

Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-first Century

Proceedings of the
Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists
Cairo, 2000

Volume 2
History
Religion



Edited by
Zahi Hawass

In collaboration with
Lyla Pinch Brock

The American University in Cairo Press
Cairo New York

On the Obelisks Mentioned in the
Northampton Stela of Djehuti,
Director of the Treasury during
Hatshepsut's Reign

Dariusz Niedziółka
Institute of Oriental Studies, Warsaw University

In the text of Djehuti's (Northampton) stela, carved on the western wall of the court of his Theban tomb (TT 11) at Dra Abu al-Naga, many monuments of queen Hatshepsut decorated or executed under Djehuti's supervision are mentioned. One of them is a pair of obelisks:¹

ḏḥwtj wr.wj k3=sn mh 108 ḏsk.(w) r 3w=sn m ḏ'rmw mh.w 13.wf m s3.wj=sn

"two great obelisks, which are 108 cubits high, being worked entirely with electrum, while the Two Lands have become full of their rays"

The obelisks mentioned in the text were, and still are, differently identified with actual monuments erected by Queen Hatshepsut in the temple of Amun at Karnak. In the opinion of Spiegelberg,² the author of the first publication of the whole stela, they should be identified with the pair erected in the hall between the Fourth and Fifth Pylons, and not another pair suggested by Sethe two years earlier.³ Spiegelberg's opinion has been accepted by Breasted,⁴ Heick,⁵ Barquet,⁶ Ratté,⁷ and Meyer.⁸ It was Lercay⁹ who first identified the obelisks referred to in Djehuti's inscription as those erected by the queen in the eastern part of Amun's precinct. His point of view has been adhered to by Habachi,¹⁰ Hayes,¹¹ Martin,¹² Gabolde,¹³ and Vandensleyen.¹⁴

It seems, however, that there are data, of both of an epigraphic and an archaeological nature, to support Spiegelberg's opinion and those of scholars who accepted the identification of the obelisks mentioned by Djehuti with those erected by Hatshepsut in the *wadji*. Considering the dimensions of the actual monuments and the height referred to by Djehuti, and taking into account the adorning of the obelisks with electrum as attested on Djehuti's stela as well as in the inscriptions on the western pair of the queen's obelisks, and comparing this with the texts accompanying the representations of obelisks in the temple at Deir al-Bahari, one should rather be inclined to identify the obelisks mentioned by Djehuti with the pair erected in the hall between the Fourth and Fifth Pylons at Karnak.¹⁵

According to recent metrological investigations by Carlotti, the royal cubit used in Karnak during Hatshepsut's reign was equal to 0.525 m in the case of the quartzite Barque Chapel,¹⁶ and

0.53 m in the case of the Eighth Pylon in the temple of Amun.¹⁷ Thus, the 108 cubits mentioned by Djehuti would result in 56.70 m or 57.24 m, for the cubit of 0.525 and 0.53 m respectively.

Spiegelberg¹⁸ was the first to suggest that 108 cubits must represent the combined height of a pair of obelisks. This was rather commonly accepted by subsequent scholars, some of whom observed, however, that the total is less than twice the height of the still-standing Hatshepsut obelisk.¹⁹ This was considered to be 29.83 m high, according to measurements taken by the Commission de l'Égypte.²⁰ The difference in height of 1.48 m for a single monolith did not prevent—in their opinion—the obelisks mentioned by Djehuti to be identified with those erected by Hatshepsut in the hall called *wadfit*. Such an interpretation was generally accepted until Habachi²¹ suggested that the height of 108 cubits (i.e., 56.70 m) should represent a single monolith. In his opinion, the obelisks referred to by Djehuti should be identified with the pair erected by Hatshepsut in the eastern sector of Karnak. His hypothesis was also based on comparison of measurable elements of Hatshepsut's eastern and western pairs of obelisks. For example, the width of the northern obelisk socle in the eastern pair is ca. 3.90 m,²² and the northern monolith socle in the western pair is 3.77m;²³ the original height of the Cairo pyramidion was 3.92 m,²⁴ and the pyramidion of the southern monolith in the western pair is 2.96 m high;²⁵ the base of the former pyramidion is 1.805–1.83 m wide,²⁶ and the width of the base of the latter is 1.78 m.²⁷

Subsequently many scholars, including Martin,²⁸ Golvin,²⁹ Vandersleyen,³⁰ and the present author³¹ were of the opinion that the eastern obelisks were taller than the western ones. Vandersleyen, however, is the only one who accepted Habachi's hypothesis of the eastern obelisks at Karnak exceeding 50 m in height.

