The North-Western End of the Upper Platform, *MEEF* 13, London
- Naville, E. 1896: The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part II. The Ebony Shrine. Northern Half of the Middle Platform, *MEEF* 14, London
- Naville, E. 1898: The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part III. End of the Northern Half and Southern Half of the Middle Platform, *MEEF* 16, London
- Naville, E. 1901: The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part IV. The Shrine of Hathor and the Southern Hall of Offerings, *MEEF* 19, London
- Naville, E. 1906: The Temple of Deir el-Bahari. Part V. The Upper Court and Sanctuary, *MEEF* 27, London
- Newberry, P.E. 1906: Egyptian Antiquities. Scarabs. An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings, London
- Nims, Ch.F. 1969: Thutmosis III's Benefactions to Amon, [in:] Studies in Honor of John A. Wilson September 12, 1969, *SAOC* 35, Chicago, 69–74
- Niwiński, A. 1996: Les périodes whm mswt dans l'histoire de l'Égypte: un essai comparatif, *BSFE* 136, 5–26
- Obsomer, C. 1993: La date de Nésou-Montou (Louvre C 1), *RdE* 44, 103–140
- Obsomer, C. 1995: Sésostris I<sup>er</sup>. Étude chronologique et historique du règne, *Étude* 5, [Bruxelles]
- Pécoil, J.-F. 2000: *L'Akh-menou* de Thoutmosis III à Karnak. *La Heret-ib* et les chapelles attenantes. Relevés épigraphiques, Paris
- Petrie, W.M.F. 1896: Koptos, London
- Radwan, A. 1981: Zwei Stelen aus dem 47. Jahre Thutmosis' III, *MDAIK* 37, 403–407
- Raue, D. 1999: Heliopolis und das Haus des Re. Eine Prosopographie und ein Toponym im Neuen Reich, *ADAIK* 16, Berlin
- Redford, D.B. 1987: The Tod Inscription of Senwosret I and Early 12th Dynasty Involvement in Nubia and the South, *JSSEA* XII/1–2, 36–55

- Schenkel, W. 1975: Die Bauinschrift Sesostris' I. im Satet-Tempel von Elephantine, *MDAIK* 31, 109–125
- Schulman, A.R. 1987–1988: The Ubiquitous Senenmut, *BES* 9, 61–81
- Simpson, W.K. 1991: Mentuhotep, Vizier of Sesostris I, Patron of Art and Architecture, *MDAIK* 47, 331–340
- Spiegelberg, W. 1900: Die Northampton Stele, *RecTrav* 22, 115–125
- Studer, S. 1996: Bemerkungen zu *hm* “Allerheiligstes” (Wb III, 280,10–13), [in:] Schade-Busch, M. (Ed.), Wege öffnen. Festschrift für Rolf Gundlach zum 65. Geburtstag, *ÄAT* 35, Wiesbaden 1996, 326–329
- Thiers, Ch., Zignani, P. 2011: The temple of Ptah at Karnak, *EgArch* 38, 20–24
- Traunecker, C. 1992: Coptos: Hommes et dieux sur le parvis de Geb, *OLA* 43, Leuven
- Vernus, P. 1979: Un décret de Thoutmosis III relatif à la santé publique (P. Berlin 3049, v° XVIII–XIX), *Or* 48/2, 176–184
- Wallet-Lebrun, Ch. 1994: Contribution à l'étude de l'histoire de la construction à Karnak. La substitution du grès au calcaire comme matériau de construction dans le temple d'Amon-Rê, [in:] Dewachter, M., Fouchard, A. (Eds), *L'égyptologie et les Champollion*, Grenoble, 223–256
- Wallet-Lebrun, Ch. 2009: Le grand livre de pierre. Les textes de construction à Karnak, *EtudEg* 9, *MAIBL* 41, Paris
- Weigall, A.E.P. 1908: Upper Egyptian Notes, *ASAE* IX, 105–112
- Winlock, H.E. 1928: The Egyptian Expedition 1925–1927: The Museum's Excavations at Thebes, *BMMA* 23/2, 3–58
- Wysocki, Z. 1986: The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari. Its Original Form, *MDAIK* 42, 213–228