As previously suggested by Engelbach,³² a ratio of given elements of two obelisks cannot constitute a solid basis for determining the exact height of a monolith. One should note, however, that the height suggested by Habachi for the eastern obelisks of Hatshepsut, would exceed by more than 22 meters the height of Thutmose III's Latecan single obelisk, originally more than 33 m high, and probably the tallest monument of this kind ever erected in Egypt.³³ Even the unfinished monolith in the quarries at Aswan was intended to be 41.75 m high in its original, more monumental version,³⁴ that is, almost 15 m less than the height of Hatshepsut's eastern obelisks as Habachi suggested. Moreover, the width of the unfinished Aswan monolith is 4.20 m at its base,³⁵ that is more than the width of the socles on which Hatshepsut's eastern obelisks were actually erected, the latter being ca. 3.90 m. Thus, Habachi's hypothesis concerning the height of the obelisks seems to be excluded, and consequently, the value of 108 cubits should represent the combined height of two monoliths. This would imply that the single monument was 54 cubits (28.35 m) high. This value, in turn, coincides almost perfectly with the actual height of the still-standing obelisk of Hatshepsut, which is 28.48 m high, according to the recent measurements taken by the Centre Franco-Egyptien,³⁶ and not 29.83 m, as *Description d'Égypte's* La Commission des Arts et des Sciences recorded. Thus, the actual obelisk would be only 13 cm higher than the height mentioned in Djehuti's stela, assuming the royal cubit to be equal to 0.525 m, or only 14 cm smaller, if one assumed the cubit of 0.53 m, as was also attested during the reign of Hatshepsut. One should also note that the obelisks of a pair could differ slightly in height, and that 108 cubits (= 56.70 or 57.24 m) need not necessarily be split into strictly equal parts. It is well known that such differences in size could exist between one pair of monoliths. For example, in the case of the Luxor obelisks of Ramesses II, the eastern monolith is taller than the western one, now in Paris, by 2 m.³⁷ Considering the size of the preserved parts of Thutmose III's obelisks once erected in front of the Seventh Pylon at Karnak, one could also assume that the eastern monolith was taller.³⁸ Taking into account such closely-convergent textual and archaeological data about the dimensions of Hatshepsut's obelisks, it seems difficult to assume that the text of Djehuti would

refer to any pair of obelisks other than those erected by the queen in the Year 16 of Thutmose III's reign in the hall between the Fourth and Fifth Pylons at Karnak. Such an identification appears all the more probable since the eastern obelisks of Hatshepsut almost surely exceeded the western monoliths in size, as measurable elements of the former ones might imply.

It seems that the mention of the electrum covering their entire length (*r 3w=sn*) should be considered another argument in favor of their identification with the pair erected by the queen in the hall between the pylons at Karnak.

Remains of the queen's eastern obelisks examined by Lacau³⁹ revealed no traces of covering with any precious metal. Since Lacau assumed that the obelisks mentioned in the text of Djehuti were erected in the eastern part of Karnak, he has suggested that a thin foil of precious metal was affixed with plaster.

In the famous scene showing the dedication of the obelisks on the wall of the southern low-ermost portico of Hatshepsut's temple at Deir al-Bahari, two pairs of monoliths are depicted.⁴⁰ One of them should represent the eastern obelisks of the queen at Karnak (probably the left pair), and the second, the ones of Thutmose II, decorated and erected by Hatshepsut in the festival court in front of the Fourth Pylon at Karnak⁴¹ (probably the right pair).

This interpretation seems to be supported by two facts. First, based on the dedication formula occurring on the representations of obelisks at Deir al-Bahari, the pyramidia of the left pair were covered with electrum.⁴²

hr-n=s m mnw=s n hr=s [mn + 1 gr + s'hr] n=f tjn.wi wr.wi m mzi bnhn.(w)r m q'r m hr=s di.(t) 'nh nb mi r' dt

"That she has acted is her foundation for her father [Amun . . .] (namely) the erecting] for him of two great obelisks with pyramidia of electrum, that she might act being given all life like Re forever."⁴³

And in the case of the other dedication, the space is insufficient to restore any mention of gold or electrum in the text:⁴⁴

hr-n=s m mnw=s n hr=s [mn] r' nb ns.wr [3.wi.....] s'hr [n=f tjn.wi wr.wi hr=s] di.<ti> r'nh mi r' dt

"That she has acted is her foundation for her father Amun-Re, the lord of the thrones [of the Two Lands . . .] (namely) the erecting [for him of two great obelisks, that she might act] being given life like Re forever."

Thus it would be difficult to identify the obelisks depicted in Deir al-Bahari with those erected in the hall between the Fourth and Fifth Pylons, for the latter were decorated at least on their upper halves with electrum. Considering the texts on the obelisks in the portico, one could accept at least that the pyramidia of one pair were decorated with electrum, thus none of these monuments could be identified with those referred to by Djehuti.

Secondly, as is widely known, the transport of obelisks is shown in the most spectacular representation in the same portico of the temple.⁴⁵ Despite some attempts to recognize in it a depiction of the transport of four monoliths,⁴⁶ both the representation and especially the text above it, clearly attest that two obelisks only, not four, are shown and mentioned.⁴⁷ The apparent inconsistency in the number of monuments depicted in the scene of transport (two obelisks) and the scene of dedication (four obelisks) seems easy to explain. Most probably, Hatshepsut's eastern obelisks at Karnak are depicted in the former representation, and the same ones together with those of Thutmose II in the latter. This might suggest that up to the moment of decorating the portico, the queen executed and transported only one pair of monuments to Karnak, surely the eastern ones, that is, those depicted in the scene of transport. She might have, however, erected

two pairs of obelisks, namely the eastern ones and those already executed and transported to Karnak by Thutmose II, that is, the four monuments shown in the scene of dedication.

As regards sheathing with electrum, the identification of the obelisks mentioned by Djehuti with those erected in the hall between the pylons finds support both in archaeological and epigraphic sources. Lacerat observed that inside the *p.t. 13*, and *w3s* signs framing the shaft sides of Hatshepsut's obelisks erected in the *wadji*, there are rather thin, deep grooves, most probably intended for fixing electrum foil over more than half of the monoliths' sides, from the pyramidia down to the lowermost register.⁴⁸ This is confirmed beyond doubt by the texts adorning these obelisks.

1. Dedication text on the front face of the still standing northern obelisk:⁴⁹

hr-n-s m mnw-s n hr-s imn nb ns-wr 13-wi s'hr n=f tgn-wi wr-wi r sb3 šps imn-wr-šy.t b3k.w m đm 3 wr.t šđđ-n=0 13-wi mi tm n zp tr-(w) mi.t đr p3w.t 13 tr n=f 23 r' h3.t-šps-wi-imn-t-hn dt-(w) r'nh mi r' đ.t

"That she has acted is her foundation for her father Amun, the Lord of thrones of the Two Lands, (namely) the erecting for him of the two great obelisks at the splendid gate (named) Amun is great of prestige'; they being worked very greatly with electrum, while (this)⁵⁰ has illumined the Two Lands like the sun disk—a similar has never been made since the primeval time of the earth—that the son [sic]⁵¹ of Re Hatshepsut-united-with-Amun might act for him (Amun) being given life forever."

2. Long text at the bottom of the same obelisk:⁵²

tr-n-s m mnw-s n hr-s imn nb ns-wr 13-wi bnt tp.t-s-wt tr.t n=f tgn-wi wr-wi m m3i rwd.t n.t r-si gs-sn hr.t m đm ni tp-(w) h3s-wr nb-wr m3.dw m hnti hrw b'řān sr-wi=sn 13-wi wbn im imi-wr ni hr'c'f m žt.t n.t p.t

"That she has acted is her foundation for her father Amun, the Lord of thrones of the Two Lands, the foremost of the temple at Karnak, (namely) the making for him of two great obelisks of hard granite of the southern region, their upper halves being of electrum from the best of all foreign countries, and it is seen on both sides of the river that their rays have inundated the Two Lands, whenever the sun disk rises between them, as when it appears in glory on the horizon of the sky."

3. Further in the same inscription:⁵³

ink pw sngnhr=i m řh šđ3-n=i km3 wi ib=i hr hrp=i r tr.t n=f tgn-wi wr-wi m đm bhbn(w)=sn 3bhw m hr.t m twny.t šps.t r-imt.dw bhnti wr.ti n.(t) nzw k3-nht nzw hnti 3-đpr-k3-r' hr m3'-hrw

"As regards me,⁵⁴ while I was sitting in the palace (and) thinking about the one who had created me, my mind has directed me to make for him two great obelisks of electrum, pyramidia of which would mingle with the sky, in the splendid *imn*⁵⁵ in the midst of two great pylons of the king 'Victorious Bull', the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Aakheperkare (Thutmose II), Horus, true of voice."

4. Further in the same inscription:⁵⁶

z3-w đđ=t n m n řh(=t) zp 2 tr-n-w mn hr-m ms.t đw m nbw r 3w=f mi tğ.t wn hpr.t(i)
"Beware lest you say: 'I don't know, I don't know why it has been done, (namely) that a mountain has been fashioned, entirely of gold, like a naturally existing thing!'"

5. Further in the same inscription:⁵⁷

hw tr p3 tgn-wi wr-wi b3k.n im=i m đm n hr=i imn n mr-wt wn rti=i mn-(w) w3h-(w) m r3-pr pn r nht hr' đ.t hw ni s.t hr w' m m3i rwd.t m šht mn dn-w mn
"As regards the pair of great obelisks, which my majesty has worked with electrum for my father Amun, in order that my name may exist, being established and enduring in

this temple for ever and ever, it is of a single block of hard granite, and there is no assembling (of stones) nor patching stones⁵⁸ therein."

6. Further in the same inscription:⁵⁹

nh.t=i pw tr.t n=f sr nbl.<ti> m đm w3h-n=(i) ts gs=sn hr đ.t=sn

"It was my wish to make it (obelisks) for him, being gilded with electrum, thus I have fixed even their (obelisks) halves on themselves."⁶⁰

7. Further in the same inscription:⁶¹

rdt-n=(i) r-s m đm ni kn h3-n=(i) m h3.t mi sšw hm=i hr nis trw.t r m3.n 13-wi mn(w) hm ni nh rñ-(w) sr

"It is electrum of the fine quality, which I have measured in *heqais* like grain, that I have given to it (obelisks), and my majesty has been announcing quantity loudly so that the complete Two Lands might see, and an ignorant as well as wise man might know it."

The gliding of these monoliths is also twice referred to in inscriptions decorating Hatshepsut's Red Chapel.

1. The text accompanying the scene of the gold offering to Amun:⁶²

nzw đs=f hpr đm 3 wr.t n imn nb ns-wr 13-wi m tp-w b3k.w n(w) h3s-wr nb-wr r nbi tgn-wi 3-w(i) tr-s dt.<ti> r'nh

"The king himself is one who has offered electrum in great amount for Amun, the Lord of thrones of the Two Lands, as a principal tribute of all the foreign lands, to glid two great obelisks, that she might act being given life."

2. The text accompanying the scene of obelisk presentation to Amun:⁶³

nzw đs=f s'hr tgn-wi wr-wi n hr-s imn-r' m bnti w3đy.t šps.t b3k(w) m đm 3 wr.t k3=sn dmn=0 hr.t šđđ-n=0 13-wi mi im n zp tr.t mi.t đr p3w.t 13 tr-s dt.<ti> r'nh đ.t

"The king himself is one who has erected two great obelisks for her [sic]⁶⁴ father Amun-Re, within the splendid *wadji*, while they are worked very greatly with electrum and their height, (it)⁶⁵ has pierced the sky, and (this)⁶⁶ has illumined the Two Lands like the sun disk—a similar has never been made since the primeval time of the earth—that she might act being given life forever."

Therefore, considering the dedication formulae of the representation of the obelisks at Deir al-Bahari, the lack of mention of a more extensive gliding of Hatshepsut's eastern monoliths, and concurrently, the very well-attested rich adorning with electrum of her western pair of monuments, it seems almost certain that the text of Djehuti's stela refers to the latter ones.

There is also another factor, which seems to have never been considered in the scholarly debate on the attribution of the obelisks mentioned by Djehuti: it is very probable that the works enumerated in the list on the stela were arranged in a chronological sequence, beginning with Hatshepsut as king,⁶⁸ ending with the building of the Red Chapel.⁶⁹ It is attested beyond all doubt that the western obelisks were executed, transported to Karnak, then erected over Years 15–16, as shown in the inscription at the base of the northern monument:⁷⁰

š3-n hm=i k3.t r-s m rnp.t zp 15 3bd 2 pr.t sww 1 nfy.t r rnp.t zp 16 3bd 4 šww r'ky sww tr-n=0 3bd 7 m 33.t m đw

"My majesty has ordained works concerning it (obelisks) beginning on the regnal Year 15, second month of the *peret*-season, first day, ending with regnal Year 16, fourth month of the *shemu*-season, last day, while (this)⁷¹ has made seven months as those ordained in the mountain (quarries)."

Thus, their position in Djehuti's list would fit well into the alleged chronological order of works supervised by this official. Moreover, the works following the gliding of obelisks concern the door-wing of the gate of the Fifth Pylon,⁷² which might have been destroyed during the erection of the obelisks in the hall in front of this pylon.

Considering these combined archaeological and epigraphic data, it seems certain that the text of Djehuti refers to the covering with electrum of the western obelisks of the queen, erected in the hall between the Fourth and Fifth Pylons at Karnak, and not to the eastern ones, as has sometimes been suggested, especially in more recent publications.

- 18 *Rec. de Trav.* 22, 123.
 19 Eg. Breasted, *AR II*, 156 n.h.
 20 After Spiegelberg, *Rec. de Trav.* 22, 123.
 21 Habachi, *JNES* 16, 99.
 22 As results from the plan published by A. Varille; "Description sommaire du sanctuaire oriental d'Amón-Ré à Karnak," *ASAE* 50 (1950), Pl. XII.
 23 See M. Azim *et al.*, *Karnak et sa topographie. I: Les relevés modernes du temple d'Amón-Ré 1967-1984* (Paris, 1998), Pl. 3.
 24 Ch. Kuentz, *Obélisques* (Le Caire, 1932), 21 fig. 25.
 25 R. Engelbach, *The Aswân Obelisk* (Le Caire, 1922), 9.
 26 Kuentz, *Obélisques*, 21 fig. 25.
 27 Engelbach, *Aswân Obelisk*, 9.
 28 Martin, *Garaussymbol*, 149.
 29 J.-C. Golvin, "Hatchepsout et les obélisques de Karnak," *Les dossiers d'archéologie* 187 (1993), 40.
 30 Vandersleyen, *Egypte*, 287 and 293 n. 1.
 31 D. Niedziółka, *Sektor wschodni Karnaku w czasach Tomenes III* (=The Eastern Part of Karnak during the Reign of Thutmose III) (Warsaw, 1989), unpublished M.A. thesis, Institute of Archaeology, Warsaw University, 86 and 101; see also *Gelchtmisvolle Königin Hatschepsut* 32.
 32 R. Engelbach, "The Obelisks of Pylon VII at Karnak," *Ancient Egypt* (1923), 60-62.
 33 G. Lebevre, "Sur l'obélisque du Larau," *Revue Archéol.* 6 série 31-32, (1949), 589 and n. 2.
 34 Engelbach, *Aswân Obelisk*, 3, 9, Pl. 1.
 35 Engelbach, *Aswân Obelisk*, 3, 9, Pl. 1.
 36 See Gabolde, *Cahiers de Karnak VIII*, 150.
 37 See W. Westendorf, *Ägyptische Darstellungen des Sonnenlaufes auf der abschüssigen Himmelsbahn* (MÄS 10, Berlin, 1966), 67.
 38 See Cl. Traunecker, "Estimation des dimensions de l'obélisque ouest du VII^e pylône," *Cahiers de Karnak VIII* (1982), 205 n. 11.
 39 *ASAE* 53/2, 247.
 40 E. Naville, *The Temple of Deir el Bahari VI* (London, 1906), Pl. 156.
 41 Regarding these obelisks, see Gabolde, *Cahiers de Karnak VIII*, 143-58.
 42 Naville, *Deir el Bahari VI*, Pl. 156, left pair. The actual facsimile of this text kindly provided by Zbigniew E. Szafranski, Director of the Polish-Egyptian Mission at Deir el-Bahari, contributes nothing to the reading published by Naville. The lacuna is exactly three sign-groups high, thus one should reconstruct the name of Anunn in the first group, an epithet of the god in the second, and the infinitive *s'jr* (*tr*) is much less probable) in the third.
 43 Regarding different interpretations of the dedication formula's grammatical structure see A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian. A linguistic introduction*, (Cambridge, 1995), 198; T. Ritner, *Das Verbalssystem der königlichen und privaten Inschriften: XVIII. Dynastie bis einschliesslich Amenophis III* (GOF IV 30; Wiesbaden, 1995), 139-41; J. M. Kruchten, "Deux cas particuliers de phrase coupée sans l'opérateur énonciatif *h₂*," *JEA* 82 (1996), 51-60; K. Jansen-Winkeln, "Hervorgehobenes Objekt und königliche Widmungsformel," *Or* 66 (1997), 15-33; P. Laskowski, "Some Remarks on the Dedication Formula *irjw=f* *m nwn=f*," *GM* 167 (1998), 77-81.
 44 Naville, *Deir el Bahari VI*, Pl. 156, right pair. Thanks to the facsimile kindly provided by Dr. Szafranski, one can ascertain that the lacuna, which is almost six sign-groups high in Naville's publication, actually contains almost eight groups. Fortunately, there are some signs partly preserved allowing reconstruction, to some degree, of the missing part of the text. Immediately below *l=s* there are traces of the name

Notes:

- 1 K. Sethe, *Urk.* IV, 425, 16-426, 2.
 2 W. Spiegelberg, "Die Northampton Stela," *Rec. de Trav.* 22 (1900), 123-24.
 3 K. Sethe, "Die Thronwreien unter den Nachfolgern Königs Thutmosis' I., ihr Verlauf und ihre Bedeutung," (UGAA 1, Leipzig, 1896), 33, n. 45.
 4 J. H. Breasted, *AR II*, 156 n.h.
 5 W. Helck, *Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs* (Leiden and Köln, 1958), 398 n. 9 and *Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reichs I* (Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1960; Nr. 10 Wiesbaden, 1961), 807.
 6 P. Barque, *Le temple d'Amón-Ré à Karnak: Essai d'état* (RAPH 21, Le Caire, 1962), 100 n. 1.
 7 S. Ratié, *La reine Hatchepsout: sources et problèmes* (Orientalia Monasteriensia 1, Leiden, 1979), 271, n. 49.
 8 C. Meyer, *Senenmut: eine prosopographische Untersuchung* (MAS 2, Hamburg, 1982), 136.
 9 P. Lacaun, "L'or dans l'architecture égyptienne," *ASAE* 53/2 (1956), 247.
 10 L. Habachi, "Two Graffiti at Setel from the Reign of Queen Hatshepsut," *JNES* 16 (1957), 99.
 11 W. C. Hayes, *Egypt: Internal Affairs from Tutimosis I to the Death of Amenophis III; Part I* (CAH II; Cambridge, 1962), 21.
 12 K. Martin, *Ein Garamisymbol des Lebens. Untersuchung zur Ursprung und Geschichte der altägyptischen Obelisken bis zum Ende des Neuen Reichs* (HÄB 3, Hildesheim, 1977), 153.
 13 L. Gabolde, "A propos de deux obélisques de Thoutmosis II, dédiés à son père Thoutmosis I et érigés sous le règne d'Hatchepsout-pharaon à l'ouest du IV^e pylône," *Cahiers de Karnak VIII* (Paris, 1987), 149 n. 9.
 14 C. Vandersleyen, *L'Égypte et la vallée du Nil. Tome 2: De la fin de l'Ancien Empire à la fin du Nouvel Empire* (Paris, 1995), 293 n. 1.
 15 See D. Niedziółka, "Die Bauten der Königin Hatschepsut," in *Gelchtmisvolle Königin Hatschepsut. Ägyptische Kunst des 15. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Wanshan, 1997), 32; D. Laboury, *La statue de Thoutmosis III. Essai d'interprétation d'un portrait royal dans son contexte historique* (Aaglead 5; Liège, 1998), 23 and n. 134, 554 and n. 1598, 1600.
 16 J. F. Carloti, "Contribution à l'étude métrologique de quelques monuments du temple d'Amón-Ré à Karnak," *Cahiers de Karnak X* (1995), 80.
 17 *Cahiers de Karnak X*, 85.

- imn-r'* and this god's epithet *nb ns-wr* [ʒ3-wʃ], that jointly fills two groups and a half. Then, one missing group, which once had undoubtedly contained another epithet of the god, is followed by traces of *s'hr*, that combined gives another two sign-groups. The remaining part of the lacuna, which is a little higher than three sign-groups, should be filled with *n=f tḥn-wi* (one uppermost sign-group and a half) and *fr=s* (half of the lowermost sign-group). Since one cannot insert the phrase *m ḡr-m*, or *m nbw* into the still missing part of the lacuna, which should have filled two groups, the epithet *wr-wi* should be considered the one possible candidate to be reconstructed therein.
- 45 Naville, *Deir el Bahari* VI, Pl. 154.
46 E.g. Lacau, H. Chevrier, *Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak I* (Le Caire, 1977), 233-34 § 373; Laboury, *Statuaire de Thoutmosis III*, 554.
47 See e.g. Meyer, *Senehmut*, 135; Golvin, *Les dossiers d'archéologie* 187, 38.
48 ASAE 53, 244 and fig. 8.
49 *Urk.* IV, 357, 4-9.
50 There is an evident subject omission under relevance in this clause. In regard to this issue see M. Collier, "The Relative Clause and the Verb in Middle Egyptian," *JEA* 77 (1991), 36-37; Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 161. One might hesitate, however, to conclude that this omitted subject is coreferential with the obelisks or with the mere fact they have been covered with a precious metal. Since it was this elctrum covering that could result in illumining of the Two Lands with the reflected light of the sun, the latter solution seems more probable.
51 There is an evident inconsistency in the text as regards the female or male nature of Hatshepsut.
52 *Urk.* IV, 362, 10-14.
53 *Urk.* IV, 364, 16-365, 5.
54 As regards function of this type of clause, see J. F. Borghouts, "Prominence constructions and pragmatic functions," in: G. Englund, J. Frandsen (eds.), *Crossroad. Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm. Papers from the Conference on Egyptian Grammar Helsinki 28-30 May 1986* (København, 1986), 54-55; Vernus, "Observations sur la prédication de la classe ('Nominal predicative')." *LingAeg* 4 (1994), 336-41; Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 111-12; M. Malaise, J. Winand, *Grammaire raisonnée de l'Égyptien classique* (Aegleod 6; Liège 1999), 284 § 469 and 1054 § 671.
55 The hall between the Fourth and Fifth Pylons at Karnak, provided with polygonal columns at the moment of erecting of these obelisks, cf. inscriptions on the Red Chapel referring to *wadjit*, the same hall with papyrus columns.
56 *Urk.* IV, 365, 10-13.
57 *Urk.* IV, 366, 13-367, 2.
58 As regards this method of blocking up (*dm*) damaged masonry parts, see D. Arnold, *Building in Egypt. Pharaonic Stone Masonry* (Oxford and New York, 1991), 241-42; *Lexikon der ägyptischen Baukunst* (München and Zürich 1994), 38; R. Cernec, "Egyptian 'building excellence': Thutmose III's builders," in *Essays in honour of Prof. Dr. Jadwiga Lipińska* (WES 1; Warsaw 1997), 27.
59 *Urk.* IV, 367, 8-9.
60 The last clause has been interpreted and translated differently by certain authors, and some left the clause untranslated, e.g. Brevstedt, *AR II*, 133; L. Habachi, *The Obelisks of Egypt. Skyscrapers of the Past* (New York, 1977), 66; E.A.W. Budge, *Cleopatra's Needles and Other Egyptian Obelisks* (London, 1926), 121 and n. 1, translated, "[o]r I laid their part (or half) upon their bodies" and commented, "the meaning seems to be that the Queen says that she set up the upper or lighter halves upon the heavier halves, i.e. that she placed the obelisks in their upright positions." M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature, vol. II: The New Kingdom* (Berkeley, 1976), 29 and 29 n. 9) translated "Their foil (literally 'their sides') lies on their body" interpreting this as peoples' words expected by the queen, and commented on this translation, "The

- meaning seems to be that the gold foil forms a solid sheath." I. Müller's translation "*Ich habe tatsächlich ihre (des Obeliskens) Seite, wie es sein soll, aufgestellt*," has not been commented upon (see *Urk.* IV, *Übersetzung zu den Heften 5-16* (Berlin, 1984), 34). It seems that all these translations are rather distant from the Egyptian text and the suggested interpretations fail to support them. It might be more probable that the queen in person had determined, on the obelisks themselves (*hr d1=sr*), the line to which they were to be gilded, thus establishing (*w3ḥ*) a gilded upper half or side (*ḡs=sr*) of each monument and an ungilded lower half. Such an interpretation would not require any emendation to the inscription, except the suffix *=l* attached to *w3ḥr*, and moreover, this would not concurrently imply otherwise unattested meanings for particular lexemes occurring in the text. The clause seems to express the queen's creative contribution in fashioning these obelisks, one that would be emphasized by the particle *is* occurring in the clause. Concerning this function of the particle, see Borghouts in *Crossroad* I, 66-67; idem, *A Concise Introduction to Middle Egyptian* (Leiden, 1989), 76-77 § 59.17 and 215 § 211.e; L. Depuydt, "Zur Bedeutung der Partikeln *isk* und *is*," *GM* 136 (1993), 20-23; Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 153-55; Malaise, Winand, *Grammaire raisonnée*, 181-84 § 313 and 564-66 § 911.
61 *Urk.* IV, 367, 14-368, 1.
62 Lacau, Chevrier, *Chapelle d'Hatshepsout* 230 § 365.
63 Lacau, Chevrier, *Chapelle d'Hatshepsout*, 232 § 369.
64 There is again an inconsistency in the text regarding the gender of Hatshepsut.
65 It is undoubtedly a subject omission under relevance, cf. n. 50 above. The omitted subject *=s* is surely coreferential with the phrase "their height" (*ḡs=sr*), the latter being the topicalized subject of the clause.
66 There is again an evident subject omission under relevance in this clause, cf. n. 50 above. The omitted subject, probably *=s*, should rather be coreferential with the fact of the gilding of the obelisks (cf. n. 50 above).
67 *Urk.* IV, 421, 2-4.
68 *Urk.* IV, 421, 10-12; 422, 2-3; 422, 9-11.
69 *Urk.* IV, 427, 15-428, 2.
70 *Urk.* IV, 367, 3-5.
71 Again, the subject omission under relevance, cf. n. 50 above. The omitted pronoun *=s* should most probably be identified with the duration of the works referred to in the preceding clause.
72 *Urk.* IV, 426, 8-10.